

DOI <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2018-07.32>

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY-BASED WOMEN'S EMPOWERMENT MODEL FOR POOR WIVES USING PARTICIPATORY POVERTY ASSESMENT METHOD

Muhsin Ahmad, Ristono Agus\*

Faculty of Industrial Engineering, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional, Indonesia

Yuni Siswanti

Faculty of Economy, Universitas Pembangunan Nasional "Veteran" Yogyakarta, Indonesia

\*E-mail: [ahmad.muhsin@upnyk.ac.id](mailto:ahmad.muhsin@upnyk.ac.id)

ORCID: 0000-0003-2457-268x

### ABSTRACT

The Indonesian government has issued many policies on poverty alleviation programs but nothing has been able to significantly improve the welfare of the poor. This is because the programs are more on top-down model and prioritize the technical aspects. The poverty issues in some regions have diverse, specific, and multidimensional situations so that it is unable to generalize poverty from one region to another. This study examined poverty issues by involving the participation of poor people as the target of the programs to define poverty, identify potentials, and design solutions that can be conducted using the Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) method. The object of study was the wives from poor families in Srimartani village of Piyungan Bantul Yogyakarta. The results showed that the potentials of household resources of wives of the poor families consisted of 37,78% wives who have ever had their own businesses, 35,56% having experiences in trading, 15,56% having farming skills, and 11,11% having skills as laborers. The empowerment model is by providing *hardskill* and *softskill* training based on capability already possessed and business assistance.

### KEY WORDS

Poverty, participatory poverty assessment, community, business.

The Indonesian government launched many poverty alleviation programs such as Presidential Instruction for Underdeveloped Villages (IDT), Social Security Network (JPS), Urban Poverty Alleviation Program (P2KP), Coastal Community Empowerment (PEMP) and Small Scale Fishing Enterprise Development Program (PUPTSK). However, these programs have not been able to significantly improve the welfare of the people. The causing factor of the lack of effectiveness of government programs in alleviating poverty is the policies that are designed to be *top-down*. The program solutions launched are more likely to be uniform while the poverty issues faced by the people are diverse and sometimes specific to a particular region.

Another cause is poverty reduction programs are more technical, bureaucratic, and give priority to direct cash or capital assistance. Poverty is a phenomenon that should be perceived systemically and holistically. This is because poverty is the effect of behavior that is not prosperous, and consumptive consciousness and does not result in any development. Poverty is more a habitual culture of society that must be addressed by using local wisdom approach because the problems faced by the poor are actually complex and specific. Poverty is not only caused by financial shortages but is also influenced by political, social, environmental, economic and network access factors.

Actually, there have been an idea of improving the *well-being* presented in the 1990s as a response to efforts to alleviate poverty. Citizens are directed to see poverty from their own point of view. The *Participatory Poverty Assessment* (PPA) method is a participatory analysis method to guide citizens in recognizing conditions and formulating their own solutions to alleviate poverty. PPA incorporates the poor directly in an interactive manner as

the target of the programs based on the assumption that the poor know better about their own poverty condition.

Indigenous people tend to be poor, having low health level and limitations to show the conditions at hand (Mohindra, Narayana and Haddad, 2010). Poverty needs to be resolved because people, especially for poverty-stricken children, are more vulnerable to low health level, mental problems, cognitive problems and limited livelihoods (Najman *et al.*, 2018), which affects the teenagers aged 14 and 21 years old at having risk of anxiety and depressed feelings or the adolescent and adult depression (Najman *et al.*, 2010). Poverty experienced by citizens is influenced by poverty that occurs in the environment (Schulz *et al.*, 2012). In certain cases such as agricultural areas, poverty is affected by crop productivity, land size, location, demography, and availability of irrigation facilities (Hussain *et al.*, 2006).

Poverty is an endemic problem that is a major concern of a country, such as poverty that has weakened the countries of the African continent (Nwankwo, 2013). The findings showed that socio-cultural ability is more dominant in poverty alleviation programs with entrepreneurship (Naminse and Zhuang, 2018). Poverty measurement is required by involving multidimensional because poverty is specific and different in each region so that local poverty is needed, identifies and describes their characteristics (Wang and Wang, 2016). The World Bank notes that poverty alleviation strategy is to involve the participation of the poor and improve the capability of its human resources (Gaiha and Kulkarni, 1998) by recognizing the regional potentials to improve productivity and sustainability (Olawepo, 2008). The effective community empowerment model is what is based on the criteria approach explored directly from the community as the target of the programs (Muhsin, Hapsoro and Yuni, 2018).

One of the reinforcement made on the capacity of the people is by focusing the development assistance shifted to providing the poor people the access to economic and basic services to meet their needs (Harpham and Anelay, 1999). A tool for conducting the literature and field gap approach is by conducting the community-based participatory research (Loo, 2014). Community mobilization is an important component in a participatory approach to development programs (Thomas *et al.*, 2012). The poverty reduction strategy is continually updated to adjust the time and conditions to get the right solutions at the right time by examining the potentials and involving many parties (Marcus, Wilkinson and Marshall, 2002).

This study aimed to understand and define poverty through the perspective of the poor people themselves by involving the poor in an interactive participatory manner on a series of interviews and Focus Group Discussion. The method used was Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) and variable selection method used was Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP). The result of PPA became the materials to formulate the planning strategy of community empowerment development model for poverty reduction based on the aspiration and input of the poor people themselves which is aimed to match the condition of local problems.

The initial hypothesis resulted from field observation is that the community is still fragmented in defining poverty because it adjusts the criteria determined by the government. The poor, according to them, is the person recorded as a participant of the poverty alleviation program proclaimed by the government, namely GAKIN (Poor Family), or getting social assistance, namely RASKIN (Rice for the Poor), or requesting the Low-Economy Family Statement Letter (SKTM) from the Village Government, and or holding a Public Health Insurance (JAMKESMAS).

Another definition of poverty added is that poverty is identified for having no house to live, unable to afford school fees for children, having no fixed income, and having no vehicle to travel and a range of criteria that arise and vary in every region.

The poverty alleviation methods that have been launched do not always succeed in achieving the goals and most of them failed. It is because they are not observed by a study in applying suitable methods to empower people in a region. Even worse, outcomes of the Poverty Reduction Program of the Government are illustrated as a cash assistance which is

ready to receive and should be received by the people, so that there are many people who register themselves as the poor to get the assistance.

Such conditions make the community less productive but more consumptive and weak. The approach taken in this study was *Participatory Poverty Assessment* to formulate the poverty defined by the poor people. This study addresses several topics related to poverty, among others: the definition of poverty, the criteria of poverty, the causes of poverty, and the impact of poverty.

Through this method, it is expected that the public will be able to find the answers to the criteria of poverty that are appropriate to their own situation. Once they are aware of their condition, they are brought to answer the causes of poverty and how to overcome them and to get themselves out of poverty by empowering the potentials of both human and natural resources.

## METHODS OF RESEARCH

This study used Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) method to define poverty definition by directly involving poor people in determining their own poor criteria. The most influential variables were determined by using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method. The primary data were collected using interviews and questionnaires to wives of the families recorded as participants of the government's poverty alleviation program. Secondary data were collected from the government and the Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS). This research was conducted in Srimartani Village, Piyungan Subdistrict, Bantul Regency, Yogyakarta.

Data obtained from the results of research were processed using SPSS software to determine the validity and consistency of data. The steps in data processing in this study were as follows:

- Identifying of the wives of the poor families as the object of research
- Preparing and completing the preliminary questionnaire.
- Identifying and defining criteria.
- Testing the validity and consistency of results.
- Introduction to poverty and self-potential.
- Determining the empowerment model.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The respondents of this study are the wives of poor families in Srimartani Village who have different backgrounds in terms of age, educational background, business experience, and employment status.

Table 1 – Respondent Characteristics By Age

Age Group	Group I		Group II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
21-30 years old	5	20	2	8
31-40 years old	9	36	8	32
41-50 years old	9	36	9	36
> 50 years old	2	8	6	24
Total	25	100	25	100

Source: Processed Primary Data.

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that most respondents are aged 31-50 years old (72% and 68%). This age group is not highly productive, but is still feasible and strong in working because it is assumed to not yet be included retirement age in terms of being Civil Servants, so it is still very possible to be independent and working.

Table 2 – Respondent characteristics by educational background

Educational Background	Group I		Group II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Not graduated from Elementary School	2	8	1	4
Elementary School	5	20	7	28
Junior High School	7	28	8	32
Senior High School	11	44	9	36
Total	25	100	25	100

Source: Processed Primary Data.

Based on Table 2, it can be seen that most of the respondents have junior and senior high school education (72% and 68%). The Ministry of Education and Culture of Indonesia (Kemdikbud) has set a 9-year compulsory education, so the minimum formal education to have is junior high school. Based on the government's policy, the respondents of this research have received sufficient education to be able to think about developing their own potentials and the surrounding resources.

Table 3 – Respondent characteristics by work experience

Work Experience	Group I		Group II	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Available	23	92	22	88
Unavailable	2	8	3	12
Total	25	100	25	100

Source: Processed Primary Data.

Based on Table 3, it can be seen that most respondents already have work experience (92% and 88%). The high work experience shows that respondents already have the *hardskill* to try and have experienced system and work management. Differences in work experience will affect the method and type of self-potential development model that will be applied. Therefore, the identification of self-potential and resources to facilitate the respondents in order to start the business in accordance with the background of *hardskill* that has been formed, so it will be easier to generate and empower them in order to run the business well.

The respondents were divided into two groups in order to conduct test on their homogeneity by using Homogeneity Test. One of these tests that can be performed is the Cochran Test. The test is to be able to know exactly that each group has homogeneity. If each group is different, then it will be re-randomized, so that each group is really homogeneous.

Table 4 – Results of Homogeneity Test

No	Type	Homogeneity Test	Interpretation
1	Work Experience	0,726	Homogeneous
2	Education	0,565	Homogeneous
3	Age	0,076	Homogeneous

Source: Processed Primary Data.

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the probability value of Wilcoxon Test and t test is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that the members in each group have many similarities, both from the type of work experience, education, and age. Therefore, the grouping of community empowerment participants conducted in this study has been appropriate because it is homogeneous.

The determination of the attributes considered in the assessment of the results of the mentoring and training programs in this study was conducted through *Focus Group Discussion* (FGD) for the wives of the poor families as the basis for the determination of the initial attributes. This is certainly based on initial research that the basic principle of research

is the model of *Participatory Poverty Assessment* (PPA). The initial attributes formed are then tested using the Cochran Q test in order to see the extent to which the attributes obtained are accountable, so that they can be the attributes that are fully considered in the assessment of the success of the mentoring program.

*Hypothesis Test:*

Hypothesis 1 states that: monetary assets can be increased through empowerment and mentoring models. This hypothesis can be proved by comparing the level of significance of the average of Pre- and Post-Test scores of all respondents with a critical value of 5%.

Table 5 – Pre- and Post-Test Scores for Monetary Assets

Group	Pre-Test Score Average	Post-Test Score Average	t-test value	Interpretation
I	600.000,-	696.000,-	7,805	Different
II	676.000,-	668.000,-	0,647	Not Different
I and II	638.000,-	682.000,-	0,219	Not Different

Source: Processed Primary Data.

Based on the table above, it is known that the significance value in group treated with training is 7,809. This number is greater than the t table, so it can be concluded that there is a significant difference between before and after the implementation of the empowerment model and mentoring, so that hypothesis 1 is accepted. While on there is a difference on the other t test value for the control group (Group 2) that is to prove that the result shows no difference when there is no training given, where this group has been stated homogeneous with Group 1.

Hypothesis 2 states that: There is a significant difference between the implementation of empowerment model and mentoring with the increasing goods. This hypothesis can be proved by comparing the average significance level of Pre- and Post-Test scores for each group with a critical value of 5%.

Table 5 – Pre- and Post-Test Scores for Goods

Group	Pre-Test Score Average	Post-Test Score Average	Wilcoxon test value	Tafsir
I	75,77	79,92	-2,35	Different
II	76,69	77,77	-1,607	Not Different
I and II	74,73	77,35	-0,219	Not Different

Source: Processed Primary Data.

Based on the above table, it is known that the value of Wilcoxon for group 1 is -2,35 so it is stated there is a significant difference in this group in the implementation of training, because the number is smaller than the critical Z value with a significance level of 0,05. While in group 2, the Wilcoxon test value is -1,607, greater than the critical Z value with a significance level of 0,05 so there is no significant difference between the Pre- and Post-test. Thus, it can be concluded that model 2 has no difference, whereas model 1 has a significant difference. Thus, hypothesis 2 is accepted.

## CONCLUSION

The potentials of household resources of wives of the poor families consisted of 37,78% wives who have ever had their own businesses, 35,56% having experiences in trading, 15,56% having farming skills, and 11,11% having skills as laborers. The empowerment model is by providing *hardskill* and *softskill* training based on capability already possessed and business assistance. Group I, consists of people who have the ability to trade, was given business management training, expected that the business and financial management can be more professional. Group II, consists of people who have experience in cattle breeding/fish farming, both for catfish, cattle and goats, was given food efficiency training using fermentation, so that they can save more production cost. Group III, consists of people who have experience as temporary farmers but have no agricultural land, was given

the training of farming methods by optimizing the existing land, one of which by giving polybag agriculture training. Based on the discrimination test, it can be concluded that the people who were given the training as well as mentoring were more successful than the people who were not given training at all.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Institute for Research and Community Service (LPPM) of UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education Republic of Indonesia for facilitating this research in Cluster Research Scheme and providing financial support to produce this publication.

### REFERENCES

1. Gaiha, R. and Kulkarni, V. (1998) 'Is Growth Central to Poverty Alleviation in India?', *Journal of International Affairs*, 52(1).
2. Harpham, T. and Anelay, L. (1999) 'After roads and dams: What role for engineers in the poverty reduction strategies of bilateral development agencies?', *Journal of International Development*, 11(6), pp. 811–823.
3. Hussain, I. et al. (2006) 'Irrigation, productivity and poverty linkages in irrigation systems in java, Indonesia', *Water Resources Management*, 20(3), pp. 313–336.
4. Loo, C. (2014) 'The Role of Community Participation in Climate Change Assessment and Research', *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 27(1), pp. 65–85. doi: 10.1007/s10806-013-9452-0.
5. Marcus, R., Wilkinson, J. and Marshall, J. (2002) 'Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs)--Fulfilling Their Potential for Children in Poverty?', *Journal of International Development*, 14(8), pp. 1117–1128. doi: 10.1002/jid.953.
6. Mohindra, K. S., Narayana, D. and Haddad, S. (2010) "My story is like a goat tied to a hook." Views from a marginalised tribal group in Kerala (India) on the consequences of falling ill: A participatory poverty and health assessment', *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 64(6), pp. 488–494. doi: 10.1136/jech.2008.086249.
7. Muhsin, A., Hapsoro, D. S. and Yuni, S. (2018) 'Community-Based Poverty Alleviation Using Rural Appraisal', *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, 6(June). DOI: 10.18551/rjoas.2018-06.12
8. Najman, J. M. et al. (2010) 'Family poverty over the early life course and recurrent adolescent and young adult anxiety and depression: A longitudinal study', *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(9), pp. 1719–1723. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2009.180943.
9. Najman, J. M. et al. (2018) 'The inter- and intra- generational transmission of family poverty and hardship (adversity): A prospective 30 year study', *PLoS ONE*, 13(1), pp. 1–13. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0190504.
10. Naminse, E. Y. and Zhuang, J. (2018) 'Does farmer entrepreneurship alleviate rural poverty in China? Evidence from guangxi province', *PLoS ONE*, 13(3), pp. 1–19.
11. Nwankwo, R. N. (2013) 'Official corruption and poverty reduction in Nigeria: a critical assesment (2003-2010)', *International Journal of Arts & Sciences*, 6(2), pp. 305–329.
12. Olawepo, R. A. (2008) 'Using Participatory Rural Appraisal to explore coastal fishing in Badagry villages, Nigeria', *Environmentalist*, 28(2), pp. 108–122.
13. Schulz, A. J. et al. (2012) 'Associations between socioeconomic status and allostatic load: Effects of neighborhood poverty and tests of mediating pathways', *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(9), pp. 1706–1714. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2011.300412.
14. Thomas, T. et al. (2012) 'Design of a Community Ownership and Preparedness Index: using data to inform the capacity development of community-based groups', *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 66(Suppl 2), pp. ii26-ii33.
15. Wang, Y. and Wang, B. (2016) 'Multidimensional poverty measure and analysis: a case study from Hechi City, China', *SpringerPlus*. Springer International Publishing, 5(1). doi: 10.1186/s40064-016-2192-7.