Beef Cattle Farmers’ Group Cohesion In Bantul And Sleman Regencies Yogyakarta Special Region

Fransiskus Trisakti Haryadi1, Rini Widiati1, Tri Anggraeni Kusumastuti1, Siti Andarwati1

1 Faculty of Animal Science, Universitas Gadjah Mada
Corresponding email: trisakti-h@ugm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The study was aimed to analyze the cohesion level of beef cattle farmers’ groups of Bismo in Bantul and Sido Makmur in Sleman Regencies Yogyakarta Special Region. The analysis was based on the components forming group cohesion including farmers’ attractiveness in group goals, group activities, membership of the group, and interpersonal relationship among the members of the group. All the active members of the groups were selected as respondents. Data were gathered by interviewing the respondents directly using questionnaire. Descriptive analysis was used to describe the level of cohesion. The results showed that there was a difference kind of components being the highest score achievement percentage in forming group cohesion between Bismo and Sido Makmur Groups. Bismo group had group activities attraction (95.98%) as the main indicator for its member to commit to the group, while the membership of the group was the main attraction indicator (97.33%) for the member of Sido Makmur to stay in a group. Although the attractions indicator of cohesion including interpersonal and farmers’ group goal were in high score achievement percentage for both of the Groups of Bismo (89.81% and 88.21%) and Sido Makmur (88.98% and 86.67%), but they had not been used optimally yet as the main reference by the farmers’ member of the group to commit to the groups. The conclusions of the research were that there was a high category level of beef cattle farmers’ group cohesion for both Bismo and Sido Makmur groups. The farmers’ group activities and membership of the group was the main attractions indicator of beef cattle farmers’ group cohesion.
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INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, 95% of the total beef cattle population was raised by rural people in an integrated farming system (CBS, 2013). They are keeping their animals in small scale number of ownership as a side farming activities. But, this activity seems to be generating small additional incomes to the farmers in supporting their welfare (Widiati, 2014; Ryschawy et al., 2012; Ntale and Litondo, 2013).

The main strategy to empower the farmers in rural areas is by forming the farmers’ group (Syahyuti, 2011). All of the farmers should be the members of the farmer’s groups to support the attainment of the program’s goals. The Indonesia government has supported the strategy by establishing the policy of the guidance in giving an extension to farmers through the farmers’ institution (The policy of Agricultural Ministry No. 273/kept/ot.160/4/2007).

Most of beef cattle farmers in Yogyakarta Region, especially in Sleman and Bantul Regencies, which are the large population of beef cattle in Yogyakarta Special Region, had organized themselves in formal organization as a farmers’ group. But, the problem is some of
them do not develop the groups as the government expectation, so that it doesn’t support the attainment of beef cattle program’s goals. According to Widiati, et al. (2015), the local institutions recorded of the available farmers group were 423 groups in Sleman and 321 groups in Bantul, but no record of the group whether or not they were still active or inactive.

People come together to form groups not only for fellow feeling, but also for themselves (Ofuoku and Agbamu, 2012). The farmers form the group for their own common benefits. The degree to which members of a group desire to remain in the group is known as cohesion level. The cohesion is central to groups. It is considered vital in a group decision-making, goal attainment identity, and member satisfaction (Ofuoku, et al. 2008). Bollen and Hoyle (1990) cited Festinger et al. (1950) that the causes of cohesion (forces acting upon group members) was a type of indicators to measure cohesion level. Interpersonal attraction among members of a group could be viewed as a factor of someone to commit to the groups. The other factors that could be the causes of cohesion are attractiveness to goal groups, activities, and status being the member of the group. This paper tried to measure the cohesion level of beef cattle farmers’ groups offnBismo in Bantul and Sido Makmur” in Sleman Regencies of Yogyakarta Special Region.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

The research was a case study carried out in beef cattle farmers’ groups in Bantul and Sleman Regencies of Yogyakarta Special Region including Bismo and Sido Makmur groups respectively. These groups were selected based on the best performance of beef cattle farmers’ group in Bantul and Sleman Regencies assessed by Widiati et al. (2015). Farmers’ group was used as a unit of analysis. All the active members of the groups were selected as the respondents. The data were collected by interviewing the respondent directly using questionnaire.

Variable of cohesion was measured by the indicators focused on the causes of cohesion (forces acting upon group members). Cohesion is regarded as the degree to which members of a group desire to remain in the group, that is, how closely the members interact or the resultant forces acting on the member to remain in the group (Ofuoku and Agbamu, 2012). However, cohesion can also be considered as “attraction to collectivity” as opposed to an attraction to the individuals who make up that grouping (Ofuoku et al., 2008). In this research, the attractions indicator of cohesion included interpersonal among members of a group, membership of the group, group goals, and group activities. Some questions were designed for each attractions indicator. Each question had three alternatives choices which scored by 3 to 1. Level of group cohesion was calculated by percentage of the total score achievement from the maximum score. Maximum score was determined by the multiplication between the total number of questions and the high score for each question (3) and the total number of respondents of the each group. Descriptive analysis was used to explain the level of cohesion.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**The member Characteristics of Beef Cattle Farmers’ Groups**

Table 1 showed the characteristics of the farmers being the member of the groups. The average age of farmers, both for Bismo and Sido Makmur groups, was still in productive age. It meant that they could be expected having the capability to develop their beef cattle farming for the future. Most of farmers, both for Bismo and Sido Makmur groups, had already completed their duty of education level as the government policy mention regarding
nine years length of formal education. More than 50% of the farmers had already finished Junior High School (Table 1).

| No. | Characteristics                                      | Value        |
|-----|------------------------------------------------------|--------------|
|     |                                                      | Bismo Group<sup>a</sup>) | Sido Makmur Group<sup>b</sup>) |
| 1.  | Average age (years)                                  | 49.35±9.30   | 49.52±10.67 |
| 2.  | Formal education (%):                                |              |             |
|     | - Elementary School                                  | 46.15        | 12.00       |
|     | - Junior High School                                 | 19.23        | 24.00       |
|     | - Senior High School                                 | 34.62        | 56.00       |
|     | - Academy                                            | -            | 8.00        |
| 3.  | Average number of beef cattle ownership (heads):     |              |             |
|     | - Bull                                              | 0.54±1.33    | 1.64±1.52   |
|     | - Steer                                             | 0.15±0.37    | 0.32±0.63   |
|     | - Cattle                                            | 1.35±1.23    | 0.72±0.79   |
|     | - Heifer                                            | 0.23±0.43    | 0.08±0.28   |
|     | - Calves                                            | 0.42±0.64    | 0.48±0.65   |
| 4.  | Average length experience of beef cattle farming (years) | 20.92±17.98 | 17.64±16.42 |
| 5.  | Average length being the beef cattle group member (years) | 6.48±5.55   | 6.84±3.97   |

<sup>a</sup>: 25 respondents  
<sup>b</sup>: 26 respondents  

Source: Analysis of primary data (2016).

Breeding and fattening are the type of beef cattle farming for both of Bismo and Sido Makmur groups. Based on the number of beef cattle ownership, their beef cattle farming can be categorized as smallholder farmers, which one to two head of cattle ownership per farmer. Although they are categorized as smallholder farmers, but the average length experience of beef cattle farming is long enough, more than 15 years (Table 1).

The farmers had been organized in the farmers’ group, but they had not been relatively so longtime yet becoming the member of the groups with the average length of 6.48 years and 6.84 years for Bismo and Sido Makmur groups respectively (Table 1).

**Cohesion Level of Beef Cattle Farmers’ Groups**

Table 2 showed that the cohesion level of beef cattle farmers’ group was in high category, both for Bismo and Sido Makmur groups. Score achievement of cohesion for Bismo group (91.91%) was little bit higher than Sido Makmur group (91.76%) (Table 2). It meant that farmers who were the member of Bismo group had a little bit stronger commitment to their group than farmers who were the member of Sido Makmur group.

Table 2 also showed that there were different kinds of attractions indicator of cohesion which were the highest ranking of score achievement percentage. Group activities attraction indicator was the highest score achievement percentage (95.94%) for Bismo group, while Sido Makmur group had the highest score achievement percentage (97.33%) in membership attraction (Table 2). Most of the member of Bismo group had a good attraction regarding the management activities which were organized by the farmers’ group. It meant
that most of the member of Bismo group joined voluntary the activities organized by the group. This finding was in accordance with Guntoro (2001) that most of beef cattle farmers, members of the group in Bantul, felt that there was no problem in the performance of their duties and obligations which were arranged by the group. It was also indicated that the farmers’ group ensured facility for their member of the group to get involved in performing some activities organized by the group. Gyau et al. (2012) stated that the easier for farmers to participate, the farmers will rank an initiative higher.

Table 2. Percentage score achievement of cohesion indicators and level of cohesion

| No. | Attraction Indicators of Cohesion | Bismo Group | Sido Makmur Group |
|-----|----------------------------------|-------------|-------------------|
|     | % Score  | Ranking | % Score  | Ranking |
| 1.  | Interpersonal  | 89.81  | 3  | 88.98  | 3  |
| 2.  | Membership  | 95.30  | 2  | 97.33  | 1  |
| 3.  | Group goals  | 88.21  | 4  | 86.67  | 4  |
| 4.  | Group activities  | 95.94  | 1  | 96.89  | 2  |
|     | Level of cohesion  | 91.91  |     | 91.76  |     |

The different attraction indicator of cohesion was found for Sido Makmur group. Most of the member of the group had a high attraction in membership of beef cattle farmers’ group (97.33%) (Table 2). This finding indicated that the members of Sido Makmur group had a good awareness and voluntary respond that they had invested part of themselves to become a member of the group. They expected that they could get economic benefit after being the member of the group. It was in accordance with Boas and Goldey (2001) that the expectation of getting benefit from the membership of the group was one of the most important factors that motivate farmers to take part in associations.

Table 2 also indicated that attraction of beef cattle farmers’ group goals was the last rank (4th ranking) as the indicator component of cohesion for both Bismo and Sido Makmur groups. It meant that group goals had not been used as the main attractions indicator by most the member of farmers’ groups to commit to the beef cattle farmers’ group. According Guntoro and Sulastri (2000), although the beef cattle farmers’ group had a consensus regarding the group goals, but most of the member said that the original source of the goals mostly came from the government through the field extension workers.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the study, it could be concluded that there was a high category level of beef cattle farmers’ group cohesion for both Bismo and Sido Makmur groups. Farmers who were the members of the groups had high commitment to their groups.

All of attractions indicator of cohesion had high score achievement percentages. Group activities and membership of the group attractions were the most important indicators for the members of beef cattle farmers’ groups to commit to their groups. The government through their field extension workers was suggested to always improve beef cattle farmers’ attitude towards the group goals, so that the sustainability of farmers’ group dynamic also could be improved.
REFERENCES

Boas, A.A.V. and P. Goldey. 2001. Participation in Farmers’ Organization in Minas Gerais and Implication for Extension. Rev. Univ. Rural, ser. Cienc. Humanas, Vol. 23(2):101-109.

Bollen, K.A. and R.H. Hoyle. 1990. Perceived Cohesion: A Conceptual and Empirical Examination. Social Forces, Vol. 69, No. 2: 479-504

CBS. 2013. Census of agriculture in Indonesia. Press release of statistics No. 62/09/ XVI, 377 Sept. 2013

Guntoro, B and E. Sulasri. 2000. Pengaruh Jarak antara Lokasi Kelompok Tani-Ternak Sapi Potong dan Pusat Kota terhadap Dinamika Kelompoknya pada Sistem Perkampungan Ternak di Kabupaten Bantul. Buletin Peternakan Vol. 24(3):135-141.

Guntoro, B. 2001. Conflict Management in The Cattle Village Systems in Bantul-Yogyakarta. Buletin Peternakan Vol. 25(2):100-108.

Gyau, A., B. Takoutsing, A. Degrande, and S. Franzel. 2012. Producers’ Motivation for Collective Action for Kola Production and Marketing in Cameroon. Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development in the Tropics and Subtropics, Vol. 113 (1):43-50.

Ntale, J. F and K. O. Litondo. 2013. Determinants of commercial mixed farming on small farms in Kenya. Euro. J. Bus. & Man. 5: 1905-2222.

Ofuoku A. U., M. Enalkle and A.U. Nnodim. 2008. Cohesiveness Of Fish Farmers Groups In Southern Nigeria. ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science, Vol. 3, No. 4, July 2008: 16-21.

Ofuoku, A.U. and J.U. Agbam. 2012. Influence of Farmers’ Group Cohesion on Adoption of Climate Change Adaptation Strategies in Delta State, Nigeria. Global Journal of Science Frontier Research Agriculture and Veterinary Sciences Vol. 12 Issue 6 Version 1.0 April 2012.

Ryschawy, J., N. Choisis, A. Joannon, and Gibon. 2012. Mixed crop-livestock systems: an economic and environmental-friendly way of farming? The Animal Consortium. 6: 423 1722-1730.

Syahyuti. 2011. Gampang-Gampang Susah Mengorganisasikan Petani:Kajian Teori Dan Praktek Sosiologi Lembaga Dan Organisasi. 1st Ed., IPB Press. Bogor

Widiati, R. 2014. Developing beef cattle industry at smallholders to support beef self-435 sufficiency. Wartazoa 24: 191-200.

Widiati, R., T.A. Kusumastuti, F. T. Haryadi, and S. Andarwati. 2015. Penguatan Pemberdayaan Kelompok Peternak Sapi Potong Rakyat Berbasis Lembaga Keuangan Mikro untuk Mendukung Kemandirian Pangan. LPPM, UGM. Research report (Unpublished).