Community Participation on Evaluation Stage in Critical Land Rehabilitation Program
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ABSTRACT

Rehabilitation of critical land (hereafter, RLK) approaches should be done in holistically concern to the social aspects of economic and cultural communities. The evaluation of critical land aim to assess the activities of the planning process as well as its implementation and find things that were lacking in the activities, so as to provide ideas, information, solutions or new method to repair the program in the future. The purpose of the research was to (1) examine the level of public participation in rehabilitation of critical land programs on evaluation stage, and (2) examine the relationship of internal and external factors with the level of public participation in rehabilitation of critical land program on evaluation stage. The research was carried out in Randangan Watershed (called DAS Randangan), Pohuwato District, Gorontalo Province, Indonesia from September to November 2015. The study used a survey approach. The population recorded 150 people and 40% was selected as sample by systematic random sampling. The data were analyzed using analysis of participation (the interval low, medium and high) and Spearman relationships. The results show that (1) the level of participation communities in rehabilitation of critical land program on evaluation stage were categorized as low (71.7%); (2) internal factors in terms of age distribution (r=128) and education level (r=0.97) have positive correlation with community participation in land critical rehabilitation. While external factors in terms of program socialization (r=0.29) and training activity (r=0.462) have a positive correlation with community participation. However, external factors have significant positive correlation. It is concluded that external factor in terms of program socialization and training activity can be a best route to increase community participation in critical land rehabilitation. This implies that the government needs to encourage community participation in land critical rehabilitation through socialization program optimalization and stepping up training activity.
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INTRODUCTION

The control of erosion processes is an important issue worldwide [30] to improve agriculture development which is directed to strengthening the power of local community capacity against any forms of development process. Bring up the awareness of small rural communities is the responsibility of the stakeholders to be able to preserve all forms of natural resource which belonged to Indonesia. Not only is solely to be able to utilize the resource in accordance to utilization but towards to how to create, utilize and conserve the resource, because
that’s what became one of the principle of the conservation of land and water. It has many impacts, for example, land use policies had greater impact on hydrological environment changes than water management policy and climate change factors [37] both in rural and urban area. In facts, most land converted into residential areas and other urban areas were agriculturally productive. The availability of accessibility and supporting government policy had driven these conversions of land [17]. This areas is moving away from the city center [19].

Understanding the hydrology process became the important thing in planning of soil and water conservation which is managing the watersheds is the main action to determine: (a) the behavior of rain in relation to the process of erosion and sedimentation, (b) the relationship of rainfall and run-off, (c) discharge peak (peak flow) for designing the flooded buildings, and (d) the relationship of the characteristics of a watershed with debit that occurs in the area [3]. Recently, the main task of whole elements of both Government and society in Indonesia is the conservation of natural resource. The main function of the forest not only as the economic underpinning of society, but also keeping ecology and maintaining social harmony in society. Over the function of forest land being land-agricultural land provides an increasingly bad impacts on forest ecology and the sustainability of natural resources. Such as the depletion of water reserves, social conflict between humans and wild animals, climate change, increased CO2 gas, land degradation, the high surface flow and soil erosion. A further consequence of the incident is increasingly widespread formation of land-critical land on farmland.

According to the Directorate General of Land Rehabilitation and Social Forestry (2002), critical land is land that has suffered the damage so caused the loss or reduced function (a function of the production and arrangement layout of water). Decreasing the function caused by land use less or unpaying attention to the soil conservation techniques giving rise to erosion, landslides, etc. that affect soil fertility, water and the environment. Dissemination of critical land also occurred in Randangan Watershed, Pohuwato District, Gorontalo Province of Indonesia. Reported by Division of Watershed Bone Bolango section (2009), that the critical land area for the Randangan watershed reaches 91,494 Ha, comprising 18,832 Ha outside the forest area, and 72,662 Ha located in the forest area. This indicates that the high land degradation and soil erosion that occurred in the region of Randangan watershed.

One of the efforts to restore the better function of watershed area function is to rehabilitate critical lands land in Randangan watershed area. Critical land rehabilitation is an action to reverse the function of the land to be more productive. The success of critical land rehabilitation on watershed relies on society itself that lives in the area. That is, all forms of community participation activities is absolutely necessary for the sake of this construction of the welfare farm. Participation ends up being something that should be encouraged implementation [29]. Participation itself has a meaning that is the participation of a person or a group of members of the public in an activity [31].

Community functions as planners, users, maintainers and social control of the critical land rehabilitation program. National development programs by the Government to the public generally in the countryside should put them as perpetrators of development and not as recipients of benefits only. Ansori [1] explained that the placement of the community as a subject matter program is absolutely necessary so that the public will be able to participate actively starting from the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the program. Local people became the most understand the circumstances of his country that would be able to provide valuable input. Local communities with the knowledge and experience put into a very large capital in carrying out the program. Local communities know what problems are encountered and the potential possessed by the garrison and they will have the local knowledge to address problems that it faces.

Critical land rehabilitation approaches should be done holistically with attention to the social aspects of economic and cultural communities. Problems encountered in the efforts of land rehabilitation include: poverty, the limitations of alternative employment, as well as a high level of dependence towards dry land farming and farm animals [21]. It has become a strategic issue in the community, when a program does not give effect to the improvement of the economy certainly community will not participate in it. This certainly requires awareness of the society, for the individual program of rehabilitation benefits not only today but in a sustainable way. Rehabilitation programs that have been taking place surely need a cycle of assessment called the program evaluation the participatory nature of the community. The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the activities of the planning process as well as its implementation and find things that are lacking in the activities, so as to provide ideas, ideas, information, solutions or strategies/new method that is used to repair the program in the future. This has an indirectly effect on community income distribution. It also can enhance the rural livelihood economy and has changed the way in which the majority of the rural agrarian communities view their farming enterprise [18] as one of socio-economic development goals [9] in globalizing economy era. It is still very important in pro-poor policy interventions, and the Indonesian government should prioritise the revitalisation of agriculture development [2] and critical land is one of the crucial issues to solve.

The characteristics of forest and land rehabilitation are complex and causing long-term rehabilitation programs require the evaluation of a program that needs to be done carefully, systematic, and thorough, not only use a little indicator to assess its success [34]. Conducting the evaluation meant to look back on whether a program or activity may have been carried out in accordance with the planning and goals expected. The
evaluation of activities has been achieved, whether a program can meet the specified criteria. Based on the results of the evaluation then taken the decision, whether a program will be forwarded, or revised, replaced or even at all. The description is based on the understanding of the evaluation, i.e. a process of gathering information through data collection by using certain instruments to take a decision. So, basically the evaluation is an activity that tests or assessing a program's execution [36].

Cases on rehabilitation of critical land that the successes program do not significantly successful despite all stages has been conducted and passed. As reported by Ministry of Forestry in Qirom [26], that critical land rehabilitation target to no avail the maximum as expected. The results of the evaluation of the success of land rehabilitation action (GERHAN in Indonesian) are only around 60%-40% or failure to achieve the 40%-60% of the total area of the program, causing the target product is not achieved.

It is necessary to evaluate the program presumably the rehabilitation of critical land is participatory. The research objectives are (1) to analyze the level of public participation in rehabilitation of critical land programs on evaluation stage, and (2) analyze the relationship of internal and external factors with the level of public participation in rehabilitation of critical land program on evaluation stage. After getting these specific objectives, it is expected to have a contribution of the study to provide understanding that critical land rehabilitation can be solved through the better level of community participation in the program.

Method:
Research Design and Site:
This study used a survey approach. The type of data being used primary and secondary data. Primary data collected with interviews (using questionnaire for rehabilitation participants), observing and documentaries. Meanwhile secondary was using government documents related. The research was conducted in DAS Randangan, Pohuwato District, Gorontalo Province, Indonesia (Figure 1). Research locations selected intentionally (purposive), with the primary consideration is that the location of the ex-location of critical land rehabilitation activities since 2010. The study lasted for 3 months starting from September until November 2015.

![Research Site on Randangan Watershed area at Pohuwato District, the location of the implementation of critical land rehabilitation](image1.png)

Population and Sample:
The population in this research was a community that was directly involved in the critical land rehabilitation program in Randangan watershed. The population of the community was included in the group of
pre-rehabilitation critical land. The number of members of the population group of farmers in Randangan watershed were 150 participants. Sample research determined using proportional random way (proportional random sampling). According the formula of Taro Yamane cited in Riduwan [27]:

\[ n = \frac{N}{N.d^2 + 1} \]

Where : 
- \( n \) = Number of samples
- \( N \) = Total population
- \( d \) = precision

The number of samples were 60 respondents. The determination of the sampling carried out systematically (Systematic random sampling), based on the circumstances of a homogenous community in implementing activities. It can be seen from: (a) way of life, culture, and social communities are the same, (b) the pattern of the farming community which still traditional, and (c) organizational and institutional communities are homogenous.

Variable:

Independent variable was symbolized by X are all factors that affect the level of participation of the community in the rehabilitation of critical land, and bound variable (the dependent variable) symbolized by Y, was a measure of public participation. The variable X includes the internal factors i.e. age, ages and education level, while the external factors are the program socialization and training. While the variable Y is the communities' participation on evaluation stage.

Data Analysis:

1. The level of community participation in activities RLK analyzed by determining the class interval of the categories low, medium and high, and is calculated by using the formula Nasir (2013), which is as follows:

\[ k = \frac{R}{I} \]

Where :
- \( k \) = class interval
- \( I \) = number of class interval
- \( R \) = range

2. To analyse the relationship between external factors with the level of community participation using the Spearman Rank correlation method, with the following formula (Riduwan, 2013):

\[ r_s = 1 - \frac{6\sum d^2}{n(n^2-1)} \]

Where :
- \( r_s \) = Sperman Rank correlation values, i.e., the correlation coefficient ranking by size for the relationship between the variable Y (the level of community participation) and the free variable X (external factors)
- \( d^2 \) = the difference between the ranking of x and y
- \( n \) = numbers of paired data

The significant level used was \( \alpha = 0.05 \) (commonly used) and the data processed with the help of a computer using Microsoft Office Excel software and statistical program for social science (SPSS) version 16.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Research Site:

The total area of Pohuwato district is 4244.31 km² or 36.77% of the total area of the province of Gorontalo. Pohuwato district is located between 0°22' – 0°57' north latitude and 121°23’ – 122°19’ east longitude. The topography of Pohuwato district is largely hilly, so the Village area at DAS Randangan is dominated by sloping lands. The rainfall in Pohuwato district reaches 2,103 mm yr-1, with the climate of types A and C, with the distribution of summer from June to September and the rainy season from December to March. While the month of April to May and October to November is the transition that changes every half year. The range of the average air temperature in DAS Randangan ranged from 26.2 °C to 2.6 °C, with relative humidity between 77.9% to 86.5%. The level of erosion that occurs was divided into three parts, the middle area of 98 999 ha (38.64%), and very high area of 75 718 ha (29.55%), and very light area of 6,254 ha (2.44%) (BP-DAS Bone Bolango 2009; 2013; BPS Pohuwato, 2014).

In DAS Randangan, the largest used area is the forest, dry forest that is 158 317 ha (59.1%), the lowest is the primary mangrove forest area of 5 ha (0.0%). The use of agricultural land covered for agriculture covering an area of 735 ha (0.3%), dry land farming mix of bush covering 5,260 ha (2.0%), rice paddies covering 304 ha (0.1%), and the plantation area of 1,407 ha ( 0.5%). The rest is used for other purpose such as ponds, open land, water bodies and for the development of transmigration areas. Total families (KK) of all villages in the area is 2,648, with a population of 9513 inhabitants. Population by gender is male 4,847 people (51.0%), and women
are 4,664 inhabitants (49.0%). The community in the research area is dominated by farmers, which amounted to 84.46%, the rest are as laborers, traders, private sector workers and civil servants (PNS). Social institutions in the area of research include Governmental Organization (NGO), Village Consultative Board (BPD), Institute for Community Empowerment (LPM), youth organization, traditional institutions, groups of farmers (farmers ‘group rehabilitation of degraded land (RLK), farmers’ food crops groups, plantation crops farmer groups, farmer horticultural crops groups, groups of fishermen and farmers farms).

The Internal and External Factors:

Age:

According Nuswantari (2008), age is defined as the length of a person’s existence that is measured in terms of chronological time, normal individuals who exhibit the same degree of anatomical and physiological development. Furthermore, according to Hardiwinoto (2011), age is a time unit that measures the time of any object or creature, both living and dead. For instance, say human life span measured fifteen years since his birth until the age time is calculated. Thus, age is measured from birth to the present.

In this study, the age of the community was measured from birth to the age when the research is being done, which is the age of 5 (five) months older on the current research. The age range is presented by its productivity, with interval: 0-20 years old (unproductive). Furthermore, the range of 21-40 years, 41-60 years (productive), and> 61 years (old). The results of the characteristics study of community by age are presented in Table 1.

The result of the study on the characteristic of community by age (Table 1) showed that the lifespan of most community are in the productive period in the age range 41-60 years as many as 35 community (58.3%), and the range of 21-40 years as many as 24 people (40.0 %). There were no community in the age range <20 years (0.0%), but in the range of> 61 years and over is 1 person (1.7%) of the total community.

Level of Education:

In Act No. 20 of 2003 on National Education System, education is a conscious and deliberate effort to create an atmosphere of learning and the learning process so that learners are actively developing the potential for him to have the spiritual power of religion, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and skills needed him, society, nation and state. Qualification of education is defined by the level of development of learners, objectives to be achieved, and capacities that are developed. It consists of formal and non formal education.

In this study, the characteristics of community by education level are divided into five (5) categories, namely: (a) not completed primary school (SD), Graduate from elementary school (SD), junior high / secondary schools (equivalent), the high school / high school (or equivalent), colleges and universities. The level of education will have implications on the improving community competence (knowledge, understanding, and skills) to evaluate the program in the watershed Randangan RLK. The results of the study the characteristics of community by educational level are presented in Table 1.

The results of the study of the characteristics of community by education level (Table 1) showed that, at the level of primary education (SD) (43.3%), and the lowest level is at colleges and universities (1.7%). This study found no respondents who never attend school or who do not complete primary school (0.0%). Based on that that the public is aware of how important it is to go to school even if to the extent of elementary school (SD) only.

Table 1: Characteristics of community in land rehabilitation by Age and Educational Level, obtained from interviews, the number of samples (n = 60).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number (people)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifespan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20 years old</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-40 years old</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-60 years old</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;61 years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (unfinished)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School/SD</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMP/SLTP (Junior High School)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMA/SLTA (Senior High School)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, University</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socialization Program:

Socialization activities in RLK program is a process where people are starting to learn how and familiarize themselves in rehabilitating the land. It means that socialization activities carried out by relevant agencies such as watershed management centers (BP-DAS) and or the local forestry office. Results of research on socialization program are presented in Table 2.
Table 2 shows that 78.3% said there was given RLK socialization program, the remaining 21.7% said there is no socialization provided by the government. This illustrates that as a whole, not all RLK farmers get the socialization of the RLK program. The amount of socialization provided will affect the participation given to activities of RLK. The more socialization is given, the understanding of the activities of RLK is better, and impacted on the higher participation.

The number socialization program described in more detail in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: The frequency of socialization done by the government (a) and frequency of training received by the public (b) on the evaluation of critical land rehabilitation.](image)

The analysis of the frequency of socialization (Figure 2) shows that 68.3% said given socialization as much as 1-2 times, furthermore, 10.0% said that they were given the socialization of > 2 times, and 21.7% said there was no socializing given in the rehabilitation of degraded land.

**Training for Participants in Rehabilitation:**

The training activities in question is the process by which people can improve their skills on critical land rehabilitation activities that are carried out, both in planning, managing crops and land, implement the program and evaluate the program. So that people can compare theory with practice in the field. Characteristics of respondents of the training activities are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 shows that 56.7%) people say that there is training given during RLK activities, and the remaining 43.3% of people said there was no training provided by the government in the activities of RLK. These results illustrate that most people still do not get the training activities. The amount of training provided is presented in Figure 2.

Figure 2 shows that 53.3% of people had received training with a frequency of 1-2 times, 3.3% of people have had training with a frequency of > 2 times, and 43.3% of people have never participated in training (0 times) in the rehabilitation of critical land in DAS Randangan. The number of members of farmers who do not participate in the training activities will do less well on skills acquisition, acceptance of the concept, the development of attitudes and behavior in the activities of RLK. So that later on, the impact is on the ineffective and inefficient rehabilitation program that is being conducted.

**Table 2: Characteristics of community in land rehabilitation by Socialization Program and Training Activities, obtained from interviews, the number of samples (n = 60).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number (people)</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socialization Program :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is socialization</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no socialization</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Activities :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is training</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No training</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community’s Participation on Evaluation Stage of Critical Land Rehabilitation:

Evaluation is a management tool that is action and process oriented. The information collected is then analyzed so that the relevance and the effects and consequences are determined systematically and as objective as possible [35]. Evaluation of participation is a systematic analysis to project management and members of the group, re-assign policies / objectivity, reorganizing the institution, or the development of the resources [11]. Evaluation is needed to determine whether the objectives have been achieved. In an effort to assess the success of RHL, to reduce the risk of failure or improve the success rate, it is necessary to process a variety of measurement one of which is the evaluation of RHL. Characteristics of complex activities resulted in the evaluation of RHL process needs to be done carefully, systematic, and thorough. Evaluation of RHL’s been done to date has focused on accountability of activities, only use the size of percentage of living plants, tall trees, and the soundness of crops of RHL, which is not enough to evaluate the total level of success RHL as a system [16].

At the stage of evaluation of land rehabilitation activities that include meetings every certain period, give an opinion in the evaluation, monitoring and checking, reporting and submission of ideas / suggestions. Results (Table 3) shows that the evaluation stage of RLK activity level of community participation was low (71.7%), the community did not participate in the evaluation. Low community participation in the evaluation phase caused by the whole members of farmers involved directly by the group, but only a small number were included in the evaluation. Program evaluation is only done by a farmer group chairman, secretary and chairman of the program evaluation field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (value)</th>
<th>Community’s participation on Evaluation Stage</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2 (low)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 (middle)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;4 (high)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal-External Factors and Community Participation:

The level of community participation in the rehabilitation program can be influenced by various factors. In simple terms these factors consist of internal and external factors. The relationship between internal and external respondents with the level of community participation provides an overview of how the role of each factor, internal and external to the level of community participation [20]. Internal factors related to the level of community participation such as age and education level. While external factors such as the intensity of socialization, and training activities at RLK.

This analysis used Spearman rank method, which aims to look at the correlation of specified variables. The data analysis were assisted with data processing program SPSS version 16.

Table 4 show that internal factors in terms of age distribution (r=.128) and education level (r=.087) have positive correlation with community participation in land critical rehabilitation. While external factors in terms of program socialization (r=.293) and training activity (r=.462) have a positive correlation with community participation. However, external factors have significant positive correlation. It means that external factor in terms of program socialization and training activity can be a best route to increase community participation in critical land rehabilitation. This implies that the government needs to encourage community participation in land critical rehabilitation through socialization program optimization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Community Participation on Evaluation Stage</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education level</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External :</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program socialization</td>
<td>0.293*</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Activity</td>
<td>0.462**</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keterangan: *: Correlation Coefficient
** Significant value at α = 0.01 * Significant value at α = 0.05

A fundamental aspect that affect the successful of critical land rehabilitation is community participation in the program. Community participation is always influenced by two dominant factors (internal and external). Several internal factors such as age and level of education, while the external covering socialization and training activities. The nature of internal and external factors will determine the level of community participation.

Results of data analysis showed that the lifespan of people were in the range 21-60 years. This indicates that the rehabilitation of critical land in the DAS Randangan is done by the people at their productive age so that it will give good impact on the improving of community participation in RLK to the environment. In line with that, Fauziyah [12] said that, with a productive age, it is expected the development of community forests...
through Gerhan will be more successful. Erwiantono [10] reinforces this study that the relationship of the age of the member communities in the management of mangrove that the larger number of people who are in the age of productive and highly productive also strongly supports the participation in development activities. At a relatively young age and with high productivity, people are more receptive to the input / things that are new to their progress. In terms of its correlation toward the activities of community participation in the management of mangrove ecosystems will be more amenable because of the desire to improve a better future and the hope of a better economic level as well. Thus, the age of a productive society can increase their potential to have more opportunities to participate, allowing for better and smarter thinking (in planning, implementing and evaluating), and not devote more energy and capital in RLK program. Nowadays, people will be easier to change the mindset in the use of natural resources (land and water) from exploitative to the conservative model.

In addition to age factor, community participation is also affected by education attainment. Education level will positively affect on the rehabilitation of degraded land, because the level of education determines the understanding, knowledge, acceptance of information, the power of thought, the participation, the public perception of the evaluation of land rehabilitation program. However, the level of education in most areas of research is still relatively low. Because there are still large public education at primary school level SD (43.3%). Low levels of education correlate to the low level of public participation in the programs planned by the government. Thus [12] low education will lead to a lack of knowledge in exploiting the natural resources available. Lesmana in Jariyah [15] stated that, education level affects the way of thinking in looking for better future, to behave and to absorb information. In summary, Soekartawi in Jariyah [15] said that, they were educated to be faster and less educated otherwise they are rather difficult to accept the technology quickly.

It is important to note that one of the aspects affect rehabilitation program is program socialization itself. The results show that, overall public receives RLK socialization activities. The frequency of this socialization indicate that most who receive socialization is the members who have positions (chairman, secretary, treasurer, coordinator of the planning team, implementing, and evaluation). While the members are still low in receiving socialization.

Similarly, it is hard to let community attend the activity training for critical land rehabilitation. Though, the training is needed in the rehabilitation of degraded land. It is possible to say that, the higher the training, the better the community participation. Most of the people interviewed said that sometimes they just take the result only from their farmer groups without participating directly in this socialization. Socialization is centralized in one place so that not all the members could join, and merely a representation only. Just as expressed by Sudomo [33], that the training activities are usually carried out with a representative system of farmer groups. This representation system complained of by most people because basically they want to be involved but never invited. Gains should be obtained from the training activities at RLK such as: (a) can improve the skills of farmers in cultivating the soil, plant, and maintain plant rehabilitation, (b) applying new technologies that may be offered and presented by the government, (c) increase confidence, awareness, so that people become competent, and (d) increasing independence and can solve their own problems both operational and cost issues that came out due RLK activities.

Internal and external factors that are owned by the community to have an impact on the level of participation. It was found that the level of public participation in the evaluation phase of the rehabilitation program in the category of critically low. This indicates a lack of awareness in monitoring these activities implying that the higher community participation can be achieved by optimizing the role of internal and external factors.

In addition, the evaluation exercise carried out by the related department does not continuously performed, but only in periodic time. Activities such as the evaluation also does not involve all members of farmer groups of rehabilitation and only accompanied by the group's chairman, secretary or treasurer of any group. In this case, members assume the reporting is only made by the chairman of the group alone. At this stage the group members actively contribute less energy and thoughts for improvement of future activities. Yet when examined properly, the evaluation process should involve all members of the group. For the evaluation of the activities of the group members can find out where is the shortage of activities to be further improved. As explained by Pardosi et al., [23], that the people's voices are not represented (voicelessness and powerlessness) in the decision-making process when decisions are greatly influenced life / well-being.

This is in line with the results of the study reported by Sandyatma and Hariadi [28], that the level of member involvement in Joined Farmers Group (called Gapoktan) on monitoring and evaluation stage only reached 25.17%. The low level of participation was due to members of minimum contribution in terms of: (1) assess or provide feedback on the performance of the chairman and board of Gapoktan and extension as a companion activity for the business to grow, (2) help Gapoktan to remind fellow members not to sell grain / rice to middlemen, and (3) attended the annual meeting of members of Gapoktan. Another thing that causes low participation of members of Gapoktan on this stage is that they are reluctant to assist the chairman of Gapoktan in making monthly reports of results-strengthening activities of LDPM. Gapoktan members thought that
the interested parties in this stage is the chairman and board of Gapoktan, as well as agricultural extension that serves as a companion of activities and technical team district.

As reported by Muis [20], that the participation of National Movement of Forest and Land Rehabilitation (called GN-RHL) activities in Layana and Lambara is low. Most respondents in both locations said that they are never involved in the second item evaluation activities. Only a few of them, including the group's chairman, and treasurer of the activities that states never asked for information on the implementation of activities in the field, and asked for help to show the location of cultivation (guide), and even some of them were never aware that evaluation activities has been carried out.

The level of community participation in the evaluation stage when associated with a concept that is developed by Wilcox in Muis [20], included in the category of participation information (level 1), which only received notification of the results which have been decided by outsiders (the executor activities), regardless responses to community comments as the target activity, and the information exchanged is limited to professional circles outside the target group.

It is clear that statistically, the variable “Program Socialization” has a strong positive correlation with community participation (r=.293*). It means that the more socialization, the more community participation will be. All these indicate that external factor in terms of program socialization can be expected to increase community participation in critical land rehabilitation. This implies that the government needs to encourage community participation in land critical rehabilitation through socialization program optimization.

Another possible explanation related to the finding is that, correlation between age and community participation. It is true that statistically, age has no significant correlation with community participation. However, it should not be interpreted to mean that there is no impact at all. There is a correlation, but insignificant (r=.128). This indicates that the critical land rehabilitation age difference is not be an inhibitor of the community to participate. Provided that the community have the time and opportunity, participation certainly is a good / high. As stated by Damanik and Tahitu [7], which examines the level of participation in village development. The analysis showed that the difference in age one does not cause differences in the level of participation in the development of health and education. The conclusion that the public can participate in any age, as long as he has a willingness to participate.

Similarly, education level of participants doesn't show significant relationship with community participation in critical land rehabilitation program (r=.087). This means not always that a high level of education will affect the relationship of community participation. As expressed by Purwoko et al., [25], the no correlation of the level of formal education with the level of participation of members KP2A due to the implementation of a technology or skill in managing his farm, the farmer does not have to have a high level of formal education. Not all farmers with higher level of education have the skills and knowledge that the low education level of farmers have. Patabang [24] states that not a single one was found a significant relationship between education level to forms of participation that require exploration of ideas on the implementation of the program in the Village NUSSP Rappocini and Sub Pannampu.

Another important finding is external factor internally of training activity for participants has a significant positive correlation with community participation (r=0.462**). This indicate that activity training can be expected to encourage community participation in critical land rehabilitation. The phenomenon gives important message that stepping up training activity is a possible way to increase community participation for critical land rehabilitation.

Training activities provide a clear output of what will be done by the community. In a community training activities perehabilitasi critical land given an understanding, the knowledge to be able to plan, implement and evaluate internally to what he had done before the evaluation by the government. Thus, the training activities in the evaluation program of RLK society requires training that can be done gradually.

**Conclusion:**

Level of community participation on evaluation stage in critical land rehabilitation program were categorized as low (71.7%), and there was a positive relationship between internal (age and education) and external factors (program socialization and training activity) with community participation. This implies that the government needs to encourage community participation in land critical rehabilitation through socialization program optimization and stepping up training activity.
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