

TIJDESSA, Vol (No 2), 2023, Page 20-29

p-ISSN: 2581-2904,

e-ISSN: 2581-2912 DOI: 10.26418/tijdessa.v4i2.43

TANJUNGPURA INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL ON DYNAMICS ECONOMIC, SOCIAL SCIENCES AND AGRIBUSINESS

<http://tjdessa.untan.ac.id/>

The establishment of farmer groups in increasing agricultural productivity in Ketapang Regency

Novira Kusri¹, Hastiadi Hasan² Rudi Alfian³, Maswadi⁴

¹⁴Tanjungpura University

²³Muhammadiyah University

Abstract: In order to promote farming operations and enhance the welfare of the farmers themselves, there is an urgent and essential requirement for farmers to strengthen farmer group structures. However, most farmers still don't understand the importance of farmer groups, particularly in Ketapang Regency. Therefore, the goal of this research is to determine how farmers perceive the role that farmer groups have played thus far, as well as what institutional issues are preventing and encouraging an increase in agricultural production. In order to determine the best course of action for raising agricultural output in Ketapang Regency. The research is conducted in 6 sub-districts in Ketapang Regency. While the respondents were food crop and vegetable farmers come to 60 people. The method of taking respondents is by purposive sampling. The results of the study show that the institutional role of production facilities, agricultural machinery, capital and marketing has not run optimally. It is necessary to strengthen institutions so that it is expected to increase farmers' access to these institutions. Acceleration of borrowing agricultural tools and sharing information is a priority effort to do because it has an impact on increasing agricultural productivity in Ketapang Regency.

Keywords: Farmer institutions, farmer groups, higher production output

Introduction

The agricultural sector is the foundation that supports the regional economy. The agricultural sector absorbs a lot of labor and has an adequate contribution to the staple food needs of the local population. Based on the foregoing, it is fitting that the agricultural sector is the *prima donna* sector in Ketapang Regency. However, the agricultural sector, especially food crops, is still not free from problems, namely problems of welfare and business failure. (Kuncoro, 2011).

The level of income per worker in the agricultural sector is relatively very low because farmers have low productivity due to limited production factors, especially land, as well as other limited production inputs. This also causes the NTP (Farmers Exchange Rate), which is an indicator of farmer welfare, to be low due to high input costs. This of course causes the profits to be not commensurate with the costs incurred so that it is difficult for farmers to achieve prosperity. Meanwhile, the land area owned by the farmer can be seen from the small amount of land tenure. the land area owned by the farmer does not only result in poverty and low deterrence against external shocks such as falling prices or rising production costs, but also results in limited technological adaptation and low productivity, efficiency and competitiveness.

According to Dimiyati (2007), the problems that are still inherent in the figure of farmers and farmer institutions in Indonesia are: 1) The lack of insight and knowledge of farmers on issues of production management and marketing networks; 2) Farmers have not been fully involved in agribusiness activities. Farmer activities are still focused on production activities (on farm); 3) The role and function of farmer institutions as a forum for farmer organizations has not run optimally. Therefore, the role of institutions, especially farmer groups is needed in the development of agricultural productivity. Farmer groups are a variable that is indicated to have an influence on changing farmer institutions to farmer economic institutions (Effendy, 2020).

According to the above description, study on the institutional development of farmer groups in raising agricultural productivity in Ketapang Regency is required to address the issues described above. Therefore, more research has to be done on how farmers and other stakeholders see farmer group institutions. In order to establish the efforts that will be done in developing farmer group institutions in relation to boosting agricultural output, the motivating and inhibiting aspects of farmer groups are also crucial.

Methods

The research is conducted in Ketapang Regency which is the largest district compared to 14 other districts/cities in West Kalimantan Province. There are 5 sub-districts as research locations, Benua Kayong, Matan Hilir Utara, Hilir Matan selatan, Muara Pawan, and Delta Pawan. The location was purposively selected with the consideration that the sub-district is a sub-district and the majority of the people work as farmers and above 80% join farmer groups. The research method used is a qualitative descriptive method. The research was conducted in October-December 2021. The sampling method used is purposive sampling method which is a non-probability sampling technique, taking into account the characteristics of food crop and vegetable farmers. The total number of respondents is 60

people. Primary data collection technique is using a questionnaire with closed and open questions. In addition to primary data, secondary data is also needed to be obtained from literature studies such as journals, theses, scientific articles, data from the Central Statistics Agency (BPS), libraries and the internet. The analysis used to answer the objective is descriptive analysis and also uses a score to determine how far the institutional role of farmer groups is in increasing productivity.

Result and Discussion

A. Farmers' Perceptions Regarding the Institutional Role of Farmer Groups on Agricultural Productivity

Farmer group institutions are included in community empowerment whose activities refer to increasing awareness of the existence of social forces that suppress or encourage other people to take social actions to change patterns of power in society (Anantanyu, 2011). Based on interviews with respondents who represent 5 districts, in Table 1, not all farmers join farmer groups. The reason is because they are too busy farming, and they are also uninterested in going since they cannot see the advantages of doing so. The absence of group administration, financing, and programs/projects are frequently cited as reasons why farmers choose not to join farmer organizations. This requirement suggests that the viability of a farmer group depends on the management's level of activity, the availability of funding, and the existence of local government projects or programs.

Table 1. Percentage of Farmers Joining Farmer Groups

Districts	Farmers Joining Farmer Groups (%)	
	Join	Not Join
Benua Kayong	76,5	23,5
Delta Pawan	100	0
Matan Hilir Selatan	100	0
Matan Hilir Utara	100	0
Muara Pawan	83,3	16,7

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

1. The Role of Farmer Groups in Providing Farming Services

According to Table 2, the function of farmer groups in delivering farming services is represented by 8 (eight) following indicators

Table 2. Recapitulation of the Percentage of Farmers Who Think Farmer Groups Are Good at Providing Farming Services

Districts	Good Farming Services Provided by Farmer Groups ^{a)}							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Benua Kayong	64,7	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,8	11,8	5,9	5,9
Delta Pawan	75	50	50	50	50	50	50	0
Matan Hilir Selatan	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Matan Hilir Utara	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Muara Pawan	33,3	16,7	16,7	16,7	16,7	16,7	16,7	33,3

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

a) The role of farmer groups in providing farming services

1 = Submit price information

2 = Provide market opportunities

3 = Access to production inputs

4 = Provides Marketing channel information

5 = obtain/buy crops

6 = There is an opportunity for price negotiation.

7 = Providing agricultural services

8 = Providing information on the distribution of assistance for production facilities originating from government assistance,

Table 3. Score on average and category Farmer groups' contribution to agricultural services, broken down per district

No	Districts	Average Score	Category
1	Benua Kayong	1,50	lack of involvement
2	Matan Hilir Utara	1,39	lack of involvement
3	Matan Hilir Selatan	1,70	lack of involvement
4	Muara Pawan	1,53	lack of involvement
5	Delta Pawan	1,97	lack of involvement
District Average		1,62	lack of involvement

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

Table 3 shows that the average sub-district for 5 (five) sub-districts still lacks the involvement of farmer groups in the provision of farming services. In other words, farmer groups still perform very poorly when it comes to offering extension services. Overall, it is highly ironic that only one sign—the indicator for communicating price information—of the 8 (eight) indicators of farming services offered by farmer groups is perceived as being beneficial by farmers, and even then, it is still far from ideal (Table 2). Therefore, it can be claimed that farmers who have joined farmer organizations have not yet experienced the benefits they should have received for doing so, especially when it comes to farming services. The impact on farming will be significant, especially as productivity rises.

1. The role of farmer groups in providing extension services

The role of farmer groups in providing extension services consists of 5 (five) indicators as described in table 4. below.

Table 4. Recapitulation of the Farmers' Perception of Farmer Group Effectiveness in Providing Extension Services

Districts	Good Farming Services Provided by Farmer Groups ^{b)}				
	1	2	3	4	5
Benua Kayong	23,5	23,5	29,4	23,5	17,6
Delta Pawan	50	25	25	0	0
Matan Hilir Selatan	0	0	0	0	0
Matan Hilir Utara	0	0	0	0	0
Muara Pawan	16,7	16,7	16,7	16,7	16,7

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

^{b)}The role of farmer groups in providing extension services

- 1 = Through outreach training and field school activities, post-harvest technology and pest and disease management are delivered.
- 2 = Counselling is offered as necessary.
- 3 = Possibility to talk on agricultural issues
- 4 = Can address issues facing farmers
- 5 = information provided by agricultural extension agents

Table 5. Score on average and category Farmer Groups' function in delivering extension services, broken down by district

No	District	Average Score	Category
1	Benua Kayong	1,55	lack of involvement
2	Matan Hilir Utara	1,00	lack of involvement
3	Matan Hilir Selatan	1,64	lack of involvement
4	Muara Pawan	1,40	lack of involvement
5	Delta Pawan	1,40	lack of involvement
District Average		1,39	lack of involvement

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

Table 5 shows that, on average, for 5 (five) subdistricts, farmer groups continue to play a little role in providing extension services, indicating that their performance in this area is still very poor.

The thing that is of great concern is in the Matan Hilir Utara and Selatan Districts, where for all indicators, not a single respondent stated that it was good. This indicates that the existence of farmer groups in the sub-district has not provided benefits to its members in terms of extension services. Whereas in Benua Kayong District, in almost all indicators, the

benefits of farmer groups can be felt even though they are not maximized. It can be seen that on average only a few, namely around 17% -29% of respondents stated that all indicators were good. (Table 4)

1. The Function of Farmer Organizations in Offering Capital Assistance

The following table lists three (three) measures that describe how farmer groups contribute to capital aid.

Table 6. Recapitulation of the Farmers' Perception of Farmer Groups' Capability to Provide Capital Assistance

Districts	Farmer groups' capital assistance is beneficial [ⓐ]		
	1	2	3
Benua Kayong	41,2	5,9	0
Delta Pawan	0	0	0
Matan Hilir Selatan	0	0	0
Matan Hilir Utara	0	0	0
Muara Pawan	16,7	16,7	16,7

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

[ⓐ] The role of farmer groups in providing capital assistance to farmers

1 = provides sources for loans' information.

2 = Provide capital for farming

3 = Easy instalment payments

Table 7. Score on average and category Farmer groups' contribution to capital assistance, broken down per district

No	Districts	Average Score	Category
1	Benua Kayong	1,31	lack of involvement
2	Matan Hilir Utara	1,00	lack of involvement
3	Matan Hilir Selatan	1,07	lack of involvement
4	Muara Pawan	1,40	lack of involvement
5	Delta Pawan	1,00	lack of involvement
District Average		1,16	lack of involvement

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

Table 7 shows that the function of farmer groups in providing capital assistance is still weak, on average, in 5 (five) subdistricts. In Benua Kayong District, the supply of information on sources of borrowing by farmer groups, only 41.2% of farmer respondents stated that it was good. While the indicator for providing farming capital, only 5.9% of farmer respondents stated that it was good. In fact, for the indicator of installment

payments, not a single respondent answered that it was good. Likewise, with Muara Pawan District, all indicators show a very small percentage of farmers who say they are good, namely 16.7%. (Table 6.). This shows that the benefits of the existence of farmer groups in the research collation have not been fully felt by farmers in terms of capital for developing their farming businesses. According to Wamaer (2017) Microfinance Institutions (banking or Cooperatives) as village capital institutions can assist farmer groups in improving capital performance

A. Driving Factors and Inhibiting Factors in the Institutional Development of Farmer Groups

Table 8 shows that developing farmer group institutions is being driven by a number of variables. The success of an institution depends on push factors. There are ten (10) driving forces that promote the growth of farmer organizations. The presence of UPJA offered by farmer groups, which has the highest percentage of farmers choosing it at 37.8%, is the driving reason. The cohesion factor, with a proportion of 22.22%, is then the second-highest driving force. The proportion of farmers who choose is significantly less than 10%, despite other variables. The two most important variables need to be taken into account and maximized because they can strengthen farmer groups' roles and enable farmers to reap the rewards of rising agricultural productivity.

This is in line with Yuniati et al.'s (2017) assertion that institutional strengthening strategies are developed from organizational aspects, resource aspects, service aspects, and features of cooperative networks or partnerships. Developing cooperation with farmers, expanding opportunities for other agricultural businesses owned by UPJA, increasing the accessibility of agricultural machinery, and implementing socialization are some alternative strategies that need to be implemented (Osak, 2020).

Table 8. The driving factor in improving farmer group institutions

No	Driving Factors	Percentage of farmers
1	There is a Service Business Meeting (UPJA)	37,80
2	enhancing farmer comprehension	6,67
3	The government can provide assistance	8,89
4	Always give farmers information	2,22
5	able to welcome members	8,89
6	Member togetherness	22,22
7	Focus on increasing farm output	2,22
8	Adding equipment and instruments for agriculture and extension	6,67
9	Openness	2,22
10	Instruction in sustainable farming	2,22
	Total	100,00

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

Table 9 shows that there are various variables that prevent farmer group institutions from improving. Inhibiting factors are things that become obstacles in supporting the role of institutions. There are 9 (nine) inhibiting factors in developing the capacity of farmer groups. The inhibiting factor that had the highest percentage chosen by farmers was the lack of agricultural tools and machinery provided by farmer groups, namely 37.8%. Then the inhibiting factor that has the second highest percentage is the absence of communication between members of the farmer group of 22.22%. While other factors are also the percentage of farmers who vote is relatively less than 10%. The two highest factors must be considered and optimized because these factors can hinder the role of farmer groups so that they can develop and benefit farmers in increasing their agricultural productivity.

Table 9. Factors impeding the improvement of farmer group institutions

No.	Impeding Factor	Percentage of farmers
1	Lack of communication	22,22
2	Inadequate System	4,44
3	Lack of organization	2,22
4	Poor information Source	2,22
5	Less motivating	4,44
6	Lack of agricultural tools and machines	37,80
7	Governmental inattention	8,89
8	Lack of capital	8,89
9	Lack of communication	8,89
	Total	100,00

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

A. Institutional Development Efforts by the Farmer Group

The most important advice for farmers is to accelerate the process of borrowing tools and sharing information. in technical terms of cultivation, marketing, capital in farming financing and so on (Table 10.). This is very important considering that agribusiness-based agricultural activities are not developing in rural areas due to several reasons, including the level of farmer knowledge, capital ownership, market uncertainty, and limited supporting facilities and infrastructure (Listyati et al, 2014). Therefore, this information is needed from both farmer groups and agricultural extension workers. In other words, technically efforts to increase farmer groups in empowerment are carried out by agricultural extension workers (PPL). (Ramdani et al, 2015). Assistance in fostering farmer groups can also be provided by NGOs (non-governmental organizations) and other organizations deemed capable of being involved in efforts to strengthen farmer groups in empowerment.

Table 10. Farmers' recommendations to strengthen the role of farmer associations in boosting farm output

No	Farmers' recommendations	Percentage of farmers
1	Accelerating the process of borrowing tools and farmer cards	17,80
2	Expand agricultural tools and machines and counseling	4,40
3	Be more persistent in searching for knowledge	2,20
4	Security of tools, long process of farmers' cards	8,90
5	Increased understanding of farming	6,70
6	Sharing information	15,60
7	Encouraging farmers to be more active	8,90
8	Encouraging farmer groups to be more productive	6,70
9	The government can provide assistance	8,90
10	Group leaders must be more transparent in terms of assistance such as tools and others	8,90
11	Unity in farming	6,70
12	Procure superior seeds to increase production	4,40
	Total	100,00

Source: Primary Data Processed Results (2021)

Conclusion

1. The institutional role of production facilities, agricultural machinery, capital and marketing has not run optimally.
2. Farmers still have very little access to facilities that provide supporting infrastructure for agricultural activities.
3. The problems encountered in the institutionalization of production facilities are the scarcity of quality and subsidized seeds and fertilizers, high fertilizer prices, labor is sometimes not available when needed
4. The problem faced in the institutionalization of agricultural tools and machinery is the limited availability of agricultural tools and machines, both in number and type, at agricultural tools and machinery Service Units, with relatively high rental prices. In addition, the ability to manage Tool Service Businesses is still low and the use of agricultural tools and machinery by farmers is limited
5. The problems faced in institutional capital are complicated administration, high risk of business failure and lack of guarantees
6. The problems faced in the marketing institution are the lack of partnerships, low selling prices and attachment to bonded bonds
7. Farmer group institutions also do not play a role in increasing agricultural productivity.
8. The key to success in developing the role of farmer groups is the existence of Agricultural Equipment and Machinery Service Businesses provided by farmer groups and the cohesiveness of members in farmer groups.
9. Lack of agricultural equipment and machinery and lack of communication among farmer group members are barriers to the development of farmer groups' roles.

B. SUGGESTION

1. In order to expand farmers' access to these organizations, institutions must be strengthened.
2. Aspects of organization, resources, services, and networks are used to strengthen institutions.
3. Strengthening support from the government, private sector and related institutions is needed to improve the institutional performance of farmers
4. A wider network of cooperation/partnership is needed to develop farmer institutions as well as to open wider access to farmers.
5. The role of farmer groups needs to be increased again in class learning activities, collaboration vehicles, production units for farmer members so that the role of farmer groups can really be achieved in increasing the productivity of their farming businesses and the income of their members.

References

- Anantanyu, S. (2011). Kelembagaan petani: peran dan strategi pengembangan kapasitasnya. *SEPA: Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian dan Agribisnis*, 7(2).
- Bahua, M. I. (2007). Penyuluhan dan Pemberdayaan Petani Indonesia. In *Angewandte Chemie International Edition*, 6(11), 951–952.
- Dimiyati (2007), 'Pembinaan Petani Dan Kelembagaan Petani', Balitjeruk Online, Balai Penelitian tanaman Jeruk Dan Buah Subtropika Tlekung-Batu, Jawa Timur
- Effendy, L. (2020). Model pengembangan kelembagaan petani menuju kelembagaan ekonomi petani di Kecamatan Sindangkasih Ciamis. *Jurnal Ekonomi Pembangunan STIE Muhammadiyah Palopo*, 6(1), 38-47.
- Kuncoro, (2011). Ekonomi Pembangunan: Teori, Masalah Dan Kebijakan, Upp Amp Ykpn
- Listyati, D., Wahyudi, A., & Hasibuan, A. M. (2014). Strengthening Institutional To Improve Bargaining Position Of Farmers In Cocoa Marketing System. *Jurnal TIDP*. 1(1). 15-28.
- Osak, R. E. M. F. (2020). *Analisis Strategi Pengembangan Usaha Pelayanan Jasa Alat Dan Mesin Pertanian (Upja) Di Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow Timur* , 457–468.
- Ramdhani, H., Nulhaqim, S. A., & Fedryansyah, M. (2015). Peningkatan Kesejahteraan Petani Dengan Penguatan Kelompok Tani. *Prosiding Penelitian Dan Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 2(3).
- Wamaer, D. (2017). Role of Micro Financial Institutions for Farmers and Medium Small Businesses Support MIFEE. *Jurnal Pertanian Agros*, 19(2), 116–127. <http://www.e-journal.janabadra.ac.id/index.php/JA/article/view/451>
- Yuniati, S., Susilo, D., Albayumi, F., Jember, U., Jember, U., & Jember, U. (2017). Penguatan Kelembagaan Petani. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Dan Call For Paper Ekonomi Dan Bisnis (SNAPERS-EBIS 2017)-JEMBER, 2017(2016)*, 498–505.