

Farmer community participation in village building planning in Cikarawang Village, Bogor Regency

Partisipasi masyarakat petani dalam perencanaan pembangunan desa di Desa Cikarawang, Kabupaten Bogor

Ananda Bahri Prayudha✉, Lala M. Kolopaking, & Sofyan Sjaf

Study Program of Rural Sociology, Faculty of Human Ecology, IPB University
Bogor, 16680, West Java Province, Indonesia

e-mail of corresponding author : ananda_bahri@apps.ipb.ac.id

Abstract

The stages of implementing Village Development Planning Deliberations are often carried out without involving the farming community so they have not been able to produce the formulation of development programs needed by farmers according to the mandate of Law no. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, which contains the concept of village development as improving the quality of services, development, and empowerment of rural communities through a participatory approach. The purpose of this study was to determine the typology of farmers based on capital ownership and participation in planning and deliberation of village development planning, the typology of farming communities based on the type and capital ownership of community actors involved in the arena of village planning and development contestations planning meeting. This study uses the constructivism paradigm using qualitative methods with data collection techniques through observation, in-depth interviews, and focused discussions with a case study approach conducted in Cikarawang Village, Dramaga District, Bogor Regency. The result of this research is that the typology of farmers is divided into five types based on their capital ownership, namely Menlen, Biglen, Kolen, Renlen, and Nidlen types. The typology of farming communities in planning and musrenbangdes is passive, informative, functional, interactive and mobilization participation which is also influenced by ownership and capital accumulation.

Keywords: community participation; farmer community; village building; village law

Abstrak

Tahapan pelaksanaan Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa seringkali dilakukan tanpa melibatkan masyarakat petani sehingga belum mampu menghasilkan rumusan program pembangunan yang dibutuhkan petani sesuai amanat UU No. 6 Tahun 2014 tentang desa, yang memuat konsep pembangunan desa sebagai peningkatan kualitas pelayanan, pembangunan, dan pemberdayaan masyarakat desa melalui pendekatan partisipatif. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui tipologi petani berdasarkan kepemilikan modal dan partisipasi dalam perencanaan dan musyawarah perencanaan pembangunan desa, tipologi masyarakat tani berdasarkan jenis dan kepemilikan modal aktor masyarakat yang terlibat dalam kancah perencanaan desa dan kontestasi pembangunan. rapat perencanaan. Penelitian ini menggunakan paradigma konstruktivisme dengan menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan teknik pengumpulan data melalui observasi, wawancara mendalam, dan diskusi terfokus dengan pendekatan studi kasus yang dilakukan di Desa Cikarawang Kecamatan Dramaga Kabupaten Bogor. Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah tipologi petani dibagi menjadi lima tipe berdasarkan kepemilikan modalnya, yaitu tipe Menlen, Biglen, Kolen, Renlen dan Nidlen. Tipologi masyarakat tani dalam perencanaan dan musrenbangdes adalah partisipasi pasif, informatif, fungsional, interaktif dan mobilisasi yang juga dipengaruhi oleh kepemilikan dan akumulasi modal.

Kata kunci: partisipasi komunitas; komunitas petani; bangunan desa; hukum desa

Introduction

The stages of implementing the Village Development Planning Meeting are often carried out without involving the farming community so they have not been able to produce a formulation of development programs that farmers need according to the mandate of Law no. 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, which contains the concept of developing villages as improving the quality of services, development, and

empowering rural communities through a participatory approach (Kolopaking et al. 2016). Thus the village development plan deliberations (musrenbangdes) were also deemed ineffective because they did not involve the community in a series of planning processes. So far, only village elites have participated in the village musrenbangdes so the aspirations of the people from below tend not to be conveyed (Sigalingging & Warjio 2014). As a result, the community only expressed their hopes regarding development at other events that had nothing to do with village development such as begawe events, remembrance, and the like (Anto 2021). With the space to participate in village institutions, the farming community should be able to propose programs, as well as development policies that are considered essential and can provide benefits to the agricultural sector both upstream and downstream, where community members can convey their problems and needs which are then forwarded to the meeting. decision-making at the village development planning musrenbangdes, the bias in village development planning so far because it uses the eyes of "outsiders" can be minimized (Damanik 2013).

Both village development (village development) and rural development (rural development) have so far used the paradigm of "State Building Villages" (Sutoro 2015, Kurniawan 2015). But the village is a unique entity, it cannot be seen immediately that it is easy to intervene with development by the state (Sjaf 2019), because of that the state faces a dilemma of intervention with consequences if the state is not present (isolation) is wrong, but if it comes with an imposition it is also wrong (Kurniawan 2015). This difference in perspective certainly makes a difference in the regulation and administration of village governance, including development practices in the village. The development which has been controlled by the district/city government is handed over to the village government by prioritizing the principles of participation, democracy, mutual cooperation and togetherness in the village development planning meeting.

Musrenbangdes in practice has not been fully utilized. This happens because of various factors, such as a strong paternalistic cultural pattern so that you just follow what the leader says. As a result, the Musrenbangdes is only dominated by village elites and are limited to village government actors and formal village institutions, while the involvement of social organizations, community organizations, professional organizations, religious organizations, farmer organizations, and youth groups is minimal (Solekhan 2014). Bourdieu & Wacquant (1992) explain that the arena is defined as a dynamic area where there are struggles for certain positions if capital is the power of actors or positions in the social structure determined by the capital they have. Capital, or capital, in short, is a fighting strategy in the form of material goods as well as symbolic goods (Jenkins 1992). Capital includes four types: economic capital, namely wealth or economy, social capital, social networks used by actors to expand other capital; cultural capital, namely a person's intellectual classification seen from the level of education; while symbolic capital is the honor and prestige of a person/group (Bourdieu 1996, Brubaker 2000).

From the description above, this research aims to be able to describe the typology of farmers based on capital ownership and the relationship between participation and dominance formed by capital on access to the musrenbangdes contestation arena. This relationship is manifested in the struggle for village development programs. As stated Sjaf (2014), in the implementation of developing village planning, of course, there are social practices that are seen as a form of discourse that supports actors in the arena of battle.

Research Method

This study uses the constructivism paradigm with qualitative research methods through a case study approach. The constructivism paradigm is used to adjust the context or condition of the community to be studied. By using qualitative methods, researchers intend to understand the phenomena experienced by research subjects by describing them in the form of words and language which in a certain context is natural, and by utilizing various natural methods (Moleong 2015). Data was collected by means of observation and in-depth interviews, focused discussions on informants and secondary data consisting of literature study, *data desa presisi*, and documentation. The types of data used in this study consisted

of: primary data and secondary data. Primary data collection was carried out using the in-depth interview method as an instrument to be able to answer the formulation of the problem (Lipton & Moore 1980).

The selection of informants in this study used a snowball and purposive system. Snowball selection of informants is used to find informants in a chain or network while purposively, informants are determined based on certain criteria that control the problem being studied (Cresswel 2017). Informants in this study came from 18 members of the farming community spread from 3 hamlets, with a vulnerable age of 20-75 years old with status as land-owning farmers, sharecroppers, land-owning farmers as well as tenants, and employees as well as farmers in Cikarawang Village, Dramaga District, Bogor Regency. Analysis of data from in-depth interviews and observations were analyzed in three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation, and verification. Data reduction includes sorting, simplifying, classifying, abstracting, and transforming data from in-depth interviews, observations, and related documentation studies. At this stage aims to sharpen the analysis of the research. In this section, the researcher separates the data that are considered irrelevant to the study. Presentation of qualitative data in the form of interpretation results in the form of quotations. Then, the verification stage is the final stage in managing data reduction to allow drawing conclusions.

Results and Discussion

Typology of farmers based on capital and participation of developing villages

An agrarian society is a society whose economy is based on the production and management of agricultural land and food crops. In an agrarian society, land management is the main source of welfare, while other sources of livelihood and livelihoods are emphasized the importance of agriculture (Halamska 2011). Participation is the distribution of power that will allow the lower classes who are not currently accommodated in the economic and political process to enter this process. It is a strategy by which community groups join forces in determining how information is circulated, goals and policies are formulated and programs are operated (White & Pettit 2007). The new era of rural areas is given a bigger and wider political space in carrying out village government. For this reason, a participation-based approach is the most appropriate model, both in terms of epistemology, namely the limitations of knowledge and technology possessed and in terms of axiology, which is increasingly difficult to realize development goals and values (Amien 2005). To measure the participation of the farmer community then it is necessary to look at the distribution of types of farmers based on the capital they have, capital has a close relationship with one's actions.

The participation of the farming community in planning and musrenbangdes can be divided into several types by trying to understand the accumulation of ownership of capital owned by some of the informants who are members of the farming community, either as individuals, institutions or institutions in accordance with what was later put forward by the French sociologist, related to tracking capital ownership to find out the strengths of farmer community members in planning and musrenbangdes. Bourdieu (1996), explained that capital can be used to identify domination that is assumed to always exist in society by tracing the accumulation of ownership of economic capital, symbolic capital, cultural capital and network capital in society. Second, this distinctive approach becomes the main foothold for Bourdieu in explaining various phenomena, or more precisely, it is used to dismantle or analyze the dominance of power practices in various domains (arena) ranging from politics, culture and so on (Krisdianto 2014). Third, an actor or group of actors has the origin of a mental structure that functions to perceive the social world around him. Fourth, this mental structure is limited and enlivened by the structure. For this reason, we can look at the following together, how to track the type of farming community based on capital ownership and its effect on participation, as shown in Table 1.

From Table 1, it can be seen that the farming community has several types in relation to ownership or control of capital and participation in planning and musrenbangdes, the explanation of the level of capital ownership is based on differences in the magnitude of influence and ownership of capital owned

by members of the farming community, *Menlen* and *Biglen* types are types members of the farming community who have dominant or high capital power from several sources of control or sources of income that are supported by social capital through a wide *network* or network, to the national order and have the accumulation of cultural capital. Cultural capital can be seen from three things, namely ownership of objects (*objectives*) that are considered to have high prestige (high economic or cultural value), knowledge and skills (*Institutionalized*) that are recognized by the community and ingrained habits (embodied) in society. someone, starting from body movements or language style Alamsyah (2010), and ownership of a strong symbolic capital in the social order , but what distinguishes *Menlen* and *Biglen* lies in the strength of symbolic capital.

Table 1.
Types of farmers based on capital and participation in developing villages

| Farmers Community Type | Capital | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| | Economy | Social | Culture | Symbolic |
| Menlen | Employee | Network | Lecturer | Village |
| | Land owner | Local | Skill | Apparatus |
| | Businessman | Regional | Religion | Activator |
| Biglen | Businessman | Network | Skill | Religion |
| | | | Food | Relatives |
| | | | Typical | Figure |
| | Land owner | Local | Farmer | Activist Farmer |
| | Alsintan | Regional | Achievers | Village |
| | | National | Speaker | Character's |
| Kolen | Employee, Land owner | Elite Relatives, | Easy | Village Apparatus |
| | | Local | Hang out | Character's |
| | Entrepreneur | Network | Traditional | Relatives |
| | | Regional | Skills | Youth Leader |
| | | | Religious | Skills |
| Renlen | Employee, Cultivator | Elite | Easy Sociable | Village |
| | | Relatives | Active | Apparatus |
| | Laborer | Local | | Youth Leader |
| Nidlen | Cultivator | Network | Carpentry | Former |
| | | Minimal | Expert | Employee |
| | Laborer | Network | Tailor | Former Device |

Source: Primary data

Menlen, who was legitimized as a village apparatus, created this symbolic capital which later became a distinguishing feature of the participation of members of the farming community in planning and musrenbangdes. Furthermore, the *Kolen* type is the type of farmer community member who also has several sources of medium economic capital, namely the middle economic level which also comes from several types of livelihoods and is also supported by the strength of social capital in the village order through proximity or kinship with the village elite, also has a network or local networks and regional networks that can be accumulated with other capitals owned by members of this type of farming community. *Kolen* is also supported by the strength of strong cultural capital and influences the community structure which also gains symbolic capital legitimacy in the form of positions obtained through involvement as village officials so that they can be involved in participating in planning and musrenbangdes.

Furthermore, members of the farming community with the *Renlen* type are members of the farming community who have low economic resources but are supported by other capital strengths such as kinship social capital or proximity to village elites, also supported by cultural capital in the form of

being easy to socialize and sociable, active in village activities, so that being one of the driving factors for other capital forces and being able to enter the vortex of dominant symbolic power in planning and musrenbang participation, namely symbolic capital, *Renlen's symbolic capital* is obtained from the involvement of members of the farming community in the village elite vortex as an integral part of its legal legitimacy. legal space to be involved in planning and musrenbangdes participation. The last type of farmer community participation is. The *Nidlen* type is a low economic level obtained from non-permanent livelihoods and belongs to groups, laborers, small farmers or cultivators and minimal support for ownership of other capitals, negligence in involving themselves in local and national social networks, and so on.

The data in Table 1 can also be seen that members of the *Biglen Type community* with large ownership of economic resources, extensive social capital ownership, inherent cultural capital, and high symbolic capital ownership in the structure of farming community members, do not guarantee the involvement of actors in the arena. participation, planning, and musrenbangdes. The most needed capital in the context of planning and musrenbangdes participation is ownership of symbolic capital as legitimacy, position, authority in village government, cultural capital that is more religious in direction, network capital through friendship and RT meeting agendas, and in the context of planning participation arena, economic capital has absolutely no influence or guarantee of involvement in the arena.

“...When I became an RT, I was always invited during the musrenbangdes to propose programs, usually the RT, RW, Kadus attended. Public. Now I'm no longer an RT so I don't want to know about village affairs anymore, I just focus on taking care of my work and farmer groups” (Informant ENI).

This information at the same time strengthens and explains that EN's involvement in village participation was constructive because of the RT position he had previously held, but after the mandate was completed ENI was no longer involved in the planning process and was no longer invited to attend the musrenbangdes, and this strengthened the statements of previous informants namely, AHM that indeed he was never involved either in soliciting aspirations at the RT level. From these opinions, it is known that the farming community actually has a great willingness to take part and contribute to carrying out its role in participation by giving opinions or suggestions on village development planning, the level of participation of the farming community is still low in involvement in planning up to the musrenbang. As for the steps that must be taken by members of the *Biglen type community* and *Nidlen* is by accumulating the capital owned to have symbolic capital in the form of position or authority of the village apparatus or maximizing the potential of community members who are part of the village apparatus or involve themselves and want to convey aspirations when gathering community or village agendas. According to Bourdieu (1996), the accumulation of ownership of capital can be used to win the contestation arena by accumulating the capital owned to obtain capital according to the needs of the arena.

Typology of farmer participation by type

The typology of participation has been proposed by Pretty (1995), by classifying the typology of participation into seven characteristics. Informants who have been interviewed are then classified and characterized by the typology of participation of each informant related to participation . From the results of field observations and in-depth interviews with the farming community, there are various participations that occur at the level of the farming community. For more details, it can be seen in Table 2 related to the typology of farming communities.

The result of combining the two typologies of participation and typology of farmers defines the relation of capital ownership and action in the typology of participation, the typology of participation starts from passive participation, this typology of participation is a typological characteristic found in farming communities, passive participation is interpreted by participating based on the information they receive from the community. Outside parties about what is happening in their environment, in the participation

of the Developing Village in the arena of aspiration screening, hamlet deliberations, and musrenbangdes, it turns out that information on the participation process has never reached the community level of the farmers' and biglen's ministers, both through the sub-district and district governments, because of the relationship between this typology of farmers. More focused on outsiders who were present as agricultural extension agents and assistants so that they did not get information about the process of developing Village participation, passive participation in the typology of salilan farmers was the result of relations with outside parties. The agriculture and food crop service, in contrast to nidlen farmers who get information from menlen type farmers, when it should be for the success of the government's development program to distribute information to the lowest strata of society at the village level which is the main target and the holder of recognition rights and subsidiarity Village Build according to the mandate of the Act Village.

Table 2.
Typology of farmer community participation by type

| Participation Typology | Menlen | Biglen | Kolen | Renlen | Nidlen |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Passive | √ | √ | √ | √ | - |
| Informative | √ | √ | √ | √ | √ |
| Incentive | - | √ | - | - | √ |
| Consultative | - | - | - | - | - |
| Functional | √ | √ | √ | √ | - |
| Interactive | √ | - | √ | √ | - |
| Mobilization | √ | √ | √ | √ | - |

Source: Primary data

"...Socialization or access to information was only obtained from the district agriculture office. There was never any government outreach involving groups except the agriculture office, for the sub-district Musreimbang, information was also obtained from the district agriculture office and the sub-district head not from the village government. Gapoktan because I was invited by the Agriculture Service and the Camat, I am here to get information, insight and oversee the policies and programs that have been proposed, but during the sub-district meeting the program we proposed was lost" (Informant AHM).

Explanation of AHM informants who are members of the Biglen type farming community This information provides information that passive participation occurs in farming communities, where people participate based on information they receive from outsiders about what is happening in their environment Pretty (1995), but not information related to participation in "planning" and "musrenbangdes". Reinforcement of information related to passive participation was also stated by different key informants as follows.

"... Socialization from outside parties is only from the Agriculture Service and the Agricultural Technology Service, related to innovations and not about village meetings, as farmers' group leaders who are always visited by extension workers to convey information, we will only convey it to the community, because now it is deliberately collected hard sir. I have never received any socialization related to village deliberations from outside parties, if the information is not important to us and the community, yes, the information is not clear, then it is closed or not. I have also never rejected any socialization from the government." (Informant UJA)

"...Socialization is usually from extension workers and PPLs from Sindang Barang who come here to convey information about agriculture, but for other socialization it may be in the urban village with sub-district people during the Musdes" (Informant ENI).

The results of the study of farmer participation in rural development in the data obtained from the three informants as representatives of the farming community, namely the initials AHM, UJA and ENI informants, belong to the group of members of the *Biglen* type of farmer community, according to them, farmers only get information from outside the village in In this case, the Department of Agriculture and Food Crops or even PPL regarding agricultural programs and has nothing to do with participation in planning and musrenbangdes. The form of participation is awareness of the contribution that a person or other parties can make in a development activity. In other words, participation should be real and sustainable (sustainable) in rural communities, therefore members of the farming community who are the target group or target group of rural communities as beneficiaries/beneficiaries in various development activities in rural areas absolutely must be involved. This socialization should be an important agenda that must be carried out by the government, both the village government, the district government and the Bogor regency government. So that there is an awareness of consultation participation, functional participation, interactive participation and mobilization participation for community members of various types, which aims for the good faith of the community to meet the good faith of the government to become a way of achieving participatory development Sjaf (2019), resulting in programs to be able to work together to achieve the goals of the whole community.

On the other hand, what is getting attention is the group of members of the *Biglen* type of farming community and *Nidlen*, has the same tendency in planning and musrenbangdes participation, with the same intensive typology in carrying out his duties and functions in the farming community where in simple terms this typology demands resources, materials, for example. Power work and land to be exchanged for material incentives, according to the following information from the farmer community leaders.

“...To gather farmers here is very difficult, because they are always in the field until late afternoon, so if you want to collect farmers, you must have money to replace their working hours in the fields or land, especially those who are farm laborers and cultivators spend more time from morning until afternoon in the fields” (Informant AHM).

The information obtained is one of the findings of the typology of farmer community participation that puts forward the value of “incentives” in carrying out their roles according to Pretty (1995), incentive participation in which members of the *Biglen* and *Nidlen* type farming communities participate by providing resources, materials, such as labor and land for farming. exchanged for material incentives, but participation will stop along with the end of incentive rewards, low participation of members of the farming community, also due to weak awareness of the importance of strength in gathering, new knowledge and education. In this case the *Biglen* farmer community opportunity and *Nidlen*, to get involved is still hampered by the average social system of members of the farming community, which in practice is difficult to gather for the common good. The low awareness of members of the farming community in knitting community interests in development is based on factors of cognitive structure and capital owned and the influence of internalization externalization, both the level of education, insight, knowledge, environment and motivation to change.

Thus, optimal mobilization of the potential of the farming community for the benefit of implementing a development program needs to be explored, considered and developed so as to be able to create a social atmosphere that supports development and helps together the village, sub-district and district governments to realize conducive activities in their implementation in order to realize prosperity for the farming community.

Development planning without regard to community participation can potentially be a plan on paper (Adi 2001). This means that development must be based on the interests of all levels of society, including farmers. According to Adi (2001), there are 2 (two) things that become a benchmark for community involvement in development, namely Participation in Planning and Participation in Implementation. If it is seen from the results of the research and refers to the opinion (Adi 2001), the Village Development

activities in the research area still need to be increased the participation of the community members, because in terms of Planning Participation, there are layers of society namely Farmers who feel they are not involved.

Then there is the view of Wicaksono and Sugiarto in Wijaya (2001) which states that one of the elements that must be met in the participatory planning agenda is focused on the interests of the community. If the conditions in the village are related to this opinion, then the conditions in question have violated the concept of participatory planning. This can be seen from the non-involvement of farmers or farmer groups in the agenda of the Musdes or Musdus as well as the passivity of farmers and the farmers' assumption that Musdus activities are just a formality. Participatory Village Planning activities that do not run optimally can be seen from the lack of confidence from the community to express opinions, because they have experience that the opinions expressed will not be realized.

Furthermore, as stated by Tjokroamidjojo (1996) in order to achieve development success, community participation in development must be considered even to the decision-making stage. The non-involvement of a party or group or community such as a farmer group in a village in Participatory Planning is considered to have neglected the concept of participation in development which is synonymous with community power, so it is very contrary to the ideal concept conveyed through the statement (Tjokroamidjojo 1966).

The capital owned by actors in the arena

Capital according to Bourdieu (1996) is "a collection of sources of power and power that can actually be used". That is, the term 'capital' is used by Bourdieu to map the relations of power and power in society, capital is a collection of goods, skills, knowledge and recognition. possessed by individuals or groups that can be used to develop influence and gain power. Therefore, capital and actors cannot be separated in a battle arena. Own capital according to Bourdieu (2010), is divided into four types, namely economic capital which includes various material wealth and production factors, social capital which is a social network with other actors, cultural capital which is ownership material objects that have high values and intellectual qualifications as a result of the education system or passed down through concepts, symbolic capital as cultural symbols that causes the strengthening of the actor's position compared to other actors. This study will discuss the identification of capital based on theory Bourdieu (2010), as a reference to the discussion approach.

It depends on the arena or realm in which they are located. In Bourdieu's view, the realm is a system and relationships that form a network of relations. Bourdieu (1977) explains that the arena cannot be separated from the social space, where the social space is an integral space, which contains a system. In an arena there is a battle over capital. The struggle is also strengthened by capital, so that realm is a realm of power, in which there is a struggle for access to power Mutahir (2011). The contestation arena starts from the aspiration screening before entering the musdus and musrenbangdes, this mechanism will explain how the flow of the aspiration screening reaches the implementation of the musrenbangdes.

In this context, the researcher wants to see how actors then use their capital in carrying out their roles in society, economic capital, social capital in the form of networks, cultural and symbolic capital. The arena of participation in planning and musrenbangdes is a meeting point for the interests and capital owned by actors to achieve the goal of winning the battle in the arena, where the arena becomes a meeting point for ideas and aspirations from all levels of society, both organizations or communities to the smallest part, namely individuals or individuals. individuals, and layers of society. Arena can not be separated from the ownership of capital.

Farmer community actors who are involved in the planning and village development planning participation arena, because they have symbolic capital as part of the power circle or village government, this symbolic capital is obtained from the contestation of community members to win the battle in the election of the RT or RW head by collaborating the capital owned or appointed by the village elite as the

head of the village by using social capital, cultural capital and economic capital of farmer community actors, so that the symbolic capital of members of the farming community which is embodied in the form of the position is interpreted by opening up a greater participation space in carrying out their duties and functions as an integral part of the community. inseparable in the village government order so that the positions held by members of the farming community then provide the privilege of being obligated to be involved for members of the farming community.

The important role of members of the farming community in the early stages of planning which aims to accommodate aspirations, ideas more broadly and become an initial reference in preparing priority programs aimed at improving the standard of living of the community, especially members of the farming community. On the other hand, in order to be able to access the planning arena and the village planning musrenbang by collaborating the capitals owned, and to maintain the continuity of power in the arena, it is important for researchers to then present data on actors' capital ownership in the planning and musrenbangdes participation flow in Table 3.

Table 3.
Actor's capital in the arena of participation in developing villages

| Participation flow | Capital | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Economy | Social | Culture | Symbolic |
| Aspiration network | Not Use | Network Environment The place Stay | Outlook Knowledge Analyze Idea Form | Legitimacy of Village Apparatus (RT) |
| Musdus | Material Facilities Food Place | Network Hamlet Region | Knowledge Draft Skill Arrange RAB | Legitimacy of Village Apparatus RT, RW , BPD, LPM and Kadus (tentative) |
| Musrenbangdes | Not Use | Network Village Regional National | Knowledge Managerial | Legitimacy of Village Apparatus Head of Village Head of BPD, LPM RT, RW, BPD and Kadus) |

Source: Primary data

From the data in Table 3, the researcher tries to present information on each process from the pre-musrenbangdes arena to the implementation of the musrenbangdes and its relation to capital ownership which then provides an overview of the ownership of capital owned by actors in the arena of developing village contestation. The involvement of farmer community actors in the arena because they have symbolic capital as part of the circle of power or village government, this symbolic capital is obtained from winning contestations in the election of RT or RW or being appointed by the village elite as head of village and LPM by using social capital, cultural capital and economic capital of actors community, so that the symbolic capital that is embodied in the form of the position becomes a ticket for members of the farming community to be able to access the planning arena and musrenbangdes by collaborating the capitals they have to maintain the lasting power in the arena such as using economic capital, symbolic capital and social capital at this stage. aspiration screening, village officials who are also part of the community take initiatives to discuss aspirations, issues and ideas through social media in the form of the Whatsapp Group of residents of neighboring neighborhoods caused by structural pressure on the prohibition of gathering and crowding, but not Rarely also does the aspiration search take place in traditional ways, namely direct meetings and take advantage of the momentum of the meeting when

recitation events, celebrations and other village events are held which are an inseparable part of cultural capital and social capital.

Musdus is a community meeting at the RW level to produce a program plan proposed by each RT in their respective RW. At the time of the Musdus implementation, the arena can only be accessed by all actors who have cultural and symbolic capital in the form of position legitimacy and figures who are inclined to the religious side or are characterized by residents, this then also applies to the implementation of the village development planning meeting, where the village contestation arena are those who have symbolic capital as an inseparable part and are legitimately recognized as village officials or community leaders who control symbolic capital that leans on the religious side or community leaders.

In the context of participation in planning and musrenbangdes, the dominant capital that must be owned by members of the farming community is symbolic capital, while economic capital is not a must-have capital to access this arena, economic capital, social capital and cultural capital are only supportive for community members to be able to perpetuate existence in the arena. In contrast to farmer community leaders, the attachment of farmer community institutions is imaged as a group whose interests are accommodated by the agricultural service or government, so that the capital owned by community leaders cannot access the contestation arena. So if this farmer community leader is involved in the contestation of the planning and village development planning participation arena, the thing that must be done is to seize the symbolic legitimacy in the form of village officials' positions or by maximizing community members by opening dialogues to be able to facilitate all the interests of members of the farming community.

According to Bourdieu, in analytic terms, a realm or arena can be defined as a network, or configuration, of objective relations between various positions and modalities of contestation. Positions are defined objectively, in their existence and in the determinations imposed on those who occupy them, i.e. actors and structures, by actual and potential situations in power-sharing structures (or capital) in which ownership of power (or capital) opens access to an advantage that is contested in the arena of contestation, as well as in its objective relation to other positions (domination, subordination, homology, etc.) (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992).

In simple terms, the arena is the meeting point of interests, and the assets owned by actors to achieve the goal of winning the battle in the arena, in the context of this research, the arena in question is the participation of the Developing Village, where the arena becomes a meeting point for ideas and aspirations from all levels of society, both organization or community down to the smallest part, namely individuals or individuals, and the layers of society in this discussion are narrowed to the arena of the farming community in achieving the goals and ideals of the community that are championed. The arena cannot be separated from the accumulation of capital as a tool used to seize class and dominate the Village Build arena.

Bourdieu (1998) said symbolic capital cannot be separated from symbolic power, namely the power that makes it possible to get equal to what is obtained through physical and economic power, thanks to the special effects of mobilization. but it can also be inconspicuous clues that indicate the high status of the owner. For example, education degrees listed on business cards, how to make guests wait, how to affirm their authority (Haryatmoko 2003). Symbolic capital as according to (Bourdieu 1977) can be in the form of prestige and can also be in the form of 'image' as something that can be exchanged for profits in the economic aspect. Symbolic capital, can refer to the accumulation of prestige, acquaintance, honor or consecration (Jenkins 1992). And all of that is built in a dialectic of knowledge (*connaissance*) and recognition (*reconnaissance*). In the end, symbolic capital is closely related to symbolic power. Meanwhile (Sjaf 2014) explains that symbolic capital is a cultural symbol that causes the strengthening of the actor's position compared to other actors.

Conclusion

The farmer community in Cikarawang village has five types, distinguished by the level of capital ownership based on the difference in the magnitude of influence and each capital ownership is influenced by capital ownership. *Menlen* and *Biglen* types are types of members of the farming community who have dominant or high capital power from several sources of control or income sources that are supported by social capital through a wide network or, to the national order, and have a strong accumulation of cultural capital, a distinguishing feature. Between *Menlen* and *Biglen* lies in the power of symbolic capital, where *Menlen* has legitimacy as a village apparatus.

Furthermore, the *Kolen* type is a type of farmer community member who also has several sources of moderate economic capital, namely the middle economic level which also comes from several types of livelihoods and is also supported by the strength of social capital in the village order through proximity or kinship with village elites, and has a network or local networks and regional networks, while the *Renlen* type is a type of farmer community member who has low economic resources but is supported by other capital strengths such as social capital of kinship or proximity to village elites, as well as supported by cultural capital in the form of being easy to socialize and sociable, active in village activities, so that it becomes one of the other factors driving the strength of capital. Finally, the type of farmer community participation is the *Nidlen* type which has a low economic level obtained from non-permanent livelihoods and belongs to groups, laborers, small farmers or cultivators and minimal support for capital ownership. In other cases, negligence in involving themselves in local and national social networks.

Furthermore, the dominant typology of farmer community members in planning and musrenbangdes is passive participation, information and mobilization. There is an incentive typology that places a material or monetary value on the participation of members of the *Biglen* and *Nidlen* types of farming communities, while the *Menlen*, *Kolen* and *Renlen* types are involved in interactive participation where this typology of community members participates in conducting collective analysis. in the formulation of structured action and learning activities, where the community oversees local decisions and has an interest in maintaining and improving the structure and activities carried out.

The capital that must be owned by farming community actors in the participation arena from pre musrenbangdes to musrenbangdes is ownership of symbolic capital as part of the circle of power or village government, this symbolic capital is obtained from winning contestations in the election of RT, RW and BPD or being appointed by the village elite as head village. and LPM, while economic capital is not a must-have capital to access the arena of participation in planning, musdus and musrenbangdes. Economic capital, social capital and cultural capital are supporting members of the farming community to be able to perpetuate their existence in the planning, musdus and village development planning arenas.

References

- Adi IR (2001) Pemberdayaan, Pengembangan Masyarakat dan Intervensi Komunitas (Pengantar Pada Pemikiran dan Pendekatan Praktis). Jakarta: Lembaga Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Indonesia.
- Alamsyah AR (2010) Islam, Jawara dan Demokrasi: Geliat Politik Banten Pasca Orde Baru. Jakarta: Dian Rakyat.
- Amien MA (2005) Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional 2005-2025. Makassar: Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan.
- Anto O (2021) Proses Komunikasi dalam Program Pembangunan Desa (Kasus: Dana Desa di Desa Sungai Kali Kabupaten Barito Kuala Kalimantan Selatan). Bogor: IPB University Press.
- Bourdieu P (1977) Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu P & Wacquant LJD (1992) The Purpose of Reflexive Sociology: An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Bourdieu P (1996) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Chicago: Harvard University Press.
- Bourdieu P (1998) *On Television and Journalism*. London: Pluto.
- Bourdieu P (2010) *Arena Produksi Pemikiran Bourdieu*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Brubaker R (2000) *Social Theory of Habitus*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Creswell JW & Creswell JD (2017) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Damanik IPN (2013) Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi dinamika kelompok dan hubungannya dengan kelas kemampuan kelompok tani di Desa Pulokencana Kabupaten Serang. *Jurnal Penyuluhan* 9 (1):31-40.
- Halamska M (2011) The Polish countryside in the process of transformation 1989-2009. *Polish Sociological Review* 173 (1):35-54.
- Jenkins R (1992) *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Sociologists*. London: Routledge.
- Kolopaking LM, Apriande C, & Syaharbian R (2016) *Mekanisme Perencanaan Desa Membangun dan Membangun Desa*. Vol 1 No. 1. Bogor: PSP3 IPB & LPPM IPB.
- Krisdianto N (2014) *Pierre Bourdieu, Sang Ahli Damai*. Surabaya: Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Press.
- Kurniawan B (2015) *Desa Mandiri Desa Membangun*. Jakarta: Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal dan Transmigrasi.
- Lipton M & Moore M (1980) *Metodologi Studi Pedesaan di Negara-Negara Berkembang*. Jakarta: Yayasan Ilmu Ilmu Sosial.
- Moleong L (2015) *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mutahir A (2011) *Intelektual Kolektif Pierre Bourdieu: Sebuah Gerakan untuk Melawan Dominasi*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana.
- Pretty J (1995) *Regenerating Agriculture: Policies and Practice for Sustainability and Self-reliance*. London: Earthscan Publications.
- Sigalingging AH & Warjio W (2014) Partisipasi masyarakat dalam perencanaan pembangunan (studi kasus pada Kecamatan Sidikalang Kabupaten Dairi). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik* 4 (2):116-145.
- Sjaf S (2014) *Politik Etnik: Dinamika Politik Lokal di Kendari*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Sjaf S (2019) *Involusi Republik Merdesa*. Bogor: IPB Press.
- Solekhan M (2014) *Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Desa*. Malang: Setara Press.
- Sutoro E (2015) *Regulasi Baru, Desa Baru, Ide, Misi dan Semangat UU Desa*. Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daaerah Tertinggal dan Transmigrasi. Jakarta: Kementerian Desa,Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal,dan Transmigrasi RI.
- Tjokroamidjojo B (1996) *Perencanaan Pembangunan Jakarta*. Jakarta: PT Toko Gunung Agung.
- White S & Pettit J (2007). *Participatory approaches and the measurement of wellbeing*. [Accessed 02 August 2022]. <https://www.iied.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/migrate/G02100.pdf>.
- Wijaya R (2001) *Forum pengambilan keputusan dalam proses perencanaan pembangunan di era otonomi daerah (studi kasus di Kelurahan Jebres Kecamatan Jebres Kota Surakarta)*. Thesis, Universitas Gadjah Mada: Yogyakarta.