

The Condition of Poverty in Central Java, Indonesia (Case Study in Kabupaten Grobogan and Wonosobo)

Alfina Handayani^{1*}, S. Budi Prasetyo¹

Regional Planning Research and Development Agency of Central Java, Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract: This paper intends to study the condition of poverty in Central Java, particularly in Kabupaten Grobogan and Wonosobo. The data was collected by focus group discussion (FGD) and indepth interview. The results show that Kab. Grobogan is more faced with infrastructure problems that affect access to basic facilities. The low level of education and sanitation of the people in Kab Wonosobo is influenced by cultural-influenced community behaviour. A lot of programs are not on target, it needs the strong commitment of the Government to update the poverty data. Empowerment-based poverty reduction is constrained by incompatibility with the potential of the local community and environment, product marketing, capital and infrastructure.

Keywords: capital; infrastructure; poverty

1 Introduction

Poverty has been important problem in Indonesia especially in Central Java. Poverty in Central Java is likely to decline consistently between 14, 44 % in September, 2013 and 12, 23 % in September 2017 by average at 0, 55 % each year (Bappeda JawaTengah, 2018). In 2017, the proportion of poor families in Central Java reached 12, 23%, that is 4, 19 million out of the total population of 34 million people (BPS, 2017). Therefore, in accordance with the direction of national and regional development policies as stated in both the national mid-term development plan (RPJMN) and RPJMD, poverty is still the main priority to be resolved. Poverty is also the UN's first Sustainable Development Goals (SDG1) to end poverty in all its forms everywhere in 2030 (UNDP, 2015).

To improve coordination of poverty reduction, the government issued Presidential Regulation No 15 of 2010 on the Acceleration of Eradication of Poverty. The Regulation mandated the formation of the National Team to Accelerate Poverty Eradication (TNP2K) at national level, followed by the Provincial and Regency/Municipality Poverty Coordination Teams (TKPKD). In these efforts, the strategy being pursued was to integrate poverty into four cluster approach: (1) Based on assistance and social Protection, (2) Empowerment of community, (3) Empowerment of micro and small enterprises, and (4) pro-poor people program (Widianto, 2013).

However, according to TKPKD (2017), there were various problems to achieve government efforts in poverty eradication, such as uncoordination between government institutions that caused of poverty eradication programs had not fully targeted to the group of poorest families. In addition, poverty program should be designed to regard characteristic of the poorest.

Until fairly recently, discussions of poverty have largely dwelt on assessments of income and expenditure. Frequently, poverty is defined in either relative or absolute terms. Absolute poverty measures poverty in relation to the amount of money necessary to meet basic needs such as food, clothing, and shelter. While, relative poverty defines poverty in relation to the economic status of other members of the society: people are poor if they fall below prevailing standards of living in a given societal context. Poverty represents a deprivation of essential assets (physical, social, and psychological) to which every human being is entitled (ADB 1999).

According to (BPS, 2017), 14 regencies in Central Java were categorized as the poorest areas which lived below the national and regional poverty line. Furthermore, there are 115 villages based on absolute poverty data that have been prioritized to alleviate (Department of Government, Social and Cultural, Bappeda Jateng, 2018). Regarding those data, Grobogan and Wonosobo both have the majority of poorest villages (more than 10 villages). Hence, this study aim to explore the condition of poverty in those areas.

2 Methods

The research was conducted in Grobogan and Wonosobo Regency. Both locations were chosen as regard the number of poorest villages, and agriculture as the main live hood for the most people who live in that areas. Grobogan represents agricultural areas in the lowlands, whilst Wonosobo is plateau. Three villages were appointed as sample. This research used descriptive qualitative approaches. Data collected by Focus Group

* Corresponding Author: alfinahandayani16@gmail.com

Discussion (FGD) and in-depth interview. Respondents consist of district government institution, headman, public figure, poor people and poverty program companion. The collected data both primary and secondary sources were edited, summarised and analysed to meet the aims of the study. Finally, data is presented by descriptive including chart and graph.

3 Result and Discussion

This study was carried out to provide a preliminary picture of the evaluation of district government strategy in overcoming poverty. Grobogan and Wonosobo both belong to 15 areas which have poverty line under the national and regional number.

3.1 Global, national and farm level implications

Grobogan Regency located in north eastern part and is the second largest regency in the Central Java Province, Indonesia. In 2017, the number of poor families were 13,27 % with average performance in reducing poverty about 0,57% between 2013 and 2017. Karanganyar, Jambangan and Lajer were selected as research location.

3.1.1 The Condition of Poverty in Karanganyar Village

Five aspects consist of infrastructure, education, health and poverty eradication programmes have been identified: (a) *Infrastructure*. Nearly 50% of damaged road, lack of water (limited water source) in dry season and flooding during rainy season and telecommunication access was completely troublesome. (b) *Education*. The majority of education is junior high school, only limited person who study in high school and college, the distance of junior high school \pm 5-6 km and the quantity and quality of teachers were fairly low (Most of them had contract status), public education infrastructure is in good condition. (c) *Health*. No health facilities such as Community Health Centres (Puskesmas) or Community Health Sub-center (Pustu), a number of poor people do not have health insurance card and case of shortness of breath due to charcoal burning activities. (d) *Poverty Eradication Programmes*. There are still a number of poor families who have not received poverty alleviation assistance programmes (PKH, BPNT, Ranstra), sustainability of empowerment programmes (market and capital).

3.1.2 The Condition of Poverty in Jambangan Village

Infrastructure. Road access that is under the authority of the District Government is still constrained because the bridge which connected some villages is damaged. 70% of village roads are in good condition, but bridges between hamlets still need improvement. *Education*. The majority of education is junior high school. *Health*. constrained transportation access, health insurance card services are good, as well as for people with disabilities. *Poverty Eradication Programmes*. There are still a number of poor people who have not received assistance programs such as PKH and BPNT, sustainability of a number of empowerment programs has not gone well due to lack of capital and market access.

3.1.3 The Condition of Poverty in Jambangan Village

Infrastructure. road conditions are good, bridges that are under the authority of the province, which connects the village of Lajer and other villages along the 60 meters of damage, there is no irrigation water even though the dam is in Lajer Village, the distribution of Perhutani land is limited, not all residents have access to manage Perhutani land. *Education*. Access to basic education facilities (elementary and junior high school) is quite good, 70% of junior high school graduates have not yet proceeded to high school. *Health*. Not all people have received health insurance cards, the rest are facilitated by Jamkesda. *Poverty Eradication Programmes*. There are still a number of poor families who have not received poverty alleviation assistance programmes (PKH, BPNT, KIP), sustainability of empowerment programmes (market and capital).

3.1.4 The Condition of Poverty in Jambangan Village

Infrastructure. road conditions are good, bridges that are under the authority of the province, which connects the village of Lajer and other villages along the 60 meters of damage, there is no irrigation water even though the dam is in Lajer Village, the distribution of Perhutani land is limited, not all residents have access to manage Perhutani land. *Education*. Access

3.2 Discussion

Regarding the data presented, overall, it can be summarized that infrastructure condition in two villages (Karanganyar and Jambangan) were very poor.

Those three of poor villages are located around the forest. Consequently, the majority of people consider the forest resources as the potential asset. Forests become potential resources to run the economy of local people, especially for those who live around the forests. Forest resources play an important role to boost the economic condition of the residents (Goulet, 2003). Farmers living around the forest, who are known as Pesanggem farmers. They have cultivated the land forest for generation to generation under Cultivation Rights signed between pesanggem and Perhutani management. Maize, which is suitable for drought season, is important

commodity for farmers in that areas. According to farmer respondents, the condition of the infrastructure is one of the obstacles to the economic development of the community in Karanganyar and Jambangan Village. More of the 50% of the main road access is severely damaged. In addition, many villagers complained about the road from the forest to the outside of the area to transport corn yields. Whereas, Lajer Village has better infrastructure condition, for villagers who don't have access to Perhutani land, they looked for job in outside the village such as construction workers, household assistants, traders etc.

Telecommunication access in Jambangan and Lajer is better than Karanganyar. The severe problem in all villages is lack of water (limited water source for consumption and daily need) in dry season and flooding during rainy season. Village Governments have proposed some projects to overcome this problem, meanwhile these efforts are still constrained. For instance, in Karanganyar Village, Water Supply and Community Based Sanitation (PAMSIMAS) has also been implemented, constrained by salty water, it is not suitable for consumption. In other hand, the irrigation infrastructure in Lajer is very poor condition, the Lajer topography consists mainly of mountain areas. Ironically, there is dam site located in Lajer, which is function to irrigate other areas around Lajer. However, dam cannot irrigate fields at the lajer itself. Other efforts such as pumping and drilling have already been tried to extract ground water meanwhile that aren't fruitful.

Karanganyar and lajer both have limited in health and education facilities because limited access of transportation. Both don't have health facilities such as Community Health Centers (Puskesmas) or Community Health Sub-centre (Pustu). According to Karanganyar Village Head, in the past the role of bidan desa (village midwife) was very important, thereby new policy for reducing the mortality rates for mothers and infants, birth process must be carried out at the Puskesmas, in an emergency the community is in difficulties because poorly transportation access. The establishment of the Pustu is highly expected by the village community. Furthermore, there are still a number of poor people who do not have health insurance card.

In term of education, most average education level in three villages is the junior secondary level. Currently, a lot of Children are starting school earlier and staying in education longer than they ever have before. However, Access to educational facilities is still constrained by distance, particularly for junior high school that the average distance is around 5-6 km, while the furthest distance is 12 km. Another obstacle is the quantity and quality of teachers, most of whom are honorary employees, since the limited number of government teachers (2-3 each school). Severe road damage caused hardly access to education facilities, mostly they should spend 2 hours travel, there was not comparable to their salary that earned, especially for honorary employees.

Regarding of poverty eradication program especially based on assistance and social protection, the number of poor families in three villages have not been reached by those programs which based on assistance and social protection such as PKH, BPLT, KIP, ranstra (prosperous rice), etc. because of the unappropriated data of poor families. Ironically, the number of middle-income families have received such programs. The Village Government in that three locations have received lots of protests from public to improve the data of poor families. In fact, the data of poor families are compiled by Central Government, Regional and District Government both do not have the authority to improve data that must be proposed to the Central Government.

In term of empowerment program, Regional and District Government have mandated to improve community welfare by many programmes. In fact, in our research areas lots of programmes have been implemented such as training, technical and capital assistance. However, the benefits and sustainability of a program are still a concern. For example, agriculture service programmes do not differentiate between poor and more well off farmers—all are treated in the same way. Interventions include providing agricultural extension and technical assistance with farming, as well as developing agribusinesses with farmer groups. Most poor people do not have farming land, they work more as farm laborers.

Basically, many training programmes are designed to improve farmer skills in line with their potential. Such as food processing training that is introduced to improve farmer capacity to process their product and increase added value of product. In fact, after farmer master in that skill, they have been constrained by market and capital problem.

3.2 Poverty Condition in Wonosobo Regency

Wonosobo Regency located in Dieng Plateau, about 120 km from Semarang. In 2017, the number of poor families were 20,32% with average performance in reducing poverty about 0,44% between 2013 and 2017. Ropoh, Pulosari, and Pagerejo Lajer were selected as research location.

3.2.1 The Condition of Poverty in Ropoh Village

Infrastructure. Roads, water, telecommunications facilities are very adequate. **Education.** Low education level. **Health.** stunting case, Health Centre Subsector (Pustu) is already exists. **Sanitation.** the low level of people who have latrines. **Poverty Eradication Programmes.** Several programs related to empowerment such as livestock assistance, training, batik crafts. Even though the training and facilitation that has been provided to the residents, not all of them can be independent and sustainable.

3.2.2 The Condition of Poverty in Pulosaren Village

Infrastructure. Roads, water, telecommunications facilities are quite good. **Education.** Low education level. **Health.** Health services are quite good, there are Integrated Health Service (Posyandu) for both children and the elderly and village midwives. The distance of Puskesmas and Pustu is far away. On average, they have received a

health card, even though there are still those who have not received it. *Sanitation*. the low level of people who have latrines

Poverty Eradication Programmes. Several programs related to empowerment such as livestock assistance, training, batik crafts. Even though the training and facilitation that has been provided to the residents, not all of them can be independent and sustainable.

4 Conclusion

Biotechnology is one of the solutions to promote sustainable farming system as far as carefully thought. Biotechnology promotes economic impact by providing great yield, moreover, biotechnology plays a role regarding on natural resources protection. However, the acceptance level of biotechnology crop to the society is quite low due to the negative perspective of biotech product and the lack regulation from the government contribute to slow acceptance of biotech crop. The concept of clean biotechnology and clean farming system by using organic fertiliser, bio-pesticides, bioremediation and supporting from the government regulation tend to succeed the incorporating biotechnology for sustainable farming system.

References

- Bappeda JawaTengah. (2018). *Rencana pembangunan jangka menengah daerah Provinsi Jawa Tengah Tahun 2018-2023*.
- BPS. (2017). *Data kemiskinan Jawa Tengah*. Badan Pusat Statistik.
- Goulet, R. (2003). *Macarios de magnésie, le monogénès*.
- Widianto, B. (2013). *Laporan tim nasional percepatan penanggulangan kemiskinan (TNP2K)*. Jakarta.