

Review Article

The Dynamics of Rice Farmer Group "Masa ke Masa." (A Case Study in Tabalong Regency, South Kalimantan, Indonesia)

Rahmatul Jannah¹, Jabal Tarik Ibrahim², Bambang Yudi Ariadi³

^{1,2,3}Agribusiness Study Program, Faculty of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry,
University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia.

Received Date: 22 February 2022

Revised Date: 14 April 2022

Accepted Date: 19 April 2022

Abstract - This study aims to determine the current dynamics of the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group and find out the constraints faced by the farmer group members in applying the elements of the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group dynamics. Respondents in this study were all members of the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa," who were actively registered, amounting to 40 people. The data collection technique used the census method. The average level of dynamics of the eight elements of the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa" is very dynamic, with the value obtained being 5,311 with a percentage of 91%. The level of dynamics toward group goals is dynamic, and the group structure is very dynamic, group task functions are dynamic, group development and coaching are very dynamic, group cohesiveness is dynamic, group atmosphere is classified as dynamic, the pressure in the group is classified as very dynamic, group effectiveness is classified as dynamic. The obstacle faced by farmer groups is in the group atmosphere due to less close relationships caused by some members who often do not attend several farmer group agendas and do not want to pay monthly membership fees. Still, when there is the distribution of assistance from the government, they get it evenly.

Keywords - "Masa ke Masa," Group Dynamics, Farmers Group, Elements of Group Dynamics.

I. INTRODUCTION

All creatures that live on this earth, like humans, act as social beings, which means that humans live depending on other creatures to interact with others [1], [2]. As social beings, humans can never be separated from the existence of the people around them, such as families, communities, schools, offices, and social life in the community [3]. Farmer groups are created according to the needs of the community who have the same goals and want to cooperate to facilitate the achievement of a goal [4], [5]. So that the formation of farmer groups is no longer in accordance with the original expectations, namely realizing the welfare of the farming community through agricultural development [6], [7].

Farmer groups mostly appear in rural areas because the average people in rural areas live as farmers [8], [9]. For example, the farming community in Masintan Village members of the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group is an association of rice farmers in the village. Unfortunately, today's farmer groups are only tools for certain communities or groups to get government assistance. So that the formation of farmer groups is no longer in accordance with the original expectations, namely realizing the welfare of the farming community through agricultural development [10].

This farmer group often receives assistance from the government in rice seeds for each growing season, tractors, harvesting equipment, and rice milling equipment. After conducting a preliminary survey at the survey site, the researcher found several problems in the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group, such as low group member loyalty, low group activity, and members' reluctance to pay regular monthly fees as cash that applies to every month. Members of the group. Based on this description, this study aims to determine the current dynamics of the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa."

II. METHOD

The research was conducted in Masintan Village, Kelua District, Tabalong Regency, in February-March 2022. The location was chosen deliberately. The population of this research is all farmers who are members of the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa" respondents with 40 people [11]. Data collection using the census method. The analysis used in this research is the descriptive qualitative analysis and Likert scale. The data used are primary and secondary. Data collection techniques through observation, interviews, documentation, and questionnaires [12], [13], [14].

A. Measurement Method

In assessing the success of the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group in Masintan Village in achieving its goals, it can be seen from the dynamics because the more dynamic the group, the more effective the group concerned will achieve its goals [15], [16], [17]. To determine the dynamics of a group



using measurements of the dynamic elements in a group [18], [19]. Elements of group goals consist of 3 sub-elements, group unitary structure 4 sub-elements, task function consists of 4 sub-elements, group development and development consists of 2 sub-elements, group cohesiveness consists of 3 sub-elements, group atmosphere 3 sub-elements, group pressure 4 sub-elements, 7 sub-elements group effectiveness, and 3 sub-elements hidden/hidden intentions. Thus, the total number of questions to determine the dynamics of a group is 33 questions.

B. Classification

Each answer score of all the measured variables is added up to obtain a cumulative score [20], [21], [17]. The cumulative scores of the respondents were then grouped into five levels with the largest range of intervals [22]. The overall score for the assessment of the elements of group dynamics is:

$$S_{Max} = 33 \times 40 \times 5 = 6.600$$

$$S_{Max} = 33 \times 40 \times 5 = 6.600$$

$$S_{Min} = 33 \times 40 \times 1 = 1.320$$

Assessment score of each element/indicator of measuring elements of group dynamics,

$$S_{Max} = 5 \times 40 = 200$$

$$S_{Min} = 1 \times 40 = 40$$

$$i = \frac{a - b}{k}$$

Information :

- i = class interval.
- a = Total maximum score.
- b = Total minimum score.
- k = Number of classes/categories.

$$i = \frac{6.600 - 1.320}{5} = 1.056$$

So from the mathematical calculation of the class interval, the overall score is 1,056, then the division of categories is:

- Not very dynamic with scores: 1.320 – 2.376
- Not dynamic with scores : 2.377 – 3.432
- Less dynamic with scores : 3.433 – 4.488
- Dynamic with scores : 3.434 – 4.486
- Very dynamic with scores : 4.487 – 5.543

While the class intervals for measuring each element or indicator of group dynamics are:

$$i = \frac{200 - 40}{5} = 32$$

So, the division of categories of each assessment element with an interval of 33 is:

- Not very dynamic : 40 - 72
- Not dynamic : 73 - 104
- Less dynamic : 105 - 136
- Dynamic : 137 - 168
- Very dynamic : 169 - 200

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Maintain is one of the villages in Kelua sub-district, Tabalong district, which has an area of 17,5 KM². The climate of Masintan village is like other villages in Indonesia, which have a dry and rainy climate [23], [22].

A. Characteristics of 40 Respondents The Dynamics of Rice Farmer Groups "Masa ke Masa."

Table. 1 Average and Percentage of Characteristics of All Respondents in the Rice Farmer Group "Masa ke Masa"

No.	Characteristics	Category	Score	(%)
1.	Gender and Age	Man (46-50) years	17	58
		Woman (41-45) years	4	36
		Woman (46-50) years	4	36
2.	Number Family Dependents	Man (1-5) people	28	97
		Woman (1-5) people	11	100
3.	Long time trying to farm	Man (26-30) years	9	31
		Woman (15-20) years	5	46
4.	Total Land Area	1-5 (Ha/m ²)	38	95
5.	Education	Man (SMA/SMK)	12	41
		Woman (SMA/SMK)	5	45

Source: Primary Data, Processed 2022

Based on Table 1 shows that the gender and age of men on average are 46-50 years with a value of 17 and a percentage of 58%, and for women, the values and percentages are the same at ages 41-45 and 46-50 with a value of 4 and a percentage 36%, the average number of dependents of the family is 1-5 men with a value of 28 and a percentage of 97% and the average woman is also 1-5 people with a value of 11 and a percentage of 100%, the average length of business in farming men average 26-30 years with a value of 9 and a percentage of 31% and women an average of 15-20 years with a value of 5 and a percentage of 46%, the total land area on average 1-5 Ha/10,000-50,000 m² with a value of 38 and a percentage 95%, and the average education of men is SMA/SMK with a score of 12. A percentage of 41% and the average education of women is SMA/SMK with a value of 5 and a percentage of 45%.

B. The Dynamic of Rice Farmer Groups "Masa ke Masa."

Group dynamics, namely the motion or strength contained in the group, determines or influences the behavior of its members in achieving goals[24]. The Likert scale approach is used according to the instructions [25]. In this

approach, 5 scores are used, with a score of 1 given for strongly disagreeing, 2 for disagreeing, 3 for disagreeing, 4 for agreeing, and 5 for strongly agreeing.

Table. 2 Results of the Dynamics of Rice Farmer Groups "Masa ke Masa"

No.	Elements of Group Dynamics	Total Score	(%)	Category
1.	Farmer Group's Goals			
	1.1 Members understand the goals of the farmer group	166	94	Dynamic
	1.2 Farmer group activities follow the objectives to be achieved	170	97	Very Dynamic
2.	1.3 The goals of farmer groups are in line with personal goals in the household economy	166	94	Dynamic
	Farmer Group Structure			
	2.1 Equal distribution of tasks for each member in the farmer group	175	99	Very Dynamic
	2.2 Members are involved in farmer group decision making	166	94	Dynamic
3.	2.3 The communication process is important in conveying farmer group information	174	99	Very Dynamic
	2.4 Important rules used in farmer groups	167	95	Dynamic
	Functions of the Farmer's Group			
4.	3.1 Groups function in providing information on farmer group activities	165	94	Dynamic
	3.2 Groups function in solving problems experienced by members of farmer groups	168	95	Dynamic
	3.3 Groups function in growing the motivation of their members	164	93	Dynamic
	3.4 The function of the group is to invite its members to participate	171	97	Very Dynamic
5.	Farmer Group Development and Development			
	4.1 Farmer groups strive to provide complete facilities to support farmer group activities	166	94	Dynamic
	4.2 Socialization process helps farmer groups	176	100	Very Dynamic
6.	Farmer Group Cohesiveness			
	5.1 The realization of unity and integrity in farmer groups	164	93	Dynamic
	5.2 The realization of cooperation in farmer groups	168	95	Dynamic
7.	5.3 The realization of harmony in farmer groups	166	94	Dynamic
	Farmer Group Atmosphere			
	6.1 Good relations between members of farmer groups	136	77	Less Dynamic
	6.2 Creating a comfortable environment in which farmer group activities are carried out	151	86	Dynamic
8.	6.3 Smoothness in every decision making	128	73	Less Dynamic
	Pressure in the Farmer's Group			
	7.1 There is no bad impact due to conflict and competition within farmer groups	161	91	Dynamic
	7.2 No impact of competition within farmer groups	175	99	Very Dynamic
9.	7.3 Challenges and opportunities that exist around the group towards efforts to achieve farmer group goals	137	78	Dynamic
	7.4 The impact of applying sanctions in groups on efforts to spur the achievement of group goals	166	94	Dynamic
10.	Farmer Group Effectiveness			
	8.1 Farmer group members can communicate ideas	142	81	Dynamic
	8.2 Skills and abilities affect leadership	173	98	Very Dynamic

	8.3 Members wish to continue to join farmer groups	162	92	Dynamic
	8.4 Support members in every farmer group activity	145	82	Dynamic
	8.5 Trust in farmer group members	146	83	Dynamic
	8.6 Availability of group objectives, monitoring, and evaluation	163	93	Dynamic
	8.7 Achievement of the goals of farmer group members	141	80	Dynamic
9.	Hidden/Understood Intentions in Farmer Groups			
	9.1 There is no ulterior motive in farmer groups	169	96	Very Dynamic
	9.2 There is no ulterior motive in the leadership of the chairman	163	93	Dynamic
	9.3 No ulterior motives for members	161	91	Dynamic
	TOTAL	5.311	91	Very Dynamic

Source: Primary Data After Processing 2022

Based on Table 2, the group dynamics elements were assessed in the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa." Obtaining the calculation of the dynamics of the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa" obtained eight indicators of the highest value, which includes indicators of farmer group activities in accordance with the objectives to be achieved, an even distribution of tasks for each member in the farmer group, important communication processes in conveying information on farmer groups, groups functions to invite members to participate, the socialization process helps in farmer groups, there is no impact of competition with other groups, expertise and abilities affect leadership, and there is no hidden intention in farmer groups. These eight indicators show the maximum value, so it is very dynamic because the data obtained by respondents in the field gives a weight of 5 for each measurement indicator, so that each indicator gets the maximum value. So the percentage of value acquisition is 91% of the acquisition value of 5,311, then the rice farmer group "Masa ke Masa" is categorized as a very dynamic farmer group.

C. Constraints Faced by Rice Farmer Groups "Masa ke Masa."

Based on the study results, the obstacle faced by members in a group atmosphere was that the relationship between members in the less fortunate group was closely intertwined because several members of the farmer group were often absent when the group carried out several activities. Still, when the farmer group managed to get seed assistance, subsidies for fertilizers, and agricultural machinery from the government or the like, all group members demanded that they be equal to the other members who are always present in every group activity and receive the distribution of the aid. This condition is felt by 50% of respondents.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion of the "Masa ke Masa" Rice Farmer Group Dynamics in Masintan Village, Kelua District, Tabalong Regency, by measuring all the elements of group dynamics, which amounted to 9 in the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group, the results obtained a score of 5,311 with a percentage of 91% means that the dynamics of

the rice farmer group "from time to time" are categorized as very dynamic because they are in the measurement interval of 4,487-5,543. The dynamics of this farmer group are shown from the eight indicators that get the highest score, which include indicators of farmer group activities in accordance with the objectives to be achieved, an even distribution of tasks for each member of the farmer group, the communication process is important in delivering information on farmer groups, the group functions to invite members to participate, the socialization process helps in farmer groups, there is no impact of competition with other groups, skills and abilities affect leadership, and there are no hidden intentions in farmer groups. In addition to these problems, some members do not want to pay dues such as cash which is an important part of meeting financial needs to smooth the movement of the management of the "Masa ke Masa" rice farmer group.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. A. Amalia, Analysis of the Relationship between Group Dynamics and the Effectiveness of Tranggula Farmers Groups in Batur Village, Getasan District, Semarang Regency, *AGRISAINTEFIKA J. Agricultural Sciences.*, 2(2) (2019) 94, 2019, doi: 10.32585/ags.v2i2.258.
- [2] D. E. manggala Rimbawati, A. Fatchiya, and B. G. Sugihen, Dynamics of Agroforestry Farmers' Groups in Bandung Regency, *J. Pengul.*, 14(1) (2018) doi: 10.25015/pengulahan.v14i1.17223.
- [3] C. Kojansow, J. Baroleh, and M. M. Sendow, Dynamics of the Sarongsong Youth Farmer Group in Tumatangtang Satu Village, South Tomohon District, Tomohon City, 12(7) (2016)1–23.
- [4] I. P. Damanik, Factors Affecting Group Dynamics and its Relationship to the Ability Class of Farmer Groups in Pulokencana Village, Serang Regency, *J. Pengul.*, 9(1) (2015). doi: 10.25015/Penulahan.v9i1.9856.
- [5] E. Kelbulan, J. S. Tambas, and O. Parajouw, Dynamics of Kalelon Farmer Group in Kauneran Village, Sonder District, *Agri-Socioeconomics*, 14(3) (2018) 55. doi: 10.35791/agrsosek.14.3.2018.21534.
- [6] P. Khoiroh, Factors Affecting Group Dynamics Tani Padi Sawah (*Oryza sativa L.*) in Karang Anyar Village, Beringin District, Deli Serdang Regency, *J. Pembang. Will. City*, 1(3) (2021) 82–91.
- [7] Q. However, the Dynamics of Farmer Groups Target of Special Efforts to Increase Rice Production in Rice Production Center Areas in Monokwari Regency (Case Study of Prafi Mulya Village, Prafi District), *J. Trit.*, 53(9) (2016) 1689–1699.

- [8] A. Miftahuddin, D. Nikmatullah, and K. K. Rangga, The Relation of Participation Level of Farmer Group Members with Farmer Group Dynamics and Increased Rice Production in Cintamulya Village, Candipuro District, South Lampung Regency, *J. Agribusiness Sciences*, 7(2) (2019) 219. doi:10.23960/jiia.v7i2.219-224.
- [9] T. Rachman, Farmers Group Dynamics in Netpala Village, North Mollo District, South Central Timor Regency, *Angew. Chemie Int. Ed.* 6(11) (2018) 951–952., 2 (2018) 10–27 .
- [10] J. Poluan, V. V. Rantung, and C. R. Ngangi, Dynamics of Maesaan Waya Farmer Group in Manembo Village, South Langowan District, *Agri-Socioeconomics*, 13(1a) (2017) 217. doi: 10.35791/agrsosek.13.1a.2017.15637.
- [11] Yusran, Farmer Group Dynamics and Its Relationship with Production and Income of Rice Farmers in Maradekaya Village, Bajeng District, Gowa Regency, (2021) 37.
- [12] F. Ambreen, M. K. Bashir, M. Ashfaq, G. Ali, S. Hassan, and M. Shabir, The Use of Wastewater for Irrigation Purposes: Perceptions and Willingness to Pay for Treated Wastewater, *Int. J. Agric. Environ. Sci.*, 7(4) (2020) 9–22. doi: 10.14445/23942568/ijaes-v7i4p102.
- [13] A. J. Junaedi, O. Anwarudin, and M. Makhmudi, The Dynamics of Farmer Groups Against Young Generation Interest in Rice Farming Activities (*Oryza sativa*. L) in Gantar Subdistrict, Indramayu Regency, *J. Inov. Researcher.*, 1(3) (2020) 599–597.
- [14] M. Falo, Study of the Dynamics of Farmers' Groups for Beef Cattle Business at Nekmese Farmers' Groups, Manusasi Village, West Miomaffo District, *Agrimor*, 1(1) (2016) 15–18. doi: 10.32938/ag.v1i01.27.
- [15] J. T. Ibrahim, *Rural Sociology*. Malang: UMM Press: University of Muhammadiyah Malang, 2015.
- [16] H. G. Pandiangan, E. Murdiyanto, and N. D. Senjawati, Dynamics of the Bendo Mulyo farmer group in Tendas village, Tayu sub-district, Pati district, *Semin. Nas. Inov. Local Food to Support Food Security*, no. April, (2019) 68–73.
- [17] R. S. Anantanyu and A. Wijianto, Determinant Analysis of Farmer Group Dynamics in Mojolaban District, Sukoharjo Regency, *Agrista*, 5(1) (2017) 89–100. [On line]. Available: <http://ejurnal.litbang.pertanian.go.id/index.php/fae/article/download/3896/3238>.
- [18] H. Rosyidi, J. T. Ibrahim, S. Sutawi, O. Anne, and D. Rachmawati, Relationship of group dynamics and fishermen independence in fisheries agribusiness attaining maximum sustainable yield, *E3S Web Conf.*, 226 (2021). doi:10.1051/e3sconf/202122600019.
- [19] H. Heryanto and D. Sukmawati, Influence of Socio-Economic Factors and Internal Dynamics of Farmer Groups on the Success of Rice Farming (*Oryza sativa* L.) Ciherang Cultivars, *Orchid Agri*, 1(2) (2021) 9–15.
- [20] M. Murdayanti, J. T. Ibrahim, and I. Baro, Farmer Empowerment Strategies Through Organic Vegetables Development, *SOCA J. Sos. icon. Pertan.*, 15(1) (2021) 113–126.
- [21] Prasasti.S and Usmani.H, Group Dynamics to Increase Organic Farming Productivity at, *Ilm. Counseling*, 19(2) (2020) 1–19.
- [22] A. M. Yoppi, R. Yaulida, and Kausar, Dynamics of Rubber Farmer Groups in Singingi District, Kuantan Singingi Regency, *Jom Faperta*, 3(2) (2016) 15–28.
- [23] R. Daniel, F. Maad, and D. B. Wibaningwati, Dynamics of Rice Farmer Group (*Oryza sativa* L.) in Rumpin District, Bogor Regency, *Agrisintech (Journal Agribus. Agrotechnology)*, 2(1) (2021)09. doi:10.31938/agrisintech.v2i1.311.
- [24] N. Makawekas, L. R. . Pangemanan, and M. Y. Memah, Dynamics of Cempaka Farmer Groups in Meras Village, Bunaken District, Manado City, *Cocos*, 7(3) (2016) 1–14.
- [25] J. T. Ibrahim, *Agricultural Socio-Economic Research Methods*. Malang: University of Muhammadiyah Malang, (1999).