

Artikel 7

by Maya Panorama

Submission date: 18-Jul-2019 09:57PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1152936745

File name: 7._Barriers_on_Rural_Developmentnew.pdf (980.46K)

Word count: 5570

Character count: 29140

**Barriers on Rural Development in Musi Banyuasin (MUBA) District,
South Sumatera, Indonesia**

Maya Panorama, Ph.D
Faculty of Islamic Economic and Bussiness
State Islamic University of Raden Fatah, Palembang, Indonesia
(maya.izuddin@yahoo.com)

Abstract

The main aims of the research are to: 1) explore the comprehensive about the barriers on rural development with SWOT analysis; 2) explore the disparities of rural development in district MUBA, and; 3) determine the barrier factors for rural development in district MUBA.

The research used qualitative approach by using in-depth interview with civil servants. The researcher also used field observation and conduct some data from Central Bureau of Statistics.

The research result revealed some factors that can pushed rural development or become barriers to rural development. The research found 5 factors that caused disparities in rural development which are aspects of geography, demographic aspects, economic aspects, social aspects, environmental aspects. The finding showed that the main barriers on rural development is lack of professional staff-inexperienced/ too busy with other projects, lack of local leadership, frustration with local project implementation and lack of data. Meanwhile funding and natural resources are not a matter in period 2013.

Keywords: Barriers, Disparities, Rural Development

Introduction

In Indonesia, rural development is very important because of most of the population live in the rural areas. In addition, the number and the broad of rural area bigger than urban areas. The number of rural in Indonesia, more huge than the number of urban area. The number of rural in Indonesia from 2004 to 2013 can be seen in Table 1 below:

Table 1. Growth on number of rural in Indonesia period of 2004-2013

Year	Number of rural
2004	69858
2005	71535

2006	71563
2007	73408
2008	75408
2009	75666
2010	76983
2011	77548
2012	78558
2013	79702

Sources: bps.go.id, Laporan BPS Provinsi Kabupaten/Kota

In Table 1 shows the increase of the number of rural in Indonesia each year. The increasing of number of rural is significant every year. Attention to the increase in the number of rural, the government should give more attention in rural development

There are many factors that should be noted and taken into consideration in conducting the rural development. Rural characteristics are very important to understand, especially from the aspect of rural sociology. The purpose of rural development should be firm and supported with the seriousness of the Act and Regulations in favor of rural development.

The inequality of development between rural and urban areas, the problem of poverty, social problems such as low education level, low resource utilization rural and various other problems are some challenges in the rural development. It has been a lot of research on the disparity of development between rural comparing the urban or about the lowlands and highlands (Vandermoortele and Bird, 2010, p.222)

The Act No. 5 of 1979 on Rural Government which then shifted by the latest government Act No. 6 of 2014 about rural government are increasingly provide great opportunities increasingly providing great opportunities that enlighten for rural development. The Programs that poured funds 1 Rural 1 billion already give more hope to the rural community. This program seems influence their motivation to maximize rural-based programs.

Government of Musi Banyu Asin (MUBA) itself, has implemented a program 1 village 1 billion since 2013, the District Government's attention towards the rural in MUBA are big enough because in MUBA the number of rural are too much. MUBA itself has 14 sub-district, 13 village and 223 Village. Of the 223 is not his entire village including the village into a rich and modern. Though in general, an oil producer MUBA has great contribution to South Sumatra. MUBA villagers also generally not a

characteristic of the village are farmers and villagers that led to the industry of agriculture.

This research will explore the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and constraints which are owned by the rural in the MUBA as general. This also explore the potential of rural in sub-districts Bayung Lincir and sub-district Keluang as well as providing information from the practitioner of the rural development about the barriers that occurs in the process of development.

Literature Review

According to Sadjad (2011; 48-49) in "Menuju Desa 2030", there are four new paradigm in the development of the rural by the openness system. Four paradigms are: first, farming is an industrial process; second, agriculture and rural are equivalent; third, transformed into an agricultural and industrial base; and fourth, industrial rural is a system.

According to Comte in Sugihen (1996: 12), to understand the community we need to know the source of their integrity, stability and sustainability of the community, in addition to the sources of change in the community. Comte saw that social changes is the social dynamics, while the integrity and continuity of the existence of the society is a structure social.

While Spencer in Sugihen (1996; 13) suggested that the new community can be understood if it is related to the environment. Community always tries to adapt itself to the surrounding environment. Understanding a society need to focus on the process of growth and social change. When the environment changes, the public will change too.

Typology and classification of the level of the rural development consists of 4 parts: (Asyari, SI, 1993, p.112) mentioned:1) potential base; 2) type of rural; 3) indicator level for rural development; 4) factors encourage the rural development; 5) Inequality (disparity) in Economic Development (growth)

Michael R.Dove in THG Mering Ngo (1990, p.14). mentioned that there are three myths that developed and framed the thinking of people over the years, which causes cultivators accused as forest destroyer. The myths are: first, cultivators have communal land and communally consume its crops anyway. Second, cultivation is always destructive and wasteful economic value of forests. Third, their economic system are subsistence, which is entirely separated from the market economy. This view is not fair because, first, cultivators work communally only to lighten the workload and does not consume the crops communally because each family has its own

farmlands and the crops is a family's own. Second, cultivators hunting for a land or open forest with depth consideration and has its own ways of calculation, and third, cultivators also seeking for cash crops such as pepper, rubber, coffee and fruits but because of lack of transportation, the production can not be marketed. There is a difference between farming as a lifestyle (a way of life) and farming as a means of livelihood or a (a way of making a living) (Asyari, SI, 1993, p.105)

The progress that can be achieved by industrialization can not be followed by the progress of agriculture sector, especially in the inland areas. The agricultural sector is not growing as expected because: 1) the difficulty of marketing of agricultural production; 2). lack of agricultural extension and socialization of new technologies; 3) the difficulty of getting a job that generates wages; 4) the desire to migrate to the areas that became the center of economic growth and trade. As a result, the urban population increased but the rural decrease because of the narrowing of the field and the limited employment opportunities and human resource capabilities.

The push to encourage rural economy is to build a means of transportation, although this is less favorable when assessed economically and can increase the migration flows. However the construction of this transport will allow the flow of goods and labor become more fluent and production of inland area has economic value. To prevent inland migration flows to the center of growth by providing additional facilities such as field briefing and the introduction of technology.

Act No. 5 of 1979 on Rural Government has indirectly abolish "traditional governance" and indigenous/ traditional communities that have integrated community outside Java in the blood bond (clan), origin (ethnicity) or territorial. Judging from the process of democratization, of Act No. 2/1999 on Regional Autonomy amended by Act No 32/2004 gives the opportunity of growth of local democracy (Antlov H., 2001: p 26-41)

The rural government would also need to be adapted to the demands of democratization after 1998 reform. Compared with the Dutch Rural Autonomy (Regerings Reglement, 1895) is more democratic with the Act No. 5/1979 on Rural Government which is too similar for 50,000 rural (Taliziduhu Ndraha, 1981)

Refers to the approach of Gunnar Myrdal, that the institutional economic approach, in which the institution (institution) is not considered to be fixed (given), but it must be targeted if we consider the role of research is not neutral. Where for the role of institutions, especially institutions within the state in setting and directives regulations are very important for rural development programs

Presidential Regulation No. 10/2006 was welcomed by farmers, NGOs and BPN were investigated Agrarian Reform. For other laws arising inhibit reform Agrarian Act No. 7/2004 on Water Resources; House approval on Investment Bill 2007, which replaced the Act No 1/1967. This rule has been detrimental to the community which is granting flexibility is too huge to the corporate and with weak of law enforcement and corruption in bureaucracy

Concerns of the Investment Law is paragraph 6, which gives the same treatment to all investors from any country, even if there is a special agreement with Indonesia's government will earn the privilege. This makes large investors will come because still have wide land and low cost labor.

The concept of rural development is expected to based on sustainable livelihood (Daryanto and Nuryartono, 2011, p63). Rural community resilience (resilience) to the development and transformation which occurred in the rural is very important so that the development does not give a negative element.

Disparity (gap) can be a gap in per capita income, quality of human resources, availability of facilities and infrastructure such as transportation, energy, and telecommunications, social services such as health, education and so on, access to banking. This gap is caused by inter-regional trade distortion, the distortion of natural resource management and urban-rural system distortion. (Daryanto and Nuryartono, 2011, p70-71)

Actually, the concern of rural development should focus on geographic location rather than targeting the poor (Long, 2013, p 325), this is very important to used income regions for determinant factor of rural economic development and strategy.

Finally Long (2013, p 333-334) concluded that factors affected regional disparities are household characteristic and resources. For rural economic development policy should focus on: 1) improving the education level is important, prioritizing vocational training; 2) increasing the production of the cash crops, fishery; 3) improving the infrastructure facilities and lastly; 4) strengthen economic empowerments for poorer regions by creating linkage between rural and urban.

Ploeg et al (2000, p 392) mention that rural development is a multi level process rooted in historical traditions at all levels, it has emerged as a series of responses to the earlier paradigm of modernization. The level are first, global inter relations between agriculture and society; second, a new developmental model for the agricultural sector, third, rural development can be operationally at the level of individual farm household, four, should be define at he level of the country side and its actors, five, policies and institution and six, multi faceted in nature.

Leaman et al (1992, 29-30) suggest 12 steps action plan for successful on rural development which are: recognize the problem, assess the strength and weakness, create a plan, identify infrastructure deficiencies, look for funding, establish a development commission, make a long-term commitment, collect data that business need, organize volunteers for business support, identify sources of business assistance, include existing business and attract outside companies.

Meanwhile, China (Chen, 2010, p 233-234) have framework on their rural policy that have great changes and increasing in the some aspect which are, first, the financial and economic relationship between the government and rural areas have been straightened out; second, China's government already impose agricultural tax; third, government focus on infrastructure construction and social development already shift towards rural area; then infrastructure focus on rural roads, rural electricity utilities, rural drinking water utilities and construction of biogas supply. Furthermore, from the perspective of social development government focus on culture development, education, health and social security. Finally the fourth framework more attention to concept farmer-turner-workers rights

Meanwhile, China (Chen, 2010, p 233-234) have on Reviews their rural policy framework that have great changes and increasing in the some aspect roommates are, first, the financial and economic relationship between the government and rural areas have been straightened out; Second, the Chinese government has imposed a tax agricultural; third, government focus on infrastructure development and social construction already shift towards rural areas; infrastructure then focus on rural roads, rural electricity utilities, rural drinking water utilities and construction of biogas supply. Furthermore, from the perspective of social development government focus on development of culture, education, health and social security. Finally the fourth framework concept more attention to farmer-turner-workers rights

Methodology

This research uses qualitative methods to reveal some of the problems in the mentioned. This research refers to the method used by Ristic (2013; 236) is a SWOT analysis to identify strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges posed by the rural in the district in general MUBA.

Afterwards, to find out the potential of the two rural to be sampled districts, each of which represents a poor district (Sub District Keluang with 14 rural) and wealthy districts (Sub District Sungai Lilin 15 rural). Rural potential found by calculating the aspect in rural indicator scores consisting of Geography Aspects (5 indicators), Population Aspect (5 indicators), Economic aspects (3 indicators), facilities (8 indicators) as well as

Environment (2 indicators) that refer to the Research Report from P3EM and Banyuasin Government in 2004 (p. 10-15). Each indicator was given a score then calculated it. Highest score is the the highest ranking and opposite. The highest score is a rural that has great potential reverse lowest score is a small rural that has potential.

To see the factors that are impediments to rural development conducted interviews with a sample of the rural headman. Variable interview using a combination of variables used by Winter (1996, p. 73) the lack of project funding, Lack of organization not Able to get organized or access resources, lack of professional staff-inexperienced / too busy with other projects, incentive Unable city , insufficient market, local attitudes against growth, general economic condition, lack of local leadership, frustration with local project implementation. Another variable is from Long and Yabe (2013, p. 330) ie ability to access infrastructure and geographic location and lack of data.

Results and Discussion

Rural in MUBA can be classified into four, first: far from the city and have abundant resources; second: far from the city and no /lack of resources; third: close to town and has abundant resources; Fourth: close to town and do not have the resources.

SWOT Analysis

Matriks 1. SWOT Analysis for rural development in MUBA District

<p>Strengths (Internal)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Large land 2. Natural resources in plantation sector 3. Abundant oil resources 4. High regional income to funding rural development 5. Near to the capital city 6. Vision and Mission support the development of rural development 7. High motivation people 	<p>Weaknesses (Internal)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Infrastructure is very less 2. The high rate of migration 3. High population 4. high birth rate 5. Inequality between rural 6. Use of Infrastructure not in maximum 7. Unemployment is high enough 8. Some of the programs have not been well planned 9. The availability of data to support the development process is less 10. limited research on rural subject
<p>Opportunities (Externals)</p>	<p>Threats (Eksternal)</p>

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Huge of investment in the country and abroad 2. Various small industries, folk, craft and entrepreneurs 3. have a sports center in the district 4. Motivation of Ethic 5. Good commitment from government 6. Agritourism 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Competition from neighborhood and international market 2. Low trading 3. Shift on agricultural to industrial 4. Inefficient use and produce to natural resources oil 5. Insufficient funding 6. Transformation of plantation from big company to the grass root
--	---

The diversity in rural development has been recognized long time ago and has become a major challenge. But recently have not been able to answer whether the various rural development strategies were appropriate. Strength in rural development in MUBA is the contribution from the vision and mission of the local government in line with the interests of the rural development. This is in accordance with Christian and Richard (1992, p 35) who concluded that affective rural development policies must supported in integrated system by public and private sectors locally and national. The role of central government is very important and strategic to ensure effective coordination between the actors.

4 Faktor-faktor Strategis Internal				
STRENGTH		Bobot	Rating	Skor
1	Large land	0.045	2	0.09
2	Natural resources in plantation sector	0.025	1	0.025
3	Abundant oil resources	0.075	4	0.3
4	High regional income to funding rural development	0.08	4	0.32
5	Near to the capital city	0.065	3	0.195
6	Vision and Mission support the development of rural development	0.075	4	0.3
7	High motivation people	0.065	3	0.195
Sub Total		0.43	21	1.425

4 Faktor-faktor Strategis Internal				
WEAKNESS		Bobot	Rating	Skor

1	Infrastructure is very less	0.045	2	0.09
2	The high rate of migration	0.075	4	0.3
3	High population	0.075	4	0.3
4	High birth rate	0.085	4	0.34
5	Inequality between rural	0.065	3	0.195
6	Use of Infrastructure not in maximum	0.045	2	0.09
7	Unemployment is high enough	0.035	1	0.035
8	Some of the programs have not been well planned	0.065	3	0.195
9	The availability of data to support the development process is less	0.045	2	0.09
10	limited research on rural subject	0.035	1	0.035
Sub Total		0.57	26	1.67
TOTAL		1	47	3.095

4

Faktor-faktor Strategis Eksternal

OPPORTUNITY		Bobot	Rating	Skor
1	Huge of investment in the country and abroad	0.095	4	0.38
2	Various small industries, folk, craft and entrepreneurs	0.095	4	0.38
3	Have a sports center in the district	0.085	3	0.255
4	Motivation of Ethic	0.085	3	0.255
5	Good commitment from government	0.07	2	0.14
6	Agritourism	0.08	3	0.24
Sub Total		0.51	19	1.65

4

Faktor-faktor Strategis Eksternal

THREATS		Bobot	Rating	Skor
1	Competition from neighborhood and international market	0.085	4	0.34
2	Low trading	0.095	4	0.38
3	Shift on agricultural to industrial	0.085	4	0.34
4	Inefficient use and produce to natural	0.075	3	0.225

	resources oil			
5	Insufficient funding	0.085	4	0.34
6	Transformation of plantation from big company to the grass root	0.065	2	0.13
	Sub Total	0.49	21	1.755
	TOTAL	1	40	3.405

Mexico with the State Rural Development Council moving from a largely peace-meal approach to a collaborative process. Gyulai (1996, p 75) mentioned that while the council has not single handedly reinvented government, created a fully integrated and operational 'collaborative partnership' obviated impediments to rural development or ignited a rural renaissance it has been a positive influence, it has been a positive influence on rural development in New Mexico.

Migration of Population that occurred in MUBA is not a immigration but mostly emigration/ urbanization. It is also become a weakness of MUBA. Ramsey and Schaumieffel (2006, p 8) in the study about rural in Indiana, state that "for those countries that have no convention and visitors, Bureaus and local leaders should look to municipal and county park boards to develop local tourism" and "it is plausible that if more jobs are created in rural communities then more families will remain in rural Indiana "

Chen (2009, p 133-134) mentioned about three issues of barriers on china's rural development ie. first, farmer's income growth; second, changes owing to industrialization and urbanization and third, factors of production are running down in rural area. More from Chen (2009, p237-238) new issues of problem in china's rural development ie first, insufficient funds lead to poor performance public services and social management, second, inefficiencies of agricultural subsidies, third, strengthen infrastructure and public services construction and fourth, policies of rural migrant workers This condition is similar to experienced in the rural MUBA which is a semi rural industrialization. For rural development in MUBA, which mostly happens is inefficiency in the various programs.

Planning a rural development is very important. Chambers (1996, p 22) stated that rural development planning are shelved because rural leaders view that to be the best place for them. He also listed some flexible conditions for rural planning which are situational, highly emotional relying on primary data, cyclical short and long term, substances wins over presentation, not focus to meet bureaucratic needs, bottom up, in the non-technical language of residents, educational it teaches while it guides,

duration is one to three months, democratic, one to two pages in length its pocket document and seen as a tool of the local citizen, not the grant writer.

Rural's Potency in MUBA

Rural's potency can be found through the secondary data published by the Center for Bureau of Statistics MUBA District. The availability of data are very limited so not all of the indicators in every aspect scoring can be done. To see the rank of rural development success through its potential, in a look at some aspects which is:

Aspects of Geography (4 indicators) covers an area of the rural, the number of hamlets, rural distance to the district capital and the amount of household, Environmental Aspects (2 indicators) including sources of drinking water (water company, wells, rivers), electricity company.

Aspects of Rural Facilities (8 indicators) covers schools (kindergarten, elementary, middle and high school), health workers (doctors and nurses), health facilities (health centers, sub-clinics, pharmacies, midwife, physician practices, poskesdes, posyandu). Places of worship (mosques and churches), sports facilities (football, volleyball and badminton). Society organizations (recitation, devotional, grip, NGO). Types of roads (asphalt, concrete), communication (kiosks, cafes and post helpers).

Economic aspect (3 indicator) includes land (paddy fields, plantations and non-farm), business units (wood industry, industrial matting, food and beverage industry, restaurants, grocery shops, food stalls, lodging and workshop. Well as the market (market Instruction, and the non-market)

Aspects of Population (3 indicators) covers the total population, birth rate and death rate. Economic Aspects (3 indicators) include land type, type and kind Markets.

Characteristics of the 29 rural in the Sub District Sungai Lilin and keluang are not paddy plantation rural. Plantation area reaches 5 times the size of the existing rice fields.

Table 2 shows the performance score of rural with selected sample. From the total score obtained by each aspect appears that the inequality between rural is very high. For example, for the aspects of geography that achieved the highest score was 63 and the lowest score only 23. Environmental Aspects 5 highest and lowest scores 2 high inequality occurs also in the facility where the figure is 55 while the highest score of the lowest achieving only 6 with the economic aspect 3 turned out to be a very high indicator limp where the highest score was 81 and the lowest score was 8 and demographic aspects of 54 the highest score and the lowest score of 15

was also demonstrated in the aspects of the rural's population experiencing inequality.

Table 2. Score Variable For Each Rural

Sub District	Rural	Geographic	Environment	Facility Score	Economic	Population	TOTAL SCORE
Sungai Lilin	Sungai Lilin	65	5	55	81	54	260
	Sumber Rezeki	43	4	32	50	46	175
	Sukadamai Baru	39	4	28	46	25	142
	Cinta Damai	33	3	22	27	47	132
	Berlian Makmur	39	3	30	40	40	152
	Sri Gunung	55	4	47	57	39	202
	Bumi Kencana	47	3	34	51	47	182
	Panca Tunggal	32	3	35	40	21	131
	Mulyo Rejo	41	4	21	45	36	147
	Linggo Sari	28	4	23	23	16	94
	Nusa Serasan	48	4	28	46	24	150
	Pinang Banjar	56	5	31	48	29	169
	Mekar Jadi	36	4	18	47	15	120
	Bukit Jaya	29	3	18	39	28	117
	Sungai Lilin Jaya	43	5	31	51	38	168
Keluang	Tenggaro	38	3	15	52	22	130
	Keluang	57	5	33	64	47	206
	Sumber Agung	42	3	26	38	24	133
	Karya Maju	40	5	47	72	44	208
	Tegal Mulya	32	3	21	24	39	119
	Mekar Jaya	38	4	32	41	31	146
	Loka Jaya	29	2	23	27	22	103
	Dawas	39	3	22	64	43	171
	Tanjung Dalam	30	2	13	56	22	123
	Cipta Praja	27	4	25	37	28	121
	Mekar Sari	31	3	15	11	23	83
	Mulyo Asih	31	3	24	23	41	122
	Sido Rejo	28	5	24	31	24	112
	Sridamai	23	3	9	8	25	68
	Maximum Value		65	5	55	81	54
Minimum Value		23	2	9	8	15	68

Sumber: Biro Pusat Statistik, 2013, data di olah

Table 3 shows the ranking of the success of rural development in terms of several aspects of development. The total score indicates a very high development gaps where the highest score is 260 while the lowest score of the two rural only 68 samples (river candles and foxes) it appears that rural development is more memorable than the Sungai Lilin sub district sub district keluang.

Table 3. Ranking Of Rural's Potentials

Sub District	Rural	TOTAL score	RANK for all sample	RANK for each sub district
Sungai Lilin	Sungai Lilin	260	1	1
	Sumber Rezeki	175	6	4
	Sukadamai Baru	142	14	10
	Cinta Damai	132	16	11
	Berlian Makmur	152	10	7
	Sri Gunung	202	4	2
	Bumi Kencana	182	5	3
	Panca Tunggal	131	17	12
	Mulyo Rejo	147	13	9
	Linggo Sari	94	26	15
	Nusa Serasan	150	11	8
	Pinang Banjar	169	8	5
	Mekar Jadi	120	21	13
	Bukit Jaya	117	23	14
	Sungai Lilin Jaya	168	9	6
Keluang	Tenggaro	130	18	6
	Keluang	206	3	2
	Sumber Agung	133	15	5
	Karya Maju	208	2	1
	Tegal Mulya	119	22	10
	Mekar Jaya	146	12	4
	Loka Jaya	103	25	12
	Dawas	171	7	3
	Tanjung Dalam	123	19	7
Cipta Praja	121	21	9	

	Mekar Sari	83	27	13
	Mulyo Asih	122	20	8
	Sido Rejo	112	24	11
	Sridamai	68	28	14

Sources Center bureau of statistic, 2013,

First Rank in the successful development of the rural is sungai lilin sub districts. Among the aspects that measured, Sungai Lilin excels on economic aspects and geography. In the economic aspect, Sungai Lilin has had a vast wetland, grocery stalls, food stalls beside the inn even the independence of the people already see from the many self-help market.

While the last rank is Sri Damai is located in Keluang. Sri Damai not far from the capital of the district when compared with the rural of Bukit Jaya where the success of its development is quite good. This indicates that in both districts sampled distance factor to the capital not be a constraint. However, Sri Damai rural is smallest among 29 other rural.

Barriers in rural development

Interviews were conducted with rural heads in the sample rural. This is done considering the participation of rural development through the bottom up, so that is the direct agents of development to the rural. Development constraints experienced by a sample of 29 rural in the perspective of the rural headman, can be seen in Table 4 below:

Table 4. Barriers on rural development in MUBA

Aspect	Frequency
lack of project funding,	14
Lack of organization not able to get organized or access resources	20
lack of professional staff-inexperienced/ too busy with other projects	29
incentive city unable	10
insufficient market	23
local attitudes against growth	21
general economic condition,	13
lack of local leadership,	26
frustration with local project implementation.	25
ability to access infrastructure	10

geographic location	10
Lack Of Data	25

Source: interview, 2014

The main obstacle to the development of rural development is lack of professional staff-inexperienced / too busy with other projects. Unlike rural issues in general, in the rural area of let it go and keluang do not mention the lack of project funding as a major factor of rural development. This is because in the District MUBA since the year 2013 has been in scroll 1 billion fund to 1 rural.

Conclusion and Policy Implication

Characteristics of rural in MUBA district is that they are the rural plantations, which supported by industry environment. Plantation industries and oil to make life in the rural district MUBA not like the whole rural-based agricultural fields.

It was a surprise that the funding is not a major obstacle in the development of the rural in the River District urban rural MUBA Candles and foxes. The main obstacle is the non-development of human resources and data in support of rural development programs.

It is important for policy makers to implement the rural development process correctly. Provide ease of access to economic potential, providing human resources that support the potential of rural and districts, strengthen the supporting data so as to make the rural planning quickly and accurately.

References

Alinno, F. C., Sule, J. G., & Ikwegbe, D. (2012). Rural economic development: policy implementation in nigeria. *Kuwait Chapter of the Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 2(2), 14-26. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/1266941890?accountid=42599>

Asyari, S. I. (1993). *Sosiologi Kota dan Desa. Penerbit Usaha Nasional–Surabaya, Indonesia.*

Blair, R., Deichert, J., & Drozd, D. J. (2008). state rural development policy: the role of the community development block grant program. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management*, 20(1), 108-132. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/205054347?accountid=42599>

Brown, C. G., Waldron, S. A., & Longworth, J. W. (2005). Rural development in china: Industry policy, regionalism, integration and scale. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 32(1), 17-33. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/274653524?accountid=42599>

Chambers, R. E. (1996). Rural development planning: A time for change. *Economic Development Review*, 14(2), 21. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/230087788?accountid=42599>

Chen, X. (2009). Review of china's agricultural and rural development: Policy changes and current issues. *China Agricultural Economic Review*, 1(2), 121-135. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17561370910927390>

Chen, X. (2009). Review of china's agricultural and rural development: Policy changes and current issues. *China Agricultural Economic Review*, 1(2), 121-135. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17561370910927390>

Chen, X. (2010). Issues of china's rural development and policies. *China Agricultural Economic Review*, 2(3), 233-239. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17561371011078390>

Curry, N., & Owen, S. (2009). Rural planning in england: A critique of current policy. *The Town Planning Review*, 80(6), 575-595. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/232850514?accountid=42599>

Hanagriff, R., Beverly, M., & Lau, M. (2009). Can a state funded rural economic development program positively impact the state's economy? A case study application using 2007 texas department of agriculture's rural tourism economic development program. *The Business Review, Cambridge, 12(2)*, 72-77. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/197295828?accountid=42599>

Howell Chisolm, R. (2006). *Rural leadership: A case study of the factors that influence economic development in two rural communities in south carolina*. (Order No. 3204916, Capella University). *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 122-122 p. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/304909332?accountid=42599>. (304909332).

Huillet, C., & Long, R. (1992). Policy issues in rural development. *Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development.the OECD Observer*, (178), 32. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/217464954?accountid=42599>

Leaman, S. H., Cook, T. J., & Stewart, L. S. (1992). Rural economic development: Learning from success. *Economic Development Review, 10(4)*, 27. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/230106783?accountid=42599>

P3EM dan Pemerintah Kabupaten Banyuasin, (2004), *Survei Pemetaan Bantuan Desa Kabupaten Banyuasin*, Banyuasin, Sumatera Selatan

Ramsey, M., & Schaumleffel, N. A. (2006). Agritourism and rural economic development. *Indiana Business Review, 81(3)*, 6-9. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/230313817?accountid=42599>

Rangarajan, K., Ziemer, N., & Long, S., PhD. (2009). Public private partnerships and rural economic development. *IIE Annual Conference.Proceedings*, 296-301. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/192459810?accountid=42599>

Ristic, L. (2013). Strategic management of sustainable rural development in the republic of serbia. *Ekonomski Horizonti, 15(3)*, 233-248. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/1504534525?accountid=42599>

Sugihen, B. T. (1996). *Sosiologi pedesaan: suatu pengantar*. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Van der Ploeg, J. D., Renting, H., Brunori, G., Knickel, K., Mannion, J., Marsden, T., ... & Ventura, F. (2000). Rural development: from practices and policies towards theory. *Sociologia ruralis*, 40(4), 391-408.

Van Long, H., & Yabe, M. (2013). Unequal regional development in rural vietnam: Sources of spatial disparities and policy considerations. *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, 5(6), 325-335. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/1417475961?accountid=42599>

Winter, E. W. (1996). Barriers to the implementation of economic development projects in rural texas communities. *Economic Development Review*, 14(3), 73-75. Retrieved from <http://eserv.uum.edu.my/docview/230077296?accountid=42599>

Artikel 7

ORIGINALITY REPORT

4%

SIMILARITY INDEX

3%

INTERNET SOURCES

3%

PUBLICATIONS

1%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

www.emeraldinsight.com

Internet Source

1%

2

ifrnd.org

Internet Source

1%

3

Jan Douwe van der Ploeg. "Rural Development: From Practices and Policies towards Theory", *Sociologia Ruralis*, 10/2000

Publication

1%

4

pasca45manajemen.files.wordpress.com

Internet Source

1%

Exclude quotes On

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches < 1%