



Poverty Alleviation of Farmers through Institutional Role of Farmers in Pamekasan Regency

Mohammad Wahed ^{1*}, Wirya Wardaya²

^{1,2} National Development University Veterans East Java

Article Information

Article of History:
Received August 2021
Approved April 2022
Published April 2022

A B S T R A C T

The purpose of this study is to find out the factors that cause poverty in farmers, the programs and policies that farmers need most, as well as how the institutional role of farmers in poverty alleviation of farmers with the analysis method Ziel Orientierte Projekt Planung (ZOPP). The data used is sourced from secondary and primary data. the results in this study concluded that: 1) poverty in the farming community due to low income farmers as a result of government policy has not been fully propetani; 2) the main program priorities to achieve the welfare of the peasant community, namely: a) the program of market creation for farmers through the purchase of agricultural products by the government and the creation of improved skills to farmers in order to create high quality products; and b) mentoring programs for farmer groups through organizational management training and the ability to perform external functions (Networking); and 3) While the institutional role of farmers as a means to realize the expectations, desires, and fulfillment of the needs of farmers. Effective farmer institutions are expected to make a real contribution in improving independence and well-being in farmers' lives.

Keywords: Poverty, Institutional, Zielorientierte, Projekt Planung (ZOPP).

JEL Classification Code: I32, O17, O18

INTRODUCTION

As an agrarian country, its people live in the countryside and are dominated by jobs in agriculture. The agricultural sector will increase or grow if it is based on the availability of existing natural resources or services that can be provided by members of the village community concerned. Farmers have a very important role to ensure food security but on the other hand farmers in Indonesia are still mostly living below the poverty line. Poverty in developing countries is a very complicated problem called the poverty trap.

The problem of poverty is a classic issue that has always been the center of attention in development because it is difficult to solve for the developing country. Indonesia as a developing country, characterized by high poverty rates in most of its people (Sutawijaya et al, 2013). The development of the number of poor people in Indonesia tends to experience fluctuations due to the lack of income received in meeting the needs of life. For more details can be seen in the following table:

Table 1
Number of Poor People, Gini Ratio and Indonesia's Mission Severity Index

Year	Poor (Million)	Gini Ratio	Poverty Index	Severity
2014	28,28	0,406	0,44	
2015	28,59	0,408	0,54	
2016	28,01	0,397	0,52	
2017	27,77	0,393	0,48	
2018	25,95	0,389	0,44	
2019	25,15	0,382	0,37	

Source: BPS Indonesia processed, 2020

Conceptually, Syofiandi et al, (2016) poverty is one's inability to meet living standards that affect education level, health level, moral life, and sense of self-worth. Poverty has an adverse impact on social life and the cause of conflict. Poverty in Indonesia fluctuates and tends to decrease, but the figure still falls into the high category because the implementation of development occurs spatially not always systemically. Some regions achieved rapid growth and others experienced slow growth due to the condition of each different region (Hasanuddin et al, 2009).

According to (Syofiandi et al, 2016) poverty is a problem arising from human deficiencies for social groups caused by economic factors, social natural resources, norms related to material well-being, education, health and self-adjustment of

individuals or groups. One of the social problems of the above sources is the problem of poverty in pamekasan district because most of the population sourced livelihoods as dryland farmers who depended on natural generosity.

According to (Subarna, 2012) explaining poverty is a concept and phenomenon that is wayah, multi-dimensional smeru. Agricultural business in Indonesia is characterized by two things, namely; 1) large-scale agriculture managed by state or private plantations; and 2) small-scale agriculture, generally done for livelihoods in order to meet the needs of their families (Subsystem). Poverty alleviation is a major problem in development and is the main target of development policy in many countries, including Indonesia. The large poverty rate

in Indonesia causes serious treatment. Through the role of both government and non-governmental institutions, it is expected to provide various strategies in order to improve the welfare of the community, especially farmers.

The important role of institutions in the economy is a means to reduce uncertainty, so that transaction costs become lower and have an impact on increasing market transactions. The tendency of trading activities will provide an advantage for the culprit which in turn causes them to specialize in trading. Specialization will increase productivity which will ultimately increase people's prosperity and economic activity. Furthermore, the agency's role in the economy is strongly related to market conditions. If the market conditions are open and integrated then the institutional role becomes greater, so it needs to be considered about institutional development that is able to support the development of the market. According to Douglas C. North the institution is Institutions Are The Humanly Devised Constraints That Structure Political, Economic, And Social Interaction. They Consist Of Both Informal Constraints, And Formal Rules. While the World Bank defines institutions as rules, enforcement mechanisms and organizations (Eka Rahayu and Kartika, 2015).

Contrary to the above, farmers' institutions in Indonesia in general and Pamekasan regency are especially still faced with various problems, including limited initiatives and innovations of farmer groups in: 1) optimizing the utilization of various opportunities for solving farmers' social problems; 2) recognize and organize the organization; 3) administration and management of farmer organizations, especially financial planning; and 4) marketing agricultural commodities produced. While the empowerment of farmers institutions has the aim to increase knowledge and motivate farmers to be

able to take initiative and innovate in: a) optimizing the utilization of various opportunities; b) recognize and organize socially entrepreneurial oriented organizations; and c) marketing agricultural commodities produced. In general, the purpose of this study is to photograph the actual conditions of farmers in Pamekasan Regency, Madura and more specifically this study aims to find out what factors are the cause of farmer poverty, what programs are needed in order to reduce the poverty level in farmers, what policies are most needed to reduce the poverty level of farmers, and how the institutional role of farmers to reduce the poverty level in farmers.

Poverty is a picture of one's inability to meet the needs of a decent life. The problem of poverty is not only due to economic factors, but also social, cultural and conspiracy (political) factors. One of the theories of political economic poverty can be seen from the liberal perspective. According to Hasanuddin et al. (2009), in liberal perspectives view that human beings as rational beings and poverty occurs due to market distortions such as: discrimination, income inequality, and so forth. To overcome this, the government needs to empower the market to make resource allocation efficient and provide poorer opportunities for access to the market in order to have equal opportunities, so that the culture of poverty can disappear by itself.

The potential of the agricultural sector in Pamekasan Regency that contributes the largest is: food crops, plantations, marine fisheries, ponds, livestock and forestry. While the agricultural production of food crops include rice, corn, cassava, peanuts, green beans, soybeans, fruits mainly mangoes and vegetables. According to (Subarna, 2012), (Syofiandi et al, 2016), and (Nashwari et al, 2016) farmers are people who work in farming in rice fields by obtaining produce to meet their

own needs or sold to others. While the life of the farming community is identical to the rural community that manages agricultural businesses in a simple way (Hasanuddin et al, 2009). Poor farmers are low-income workers with per capita income per year of less than 320 kg or equivalent to rice needs in the countryside (Syofiandi et al, 2016). The low income of poor farmers because of the low production caused by narrow land, simple farming methods, limited equipment, and bear all the costs of fertilizer, seedlings and processing until the harvest period (Satriawan & Oktavianti 2012).

Agricultural policy (Public Action) aims to improve the standard of living in general through the improvement of economic opportunities for farmers and the development of progressive structures in people's lives including institutional system engineering required as a supporter (Mustafa et al, 2019). Efforts to achieve the desired circumstances must meet the criteria (Suradisastra, 2017): 1) the availability of technology, tools and skills to execute strategies; 2) implementation of strategies that provide Net Benefit to the parties involved; 3) the implementation of strategies that do not make the community become disturbed by the balance of harmony; and d) the implementation of environmentally friendly strategies. Broadly speaking agricultural policy focuses on three main areas namely (Pranadji, 2016): a) Farming; b) Price parity (price pair) and c) Bargaining position.

In Indonesia poverty is still a big problem awaited completion. Various efforts have been made to address the problem of poverty, but still the poverty rate is still high. According to the Poverty Alleviation Committee (KPK, 2003) some of the weaknesses of poverty alleviation efforts so far: 1) poverty alleviation programs have not been integrated; 2) the unavailability of specific instruments in accordance with the problem of poverty

in each region; 3) Various policies that are implemented give rise to new problems; and 4) Weak government bureaucracy, small role of communities, NGOs, out of sync with central and local policies, hampered communication of program makers with stakeholders, so that there needs to be an evaluation of poverty alleviation programs in order for the program to run as intended.

Agricultural development is defined as efforts to develop and improve technology, SDA, human resources, and institutional factors (Targetti, Schaller, and Kantelhardt, 2019). These factors as a condition (Sufficient Condition) to achieve the desired development goals. Institutions are formed to meet various human needs, so that the institution has the function of combining with the structure (Lin, Luo, and Luo, 2019). Institutional farmers located in the locality area in the form of farmer membership organizations that are members of cooperation groups (Uzun et al, 2019). While the institutional role of farmers, namely: 1) to mediate the community and the State; 2) mobilization of local resources (labor, capital, materials, information and management); 3) coordination of local community requests; and 4) inter-organizational tasks (Uzun, Shagaida, and Lerman, 2019).

Collective attitudes are a challenge for agricultural development implementers. According to Naab, Abubakari, and Ahmed (2019) the effectiveness of local collective action is due to Them Permit Us To Carry On Our Daily Lives With A Minimum Of Repetition And Costly Negotiations. The importance of social approaches is collectively in line with people's values and culture, so as not to cause friction of values that can have a negative impact (Lin et al, 2019). Efforts to utilize local institutions to build consensus, coordination, gathering, analyzing and evaluating information (Makate, 2019). A rural community environment where individual members of the community know each other. A

similar case, sangkepan institutions in the environment of the Balinese farmer community (Suradisastra, 2017). Subak organization institutions in Bali provide social snocation for subak members who perform Under-Invest actions, thus causing smooth farming activities.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses *ziel Orientierte Projekt Planung* analysis method or Goal Oriented Project Planning method (Fahmie, 2001). The ZOPP method is a matrix of program planning that provides brief information on: 1) why the program needs to be created; 2) what the programs want to produce; 3) how the program will work to achieve these desired results; 4) which environmental factors need to be monitored for success; and 5) from which the data is obtained to produce an objective program (Fahmie, 2001). There are several stages in the *Ziel Orientierte Projekt Planung* method, namely: 1) participatory analysis is carried out through the stages: a) identification of the names of the groups involved; b) describe the elements of interests, expectations, concerns, potentials, and weaknesses experienced; c) conduct an analysis of elements of interests or expectations, concerns, potentials, weaknesses, and implications that may arise; and d) analysis of connectedness between groups; 2) *nalicias* problems are done through: formulation of the main problems (poverty of farmers), making tree problems, and making problem matrices; 3) objective analysis *orobjectivestree* is made based on problem tree and problem matrix; and 4) alternative analysis and prioritization are made based on the assessment of all existing programs with certain criteria or weighting of each program.

Ziel Orientierte Projekt Planung analysis method needs to involve the community and all relevant parties to obtain accurate data and information. While the

data in this study uses secondary data and primary data with several stages of the process, namely: 1) interview techniques to farmers, farmworkers, communities, officials, and related parties); 2) Field studies sourced from residents, farmers, farmworkers, officials, related institutions; 3) Study documentation obtained from BPS Pamekasan Regency; and 4) Observation of direct observations.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Portrait of the condition of farmers in Pamekasan district can be said that the average does not have a formal education. While their descendants are on average in school only until elementary school because the community thinks that higher education is useless for those who end up as farmers (no need for school science). Although for researchers the thinking is wrong but the situation continues to run in the midwifery until now. The life of the farmers is fairly simple, when viewed from the diet, dress style, home style, home furnishings, and the type of food consumed every day can be averaged almost the same.

Economic ability, farmers' income is only determined from the crops that work every day but not necessarily earn money every day. If the farmers rely only on their crops, then the profits obtained are very fluctuations depending on the success of the harvest, natural conditions, production costs and the price of goods produced. At the time of crop failure, farmers' income can be minus which means losing money because production costs do not return and at the time of harvest is usually entangled in debt.

The majority of farmers in pamekasan region grow tobacco which becomes a commodity for farmers because it is the only agricultural commodity of the highest economic value for farmers. The high economic value of tobacco has not sided with farmers because the net profit

they get is very small from this condition the tobacco farmers also have to find other jobs for example as fishermen. In addition, farmers in pamekassan region are still dominated by small-scale rice farmers (sub systems) that are mostly from agricultural products consumed alone and only a small part is sold directly to small stalls around their homes.

The phenomenon of poverty in farmers' lives shows the link between spatial factors and the business sector of the majority of the population. Where the number of poor households in dry land and in the highlands is much greater than in wetlands and on the coast. Therefore, a policy pattern is needed that corresponds to the characteristics of poverty in various agroecosystems. In Indonesia, poverty caused by development malpractice reflected in economic policy by the government tends to put the interests of capital owners and industrial/service sectors ahead of small economic actors, especially farmers (Satriawan and Oktavianti 2012).

Furthermore, the position of farmers is less profitable because farmers can only hope in farming efforts for the success of harvest, stability of selling prices and smooth input of production in the hope of getting maximum profit but in reality various obstacles faced by farmers in order to realize their expectations. So that in the end these constraints become the cause of poverty in the household life of farmers. Furthermore, poverty in farmers' households is caused by low farmer investment capability, farmer dependence, dependence on funds, and unmet basic needs of farmer households.

The needs of farmers in Pamekasan regency that must be met are the needs of food, clothing, shelter, health, and education. However, the need for itas for farmers is a basic need (food, health, and education). As for the needs of clothing and boards are incidental that is not regularly or

routinely to be met. The four types of basic needs should be achieved at once but if not possible, then the order of urgency is the needs of food, health, and education (Sutawijaya et al, 2013). Food needs are physiological needs that must be met every day in accordance with decent living standards such as rice, meat, fish, tofu, tempeh, vegetables, fruit to support all activities of family members of farmers in Pamekasan Regency. Next, healthneeds that must also be met by farmers to keep the body healthy and medically treat if there are family members are sick. The last one that farmers meet is the need for children's education as a provision of a better life in the future.

Based on the results of interviews with farmers about the fulfillment of daily basic needs firmly they answered enough but if observed further that is enough means no debt or there are other sources of income to meet these needs. This finding explains that farmers can meet all their basic needs sourced from income outside the farm because the agricultural sector is Uncertainty. Uncertainty of this condition includes prices, markets, harvests, and so on, so that the condition causes farmers' incomes from the agricultural sector is very low and very uncertain to rely on in the fulfillment of basic needs for members of the farmer's family.

The first stage, analysis of the problem of poverty of farmers is done through a matrix of problems to find out the relationship and relationship of a problem (Satriawan and Oktavianti 2012). In addition, through a matrix approach can also predict units or agencies related to the problem of poverty in farmers as a reference in the next step, namely formulating policies and coordination and priority handling in order to solve the problem of poverty in farmers, for more details on the problem of poverty farmers.

Based on the table above that low opinion gets a value of 8, meaning

low income becomes the main cause of poverty in farmers. The condition of low income farmers during this time is very reasonable access, imperfect information, low knowledge and skills, high transaction to occur as a contingency of various government policies still have not sided with farmers who in turn farmers more often face uncertainty conditions. Uncertainty is directly proportional to the risks borne by farmers are also greater, so that this unfavorable situation continues to be experienced by farmers and at the same time become a major factor in the economic sector and poverty of farmers.

Furthermore, through the role of the institutional in this case farmer groups are expected to be able to solve various problems that are facing farmers because the farmer group unit gets a value of 6 for the problem causes, namely: limited input costs, poor organization management, and human resource limitations. This value is the largest value that means that the programs and policies made later must be able to prioritize solving the problem of knowledge and skills of farmers and price instability at the level of farmers khususnya farmers who are in rural areas.

The second stage, participation analysis through a matrix table with mapping information related to interests or expectations, concerns, conflicts, and weaknesses of various relevant agencies in efforts to address poverty problems in farming families. The findings in the field show that there is still a mutual mutual culture in the lives of farmers, especially in rural areas, but the culture is limited to a small part of the activities and residential areas of the peasant community.

Furthermore, the spirit of mutual cooperation between rural farmers is still very lacking. The situation is reflected in the time difference of community activities during the rice growing season so that the risk of crop failure borne by farmers is very high because of planting rice individually.

In contrast to the planting pattern in the vegetable growing season that has made cooperation or agreement on the distribution of vegetable planting with the aim of maintaining the stability of the selling price at the time of harvest does not drop drastically. The role of farmer groups is in fact quite supportive of agricultural activities, but until now farmers institutions are still not functioning optimally because the knowledge of the farmers community is very low related to professionalism in the organization as a result of low education of farmers.

The third stage, naturally the birth of policy as a result of participatory actions has occurred in the life of the community, but the policy so far from the government seems to still depend on the abundance of natural resources availability compared to policies that effectively reduce poverty rates or pro-poor policies. The effective policy illustrated the selection of various programs on the matrix table through the analysis of Ziel Orientierte Projekt Planung to answer the main objectives of this research to improve the welfare of the farming community with two indicators of farmer welfare (Satriawan and Oktavianti, 2012): 1) the fulfillment of basic needs; and 2) achieving farmers' independence so that the final goal of farmers can be achieved. Efforts to achieve the welfare of the farming community takes several stages in determining the scale of priority of the program by showing the order of the program ranging from the highest value to the lowest value, namely: 1) the creation of a market for farmers has a value of 24; 2) farmer group assistance has a value of 20; 3) procurement of pilot land in each village has a value of 19; and 4) Cooperation of farmer groups with research institutions has a value of 13, for more details can be seen in the matrix table below.

Based on the results of the program selection, researchers took 2 (two) programs with the highest score conducted

second testing to ensure the priority of the program as the main program that must be realized immediately through indicators of economic impact, social impact, needs of facilities and the period of impact achieved. A series in this stage of testing is conducted using the analysis tool Alternatif Selection Approach Program.

The fourth stage, the determination of 2 (two) main program choosing that becomes the priority scale of the policy preparation program to achieve the welfare of the farmers community. The priorities of the selected program have been adjusted to various things, namely: 1) assumptions; 2) the source of proof; and 3) the policy is order to create high quality products; and 2) Mentoring program for farmer groups that can be implemented by the training of organizational management and the ability to perform external functions (Networking).

Management of agricultural resources by farmers concerns the regulation of inputs, production processes, and outputs so as to achieve high productivity. Agricultural businesses themselves include input, production, and output activities (Naab et al, 2019). In the management of production factors, production processes, up to the processing of produce is required institutional farmers. Agricultural business activities will be successful if farmers have adequate capacity. To achieve optimal productivity and efficiency farmers must run a joint business collectively (Eka & Kartika, 2015). For this purpose, an understanding of an institution at the farmer level is required. Traditionally, institutional farming communities have developed from generation to generation, but the challenges logically described based on actual conditions and is associated with conditions expected in the future.

Based on the programs that have been prepared before, there is a policy implementation for each program. The implementation of the policy include: 1)

market creation program for farmers, the implementation of the policy of this program is the purchase of agricultural products by the government as well as the creation of skill improvement to farmers in order to create high quality products; and 2) Mentoring program for farmer groups that can be implemented by the training of organizational management and the ability to perform external functions (Networking).

Management of agricultural resources by farmers concerns the regulation of inputs, production processes, and outputs so as to achieve high productivity. Agricultural businesses themselves include input, production, and output activities (Naab et al, 2019). In the management of production factors, production processes, up to the processing of produce is required institutional farmers. Agricultural business activities will be successful if farmers have adequate capacity. To achieve optimal productivity and efficiency farmers must run a joint business collectively (Eka & Kartika, 2015). For this purpose, an understanding of an institution at the farmer level is required. Traditionally, institutional farming communities have developed from generation to generation, but the challenges of the era demand an institution that is more appropriate in meeting the needs of the peasant community. This effective farmer institution is expected to support agricultural development. At the farmer level institutions are required as: 1) rides for education; 3) commercial activities and organization of agricultural resources; 2) management of public property; and 4) defend the collective interests.

The existence of farmer institutions is based on cooperation that can be done by farmers in managing agricultural resources, among others: a) processing (Processing), to be faster, efficient and cheaper; b) marketing, will convince buyers of the quality and improve the bargaining position of farmers; c) buying,

in order to get a cheaper price; d) the use of agricultural tools (machine sharing), will lower the cost of purchasing such tools; e) cooperation of services (Cooperative Services), to provide services for the common good so as to improve the welfare of members; f) cooperation bank (Co Operative Bank); g) cooperation of farming (Co Operative Farming), will be obtained higher profits and uniformity of products produced; and h) multi-purpose cooperation (Multi Purpose Co Operatives) developed according to the same interests of farmers. Joint activities (Group Action) by farmers are believed to be the determining factor in improving the welfare of farmers (Uzun et al., 2019). Joint activities are necessary if togetherness will be more effective in achieving the desired goals together (Mustafa et al., 2019).

The existence of farmer institutions for farmers has become an inevitability to improve their standard of living, dignity and dignity (Suradisastra, 2008). Institutional farmers should be placed as a means to realize the hopes, desires, and fulfillment of the needs of farmers (Uzun et al., 2019). Effective farmer institutions are expected to make a real contribution in improving the independence and dignity of farmers.

Self Reliance (Self Reliance) farmers are believed to be the key to the welfare of farmers. The means to achieve the welfare of farmers can be reached through social processes in the institutional communities (Suradisastra, 2017). Through interactions built between individuals in the community there is a learning process that is able to increase the capacity of individuals. Capacity, according to Webster Dictionary, refers to the ability to or to do (Ability For Or To Do); capability; a condition of being qualified. Farmer capacity means the ability of farmers to conduct agricultural activities, have the ability to answer challenges, and qualify as superior farmers.

The capacity or ability of farmers

is one of the prerequisites for farmers to participate in agricultural development. This can be done through institutional development. Institutional development for farming communities is considered important for several reasons; 1) many agricultural problems that can only be solved by a farmer's institution; 2) community organizations provide continuity or continuity to efforts to disseminate and develop technology, or technical knowledge to the community; and 3) to prepare the community to be able to compete in an open economic structure (Satriawan & Oktavianti, 2012)

Farmer cooperation can encourage the use of resources more efficiently, diffusion of innovation and knowledge (Nuryanti & Swastika, 2016). The participation of farmers in various local institutions is a manifestation of community empowerment. Empowered farmers, according to (Elizabeth, 2019) are farmers who can politically articulate (convey the embodiment) of their interests, economically can conduct the process of bargaining with other parties in economic activities, can socially manage organizing communities and make decisions independently, and culturally recognized existence.

Understanding the empowerment of farmers is a strategy that focuses on how to provide a proportionate role so that farmers can play an active role in social activities. For these efforts, education process is needed to change the attitude of farmers, and to generate excitement and desire and trust in their own abilities so as to improve the ability of self-help (Self Help) individuals and groups to improve their own destiny.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of this study in efforts to alleviate poverty of farmers through the institutional role of farmers, several conclusions were obtained, as

follows, based on the matrix analysis of the problem of poverty of farmers, provide information that low income farmers become the main cause of poverty in the peasant community. low income received by farmers as a result of government policies so far is still not fully propetani, so in turn farmers are more facing the state of Uncertainty. There are 2 (two) priority scales of the main programs to achieve the welfare of the farming community, namely: 1) market creation programs for farmers through the purchase of agricultural products by the government as well as the creation of skill improvements to farmers in order to create high quality products; and 2) mentoring programs to farmer groups through organizational management training and the ability to perform external functions (Networking). The existence of farmer institutions for farmers has become an inevitability to improve their standard of living, dignity and dignity. Institutional farmers as a means to realize the hopes, desires, and fulfillment of the needs of farmers. Effective farmer institutions are expected to make a real contribution in improving independence and well-being in farmers' lives.

REFERENCE

- Eka Rahayu, Ruwanti, and Lindawati Kartika. 2015. "Institutional Analysis and Strategy to Improve the Competitiveness of Potatoes Commodity at Banjarnegara Regency, Central Java." *Indonesian Journal of Agricultural Sciences* 20(2): 150–57.
- Elizabeth, Roosgandal. 2019. "Improving Competitiveness of Food Crops Through Acceleration of Agro-Industry and Institutional Empowerment of Agriculture." *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling* 53 (9): 1689–99.
- Fahmie, Arief. 2001. "Analysis of The Problem of Taking Working Capital Assistance Rolling With Zopp Method: Case Study In Bkm Berkah Mulyo, Yogyakarta." *Psychological: Journal of Thought and Psychological Research* 6 (12).
- Hasanuddin, Tubagus, Dame G. G, and Teguh Endaryanto. 2009. "The Root Cause of Horticultural Farmer Poverty in Tanggamus Regency, Lampung Province." *Agriculture* 20 (3): 164–70.
- Lin, Jiabao, Zhimei Luo, and Xin Luo. 2020. "Understanding the roles of institutional pressures and organizational innovativeness in contextualized transformation toward e-business: Evidence from agricultural firms." *International Journal of Information Management* 51(October): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.10.010>.
- Makate, Clifton. 2019. "Effective scaling of climatesmartagricultureinnovations in African smallholder agriculture: A review of approaches, policy and institutional strategy needs." *Environmental Science and Policy* 96(August2018): 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2019.01.014>.
- Mustafa, Kaddas, and Shinta Andayani. 2019. "Institutional Classification of Farmers in Gowa Regency." *Tabaro* 3 (1): 318–25.
- Naab, Francis Z, Zaid Abubakari, and Abubakari Ahmed. 2019. "The role of climate services in agricultural productivity in Ghana: The perspectives of farmers and institutions." *Climate Services* 13 (November 2018): 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cliser.2019.01.007>.
- Nashwari, Inti Pertiwi, Ernani Rustiadi, and Hermanto Siregar. 2016. "Spatial Analysis of Farmer Institutional And Poverty of Food Crop Farmers Using Geographically Weighted

- Regression In Jambi Province.
": 83-94.
- Nuryanti, Sri, and Dewa Ketut Sadra Swastika. 2016. "The Role of Farmer Groups in the Application of Agricultural Technology." *Agro Economic Research Forum* 29 (2): 115.
- Pranadji, Tri. 2016. "Sharpening Institutional Analysis In The Perspective of Agricultural and Rural Sociological Research." *Agro Economic Research Forum* 21 (1): 12.
- Satriawan, Bondan, and Henny Oktavianti. 2012. "Using the Agricultural Institutional Collective Action Model." *Journal of Development Economics* 13 (1): 96–112.
- Subarna, Trisna. 2012. "Analysis of Poverty and Non-Food Expenditure of West Java Residents." *Bina Praja Journal* 04 (04): 243–50.
- Suradisastra, Kedi. 2008. "Farmer Institutional Empowerment Strategy." *Agro Economic Research Forum* 26 (2): 82.
- Suradisastra, Kedi. 2017. "Institutional Revitalization to Accelerate Agricultural Sector Development in Regional Autonomy." *Agricultural Policy Analysis* 4 (4): 281–315.
- Sutawijaya, Andi Angger, Siti Rochaeni, and Achmad Tjachja Nugraha. 2013. "Analysis of Household Welfare Level of Freshwater Ornamental Fish Farmers in Cipedak Subdistrict Jagakarsa, South Jakarta Municipality." *Agribusiness Journal* 7 (1): 59–76.
- Syofiandi, Randy Rizki, Rudi Hilmanto, and Susni Herwanti. 2016. "Analysis of Income and Welfare of Agroforestry Farmers in Sumber Agung Subdistrict, Kemiling Kota Bandar Lampung." *Sylva Lestari Journal* 4 (2): 17–26.
- Targetti, Stefano, Lena L Schaller, and Jochen Kantelhardt. 2019. "A fuzzy cognitive mapping approach for the assessment of public-goods governance in agricultural landscapes." *Land Use Policy* (April): 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.04.033>.
- Uzun, Vasily, Natalya Shagaida, and Zvi Lerman. 2019. "Russian agriculture: Growth and institutional challenges." *Land Use Policy* 83 (August 2018): 475–87.

ATTACHMENT

Table 2
Farmer Poverty Problem Matrix

Cause	Result	Farmer Group		Agriculture Department	Village Devices	Qty
		Problem	Problem	Problem	Problem	
Institution	Problem	1	2	3	4	
Farmer Group	Limited input access		✓			1
	Imperfect information	✓	✓			2
	Limited technology			✓		1
	Low year and skill	✓	✓	✓		3
	Limited capital	✓			✓	2
	<i>Price taker</i>	✓				1
	High transaction fees	✓	✓	✓		2
	Management bad organization		✓		✓	3
Agriculture Department	Hr Limitations	✓	✓	✓	✓	3
	Limited Funds	✓		✓	✓	3
Village Devices	Not a decider policy	✓			✓	3
Sum		8	6	5	5	

Table 3
Participatory Matrix

No.	Group	Hope	Concerns	Conflict	Potential	Debilitation
1	Farmer groups	success harvest Stability price Smooth Input agriculture.	Failed harvest, Prices plummeted, Agricultural inputs choking, <i>Price taker</i> , High transaction fees.	conflict Internal conflict External moral danger.	Togetherness Gotong royong, belief.	Organization management bad <i>Uncertainty</i> , Access to capital low low skills, information is not perfect.
4	service agriculture	Welfare farmer run bureaucracy.	poverty farmer		Skills policy makers.	Mastery technology low less understand Problems farmer Implementers only policy.
5	device village	Provider land agriculture		Tenants land, Division land.	Ownership rights	Dependency against village funds tall

Tabel 4
Program Selection Matrix

program	Creation market for farmer	Mentoring Farmer groups	Land acquisition Pilots in every Village	collaborate Farmer group with Research Institute
critierion	(Program 1)	(Program 2)	(Program 3)	(Program 4)
Government Policy	2	4	3	1
Cost effectiveness	1	4	2	3
Sustainability	5	4	2	3
Maximum utilization	2	1	4	3
Resource Limitations	5	1	4	2
Accessibility	4	3	2	1
Increased revenue	5	3	2	1
Total value	24	20	19	13

Table 5
Program Approach Selection Matrix

Criterion	Firm Judgment		Weight	Firm Judgment With Weighting	
	Prog. 1	Prog. 2		Prog. 1	Prog. 2
Social Impact	1	3	3	3	9
Economic Impact	4	2	4	16	8
Facilities Needs	4	3	2	8	6
Timeframe for Achieving Impact	4	3	1	4	3
Number of Values	13	11		31	26