

RINGKASAN

Latar Belakang Masalah

Ada dua pandangan yang bersifat kontradiktif mengenai respon petani dalam melaksanakan usaha taninya. Pandangan pertama - pandangan yang bersifat pessimistik - dikemukakan oleh Reynold (1969); Geertz (1963); dan Scott (1981) yang menyimpulkan bahwa petani kurang reseptif terhadap praktek - praktek baru dan teknologi baru dalam bidang pertanian. Pandangan pertama ini mengeluarkan konsep petani sebagai "nara pidana dalam budayanya", "inovasi pertanian" dan "budaya subsisten". Sebaliknya, pandangan kedua - pandangan yang bersifat optimistik - dikemukakan oleh Schultz (1965) dan pengikut teori human capital menyimpulkan bahwa sesungguhnya petani sangat responsif terhadap praktek - praktek baru dan teknologi baru dalam bidang pertanian.

Pandangan kedua ini didukung oleh beberapa hasil studi empirik di tingkat internasional yang dilakukan oleh Lockheed, Jamison, Lau (1980) di 13 negara; Anderson dan Bowman (1963) di 24 negara dan Roy P, Waisanen, Rogers (1969) di 2 negara. Di tingkat regional, sejumlah studi dilakukan pula oleh Bhati (1973); Welch (1977); Bhalla (1979); Freire (1979); Halim & Husain (1979); Singh (1979); Shankar (1979); Khuspe (1970); Chaturvedi (1984); McAnany (1981); Gerhart (1963); Rozenweig (1963); Villaume (1977); McLaughlin (1977); Unesco (1973) dan Lenglet (1978); di berbagai negara seperti di India, Bangladesh, Malaysia

Brasilia, Kolumbia, Pantai Gading, Amerika Utara dan Eropah. Di tingkat nasional, sejumlah penelitian yang serupa dilakukan oleh BP3K (1981); Santoso S.Hamijoyo (1980); Herman Suwardi (1976) dan Sutaryat (1984). Kesimpulan hasil - hasil penelitian tersebut, petani sangat responsif terhadap praktek - praktek baru dan teknologi baru pertanian. Salah satu prediktor dan faktor yang menjelaskan perubahan respon petani terhadap praktik - praktik baru dan teknologi baru dalam pertanian adalah tingkat pendidikan petani.

Masalah

Masalah utama penelitian ini adalah respon terhadap usaha tani maju para petani peserta program Kejar Paket "A" yang diintegrasikan dengan mata pencaharian bertani. Dapatkah program pendidikan luar sekolah - dalam hal ini program Kejar paket "A" - mampu menjadi prediktor dan dapat menjelaskan terhadap perubahan respon para petani dalam melaksanakan usaha tani maju termasuk pula determinannya yang berupa hasil belajar (kemampuan baca tulis fungsional), kemampuan berkomunikasi, kebutuhan berprestasi, orientasi nilai dan sarana produksi pertanian sebagaimana dipersepsi oleh petani?

Masalah khusus yang ingin diteliti dalam studi ini adalah : (1) tingkat respon petani terhadap usaha tani maju beserta determinannya diantara para petani yang berbeda lokalisasi - desa terbuka dan desa tertutup - dan berbeda status - petani pemilik tanah dan petani penggarap - (2) tingkat perbedaan hasil belajar para petani yang berbeda lokalitas

dan status, dan (3) apakah hasil belajar mampu menjadi prediktor dan mampu menjelaskan respon petani terhadap usaha tani maju, dan jika tidak, apakah ada peubah (variabel) lain yang berasal dari karakteristik desa dan karakteristik kepribadian petani yang menjelaskan terhadap respon para petani ? dan (4) kadar hubungan fungsional antara respon terhadap usaha tani maju dengan peubah determinan lainnya.

Prosedur

Penelitian ini menstudi 23 kelompok belajar Paket "A" yang diintegrasikan dengan mata pencaharian bertani di 4 kecamatan Kabupaten Pamekasan Madura. Data diperoleh dengan menggunakan 4 set instrumen berupa : tes, kuesioner, wawancara terpimpin dan observasi non partisipasi. Unit analisis adalah petani peserta Kejar Paket "A" dan respon dennya terdiri dari : petani peserta, para tutor, kepala desa, anggota LKMD, pimpinan informal dan penilik Penmas. Metode penelitian yang digunakan studi kasus yang dikombinasi dengan survey. Dalam menganalisis data digunakan 3 pendekatan: kuantitatif dan kualitatif, analisis korelasi dan analisis kesamaan rata - rata.

Hasil

Hasil analisis data dan tes hipotesis dapat dikemukakan secara singkat sebagai berikut :

1. Pengaruh program Kejar Paket "A" terhadap para petani yang berbeda lokalitasnya.
 - 1.1 Respon terhadap usaha tani maju para petani peserta

program Kejar yang tinggal di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup menunjukkan perbedaan nyata (alpha 0.01).

Perbedaan respon ini terutama dijelaskan karena adanya perbedaan struktur desa, khususnya akses ke pasar dan transportasi.

1.2 Hasil belajar petani peserta program Kejar di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup menunjukkan perbedaan nyata.

Perbedaan hasil belajar petani yang berbeda lokalitasnya ini terutama dijelaskan oleh mutu tutor, kualitas bahan belajar, jumlah jam belajar dan pelayanan penilik Penmas

1.3 Kemampuan berkomunikasi para petani peserta program Kejar yang tinggal di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup menunjukkan perbedaan nyata. Perbedaan kemampuan berkomunikasi ini terutama dijelaskan oleh tingkat pelayanan instansi pemerintah di tingkat kecamatan dan kabupaten.

1.4 Kemudahan sarana produksi pertanian para petani peserta program yang tinggal di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup menunjukkan perbedaan nyata. Perbedaan kemudahan sarana produksi pertanian ini dijelaskan oleh akses ke pasar dan transportasi.

2. Pengaruh program Kejar terhadap para petani yang berbeda status.

Respon terhadap usaha tani maju dan kebutuhan berpemasangan para petani peserta program Kejar yang berbeda status yaitu petani pemilik tanah dan petani penggarap menunjukkan perbedaan nyata. Perbedaan dalam kedua peubah itu dijelaskan oleh resiko dalam melakukan usaha taninya dan

motivasi untuk memperoleh hasil yang sebesar-besarnya.

3. Hubungan fungsional antara respon terhadap usaha tani maju dengan peubah lainnya.

3.1 Respon terhadap usaha tani maju para petani peserta program Kejar di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup mempunyai hubungan nyata (alpha 0,01) dengan hasil belajar (kemampuan baca tulis fungsional) dan kemampuan berkomunikasi. Hubungan yang kuat antara ketiga peubah tersebut dijelaskan oleh perubahan kognitif para petani, rasa percaya diri dan kemampuan mengidentifikasi serta menilai informasi yang berasal dari berbagai sumber.

3.2 Respon terhadap usaha tani maju para petani peserta program Kejar yang ada di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup mempunyai hubungan nyata dengan kebutuhan berprestasi petani dan orientasi nilai budaya mereka. Hubungan yang kuat antara ketiga peubah ini dijelaskan oleh kemampuan mengambil resiko dalam usaha tani, kerja keras, hemat dalam usaha memupuk modal dan rasa ketekunan dan keintiman terhadap tanah dan lingkungannya.

3.3 Respon terhadap usaha tani maju para petani peserta program Kejar yang ada di desa - desa terbuka dan tertutup mempunyai hubungan nyata dengan hasil belajar dan kemudahan sarana produksi pertanian. Hubungan yang kuat antara ketiga peubah tersebut dijelaskan oleh kemampuan membaca dan menulis, pengetahuan dasar bertani dan adanya akses ke pasar dan transportasi.

4. Peluncuran program Kejar Paket "A" di tengah masyarakat pedesaan.

4.1 Ada dua kondisi agar program Kejar Paket "A" dapat diterima oleh kelompok sasaran. Pertama, adanya insentif yang bersifat ekonomik dan psikologik. Kedua, adanya legitimasi dari pimpinan formal dan informal desa - desa tempat program Kejar tersebut diluncurkan.

4.2 Program Kejar Paket "A" mempunyai pengaruh yang berbeda terhadap para petani peserta program tersebut. Petani peserta program yang berasal dari desa - desa terbuka meraih keuntungan yang lebih besar dibandingkan dengan petani peserta yang berasal dari desa - desa tertutup. Perbedaan keuntungan yang diraih oleh kedua kelompok petani tersebut dijelaskan oleh kendala struktural dalam hal mutu tutor, tingkat pelayanan instansi pemerintah di tingkat kecamatan dan kabupaten, distribusi bahan - bahan belajar, akses ke media massa, pasar dan transportasi.

ABSTRACT

Background

There are two contradictory points of view dealing with responses of farmers to their farming. First view - pessimistic view - is stated by Reynold (1969); Geertz (1963); and Scott (1981) concludes that farmers have no receptiveness to the new practices and new technology in farming. The first view came up with the concept of farmer as "prisoner of their culture", "agricultural involution", and "subsistence culture". On the contrary, the second view - optimistic view - is stated by Schultz (1965) and the follower of human capital theory who concludes that farmers are highly responsive to the new practices and new technology in farming.

The second view was supported by a number of study at the international level conducted by Lockheed, Jamison and Lau (1980) in 13 countries; Anderson and Bowman (1963) in 24 countries; and Roy P, Waisanen and Rogers (1969) in 2 countries. At the regional level, a number of similar studies were conducted by Bhati (1973); Welch (1977); Bhalla (1979); Freire (1979); Halim & Husain (1979); Singh (1979); Shankar (1979); Khuspe (1970); Chaturvedi (1984); McAnany (1981); Gerhart (1963); Rozenweig (1963); Villaume (1977); McLaughlin (1977); Unesco (1973) and Lenglet (1978); in various countries in India, Bangladesh, Malaysia, Brasilia, Kolumbia, Ivory Coast, North America and Europe. At the national

level, a number of similar studies were conducted by BP3K (1981); Santoso S.Hamijoyo (1980); Herman Suwardi (1976) and Sutaryat (1984). The finding of those studies indicates that farmers were highly responsive to new practices and new technology in farming. One of the predictors in explaining the variation of farmer's responses to new practices and new technology in farming is the level of farmer's education.

Problem

The main problem of this study deals with the level of responses to progressive farming of the farmers who participated in a non - formal education program, namely, package "A" program which is integrated to farm occupation. Can non formal education program, namely, package "A" program be a predictor and be able to explain the variation of farmer's responses to progressive farming and of its determinant covering learning achievement, communication ability, need achievement, value orientation and infrastructure of agricultural production ?

The specific problem investigated in this study is about : (1) the level of differences in responses to progressive farming and to its determinant among farmers who have different locality setting - isolated and non isolated villages - and different status - landowners and tenants; (2) the level of differences in learning achievement among farmers who have different locality

setting and different status; (3) can learning achievement be a significant predictor or explain responses of farmers and if not so, are there any variables which come from village and farmer characteristics that can explain the variation of farmer's responses ?; and (4) the level of functional relationship between responses to progressive farming and to its determinant.

Procedure

The population studied included 23 learning groups of package "A" integrated to farm occupation in 4 sub-districts of Pamekasan, Madura. Data were obtained by means of 4 sets of research instrument : test, questionnaire, guided interview and non participation observation. Unit of analysis was farmers who participated in learning group and respondents of this study were farmers as participants, tutors, headmans, members of LKMD, informal leaders and supervisors of Penmas. The method utilized in this study was case study combined with survey. There were 3 approaches in analyzing the data i.e quantitative and qualitative analysis, correlational analysis and variance analysis.

Findings

Result of the data analysis and hypothesis testing could be briefly described as follows :

1. The impact of package "A" learning group to the farmer who have different locality setting.
 - 1.1 The responses to progressive farming among farmers

who have different locality setting - isolated and non isolated villages - were significantly different (level of significant .01). The factors which explain the variation of the farmer's responses to progressive farming were access to market and transportation.

1.2 The learning achievement of farmers who participated in the learning group was significantly different among farmers who have different locality setting. The variation of learning achievement was explained by quality of tutors, quality of learning materials, total number of session hours and guidance of Penmas supervisors.

1.3 The communication ability of farmers who participated in the learning group was significantly different among farmers who have different locality setting. The variation of communication ability was explained by the level of services which come from various government agencies in subdistrict and district levels.

1.4 The facility of agricultural production infra - structure as perceived by farmers who participated in the learning group was significantly different. The variation of facility of agricultural production infra-structure among farmers who have different locality setting was explained by the access to market and transportation.

2. The impact of package "A" learning group to the farmer who have different status.

The responses to progressive farming and the need

of achievement of the farmers who participated in the learning group and who have different status - landowners and tenants - were significantly different (level of significant .01). The variation of responses to progressive farming and need achievement of farmers were explained by the risk in doing farming and motivation to get maximum productivity.

3. Functional relationship between responses to progressive farming and other variables .

3.1 Responses to progressive farming of the farmers who participated in the learning group in isolated and non isolated villages had a significant correlation to learning achievement and communication ability (level of significant .01). This strong correlation was explained by cognitive change, self confidence and ability in identifying and evaluating of information which come from various sources.

3.2 Responses to progressive farming of the farmers who participated in the learning group in isolated and non isolated villages had a significant correlation to need achievement and value orientation. This correlation was explained by the ability to take a risk in doing their farming, hardworking, saving to accumulate capital and intimacy to their land.

3.3 Responses to progressive farming of the farmers who participated in the learning group in isolated and non

isolated villages had a significant correlation to their learning achievement and facility of agricultural production infra-structure. This strong correlation was explained by their ability in 3 R's, basic knowledge in agriculture and the existence of access to market and transportation.

4. The launching of package "A" learning group in rural community.

4.1 There are two conditions in order that package "A" learning group could be accepted by the target group.

First, the existence of economic and psychological incentives. Second, the existence of legitimization of formal and informal leaders in the village where the package "A" learning group will be launched.

4.2 The package "A" learning group had a different impact to the farmers who participated in this program. The farmers who come from non isolated villages significantly had more benefit from this program as compared with the farmers who come from isolated villages. This different benefit between the two groups of farmer can be explained by structural constraint in terms of quality of tutor, level of services which come from government agencies in subdistrict and district levels, distribution of learning materials, access to mass media, market and transportation.