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**INTRODUCTION**

According to Gunawan, S. (2014, p. 13) the village means the smallest unit of government in the sphere of governance in Indonesia. The village is a legal community unit that has a regional boundary that is authorized to regulate and administer the government, the interests of the local community based on community initiatives, rights of origin, and or traditional rights that are recognized and respected in the NKRI government system (RI, Undang\_Undang No. 23 of 2014). In carrying out the government program, including the village development program, an active community role is needed because it is the main requirement to support the success of the village development program.

Tlogoadi's land area of ​​1,895.60 Ha consists of rice fields and dry land. Rice fields are productive land that covers an area of ​​268.70 Ha (BPS, Kabupaten Sleman, 2010). The area of ​​agricultural land can be less if village officials allow land to change functions, such as used for agriculture, for example, housing in the area so that there is a comfort for the community because when it rains there are many puddles on the road because it does not pay attention to water absorption. Therefore, it is necessary to evaluate whether the results of the development program already according to the expected and need to see the level of community participation and social capital in the village in supporting the village development program.

Tlogoadi village actually has a fairly advanced environment, this can be seen from a good environmental system and has social capital in the form of a high level of cooperation in building villages. The current development is mostly carried out independently and one of the activities that are oriented towards economic development is the existence of the Taserba Community (Tabungan Serba Guna), and Padas (Paguyuban Dana Sehat). In an effort to build a competitive society, the role of social capital is increasingly important, many social capital contributions to the success of the rural development. Therefore, the active role of society is the necessity to build cooperation in achieving prosperity. Community participation is also a social security for the community to gain access to development. The level of community participation and social capital can be seen from the level of optimization of the utilization of existing natural resource potential and the potential of human resources because it can lead to the quality of the results of rural development.

The purpose of development is to improve welfare or reduce poverty and development must always be realized by the community as well, the development process must be carried out by the community ranging from planning to evaluation and focusing on the people, by the people and for people (Gunawan, S., 2014: p.14 ) According to Bappenas (2005) poverty means limited food consumption, health, education, employment and business opportunities, access to housing and sanitation services, obtaining clean water, lack of certainty of land ownership, deteriorating environmental and natural resource conditions and weak security guarantees. In addition, poverty is caused by weak participation, and the large population burden caused by family dependents. The poverty line can be measured by the low per capita. Therefore, it is necessary to reduce poverty in the community by optimizing the potential of natural resources and human resources because human beings as a group as human resources can transform regions into more advanced areas. The potential of natural resources and human resources is optimized as social capital for rural development.

Field, J., (2010: 26) means that social capital is a relationship that is limited by trust, mutual understanding and shared values ​​which limits group members to make movements effectively and efficiently. Social capital is an actual and virtual resource that develops in relationships that have been institutionalized in the perspective of others (Hasbullah, J., 2006). The definition of social capital is also expressed by Burt, R.S. (1992) by defining social capital as the ability of society to relate to one another so that it becomes a very important force, not only for economic aspects but also for every other aspect of social existence. Social capital is related to reducing crime rates, reducing mortality and better education (Putnam, R.D., 2002). Social capital has an important and market-related role and failure of government, society and networks, limited social, rational contracts, costs of receiving information and decision making, and negative influence on actions (Bowles, S., And Gintis, H., 2002) and (Savioli, M., and Patuelli, R., 2016, p. 10). Social capital develops with institutions and individuals. Economic agents often do not understand and exploit them. Policymakers can be hindered by reducing the vision of economists based on very rational individual thinking.

Maluccio, J. et al. (2000) proves that social capital is closely related to well-being, poverty reduction or reducing the likelihood of becoming poor in South African countries (Grootaert, C., et al., 2002) as well as the study Grootaert, C. ( 2001) which shows social capital influencing welfare in Bolivia (Grootaert, C., and Narayan, 2000) in Nigeria and Roslan (Diawara, BS, et al, 2003) and Malaysia (Roslan, A., et al., 2010). Social capital contributes to the welfare of households by considering the age and size of the household or family (Olawuyi, S.D., And S.E., Oladele, 2012). Social capital is very important for poverty alleviation in developing countries and seeks to improve the level of education of the poor because job creation will not succeed in reducing poverty unless accompanied by social capital (Goetz, 1997). Even the Grooteaert, C., (1999) proves that there is a close relationship between poverty and social capital in Indonesia, although the influence of social capital on household poverty is not always significant (Pramono, A, D., 2012, p. 117-229).

Social capital can be in the form of bonding or bridging. Social capital in the form of bonding is social capital in the context of inward-looking ideas, relations, and attention. This form of social capital generally appears and is in a society that tends to be homogeneous. Armitage, D.R., and Plummer, R., (2010) suggested further adjustment mechanisms are said to be adaptation mechanisms. This mechanism explains that the community has the ability of a social-ecological social system to remain ready and robust in facing and responding to changes from internal and external factors. Social capital as social bridging means groups that have an outward-looking attitude makes it possible to establish mutually beneficial networks and networks with associations or groups outside the group (Hasbullah, J., 2006). The patterns of interaction and networks formed in bridging social capital relating to outsiders are upheld with a passion for mutual benefit, awakening to others. There are nuances of equality and inclusiveness (Suparman, A, 2013).

There are three elements of resource components and important elements of social capital, namely trust, values ​​and norms and networks (Riadi, M., 2018). Trust is a belief related to results and events that express faith in integrity or technical knowledge. Trust serves to reduce or minimize the danger that comes from certain activities and is not bound by risk. But in various possibilities, trust enlarges the ability of humans to cooperate not because of cognitive rational calculations, but through consideration between desperately needed desires and expectations. Cooperation is not possible if it is not based on mutual trust between the parties involved and can increase tolerance for uncertainty (Damsar, 2009: 202). Trust is a hope that grows in the community which is shown by honest, orderly, and cooperative behavior based on shared norms (Fukuyama, 1996).

There are two things that must be considered to develop villages, namely values ​​and norms. Value is an experience idea and an important part of a culture. Actions should be in accordance with the values ​​agreed and upheld by the community to be carried out, while norms are rules of social life collectively or together. Norms contain various moral and physical sanctions for a person or group that commits a violation of social values. Norms are aimed at suppressing community members so that all their actions do not conflict with values ​​that have been agreed upon together (Setiadi, E, M., and Kolip, U, 2011: 131). Values ​​and norms are the basic things found in the process of social interaction. Values ​​and norms refer to how individuals should act in society. Norms are part of the social capital that is formed not created by bureaucrats or government. Norms are formed through tradition, history, charismatic figures who develop procedures for the behavior of a person or community group, then generate social capital in order to determine rules that can regulate personal and group interests (Fukuyama, 1996).

A network is a bond between a person or a socially related group that is tied to the trust of both parties. Networks are relationships between individuals that have subjective meanings as ties (Damsar, 2009: 214), whereas Robinson, L.J., (2011) says networks are formed because of the origin of the region, the same political or religious beliefs. Healthy communities tend to have strong social networks. Social relations networks are characterized by a typical typology in line with the characteristics and orientation of the group. Social groups are usually formed traditionally on the basis of repeated social experiences and religious beliefs that tend to have high cohesiveness, but the range of networks and beliefs built is very narrow (Mawardi, M.J., 2007).

Social capital is able to reduce the risk of disaster, loss of work and disease and collective action to overcome common problems and tend to have a negative impact on household poverty. In accordance with the study of Ahmad, N., and Sadaqat, M., (2016; p.467-482) which proves social capital has a major influence on poverty compared to individuals individually. Governments and individuals contribute by participating in networks and associations, although the market is unlikely to create sufficient social capital. Problems of market failure and government failures in free trade, public goods, complete and incomplete information are better resolved at the community level and can be overcome by social capital (Bowles, S., And Gintis, H., 2002). The implementation of social capital requires cooperation in every village development activity and requires community participation as social security. Community participation means the involvement of the community or several people in an activity. Involvement can be in the form of mental, emotional and ability (Dwiningrum, S.I,A., 2011, p.50). Community participation means people's willingness to support government programs (Agustinus, K., 2017). Community participation is very close to social capital because social capital also involves several people or communities in carrying out an activity for a purpose. In addition, optimization of natural resources and human resources will be able to realize village development in an effort to reduce poverty. Community participation and social capital are closely linked, community participation is related to activities or activities of human resources, especially in groups, while human resources in a community can be referred to as social capital. Both community participation and social capital are both used as village development capital. Significantly what is seen from the community is physical development such as housing and minimarkets, which are quite high in number, but this also has a bad impact, such as resulting in many fields that have changed functions. If it is not controlled, it will have an impact on the lower level of rural agriculture which ultimately also has an impact on the destruction of environmental conservation and the number of unemployed. According to a study by Suratno, A., (2017)

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This research was carried out in Tlogoadi Village, Mlati Subdistrict, Sleman Regency using the research subjects of 12 hamlet heads. Data collection techniques through filling out questionnaires and in-depth interviews. Respondents were asked to fill out a questionnaire compiled by the team on a self-rating basis with a score of 0-100% relating to the achievement of the village development program and the potential resources used. The potential of natural resources includes: 1) agriculture, 2) livestock, 3) tourism potential, 4) culinary potential, 5) existing institutional or group potential. While the potential of human resources is divided into 1) activities or activities of youth groups, 2) activities of women's groups, or 3) activities of other productive groups.

The potential of natural resources means agricultural products, livestock managed by the community and supporting village development activities. Potential human resources are individuals or groups of people who utilize their potential to be productive in filling village development. Both natural resources and human resources that can be used for rural development are defined as social capital because they are managed by groups. In accordance with the notion of social capital, namely the ability of the community to relate to one another so that it becomes a very important force, not only to the economic aspects but also to every other aspect of social existence (Burt, R.S., 1999).

Community participation means the involvement of the community or some people in an activity. Involvement can be mental, emotional and abilities (Dwiningrum, SI, A., 2011, p.50), a community willing to support government programs (Agustinus, K., 2014), an involvement of individuals and groups from the Tlogoadi village community in filling out activities village development. Community involvement in all group activities that support village development programs.

The village development program is a development program in the village of Tlogoadi which includes several fields including 1) social fields, 2) education, 3) environment, 4) health, 5) productive associations, 6) economy, 7) national insights, 8) mitigation disaster. Measurement of the results of the evaluation of the village development program with the average results of the self-assessment scores from the hamlet head. By measuring social capital, community participation and village development were tested and analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This study evaluates the Tlogoadi village development program that uses the subject of the hamlet head in the village of Tlogoadi. Each hamlet head was asked to fill out a questionnaire prepared by the research team regarding social capital, community participation, and village development, then the team also conducted in-depth interviews with the hamlet heads related to more complete data.

**Head Profile Of Dusun As Social Capita**l

This research uses social capital from the authorities in this case the hamlet head as a driver of the village development program. Profiles along with hamlet heads based on age and latest education level can be presented in Table 1:

**Table 1. Profile of Village Head based on Education, Age and Length of Position**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dusun | Last Education | | Age (Years) | | | Length of  Position (Years) | | |
|  | SLTA | S1 | 30-40 | 41-50 | 51-60 | 0-5 | 6-10 | * 10 |
| Sanggrahan | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Toragan | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Cebongan Lor | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |
| Cebongan Kidul | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| Gandekan | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Kamboja | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
| Karang Bojang kidul |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Plaosan | 1 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |
| Karanglo | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| Nglarang | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
| Kalongan | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |
| Bolawen | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |
|  | 11 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 |

Based on Table 1 it can be shown that the youngest age of the hamlet head in the village of Tlogoadi is 35 years, and the average age is 46-50 years. Based on the level of final education, the average high school graduates, and only 1 person with a Bachelor's final education. Based on the length of office, the average subject served as a hamlet head for 0-5 years there were 4 people for 6-10 years there were 4 such people who served more than 10 years as well as 4 people.

**Population Composition in Tlogoadi Village: as Social Capital**

Social capital based on the composition of the productive population shows 2050 people of the most population in the Cebongan Kidul hamlet, while the least in Karanglo and Gandekan hamlets with a population of 650 people. The largest component of a population with productive youth is 400 people in the village of Plaosan. This shows the role of youth is very helpful in village development activities. The highest composition of productive women is in the Cebongan Kidul sub-village totaling 410 people. This is also in accordance with the many activities of women who are active in completing the development of the Tlogoadi village. The following data on the population of the Tlogoadi village are listed in Table 2:

**Table 2. Social Capital Based on Composition**

**Productive Residents**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Hamlet** | **Number of Population** | | | |
| Total  (person) | Productive youth  (person) | Productive woman  (person) | Others  (person) |
| Sanggrahan | 1600 | 125 | 150 | 1325 |
| Toragan | 796 | 108 | 122 | 566 |
| Cebongan Lor | 868 | 47 | 201 | 620 |
| Cebongan Kidul | 2050 | 205 | 410 | 1435 |
| Gandekan | 850 | 135 | 120 | 595 |
| Kamboja | 1027 | 85 | 330 | 612 |
| Karang Bojang | 650 | 125 | 105 | 420 |
| Plaosan | 1320 | 400 | 381 | 539 |
| Karanglo | 650 | 120 | 68 | 462 |
| Nglarang | 785 | 79 | 157 | 549 |
| Kalongan | 1131 | 113 | 226 | 792 |
| Bolawen | 754 | 160 | 120 | 474 |
| Total | 12481 | 1702 | 2390 | 8389 |

**Community Participation and Optimization of Natural and Human Resources**

The effort to build the village of Tlogoadi certainly must pay attention to the amount of potential that is owned by each hamlet because the potential possessed is as capital that can be used to build villages. Both the potential of natural resources and human resources must be used as development capital, which of course the involvement of the community or the potential of human resources/human resources in the implementation of development programs will be directly related to the success of village development programs, including social capital from the community and community participation. The following is the potential data in the Tlogoadi village both in terms of the potential of natural resources and human resources shown in Table 3 as follows:

**Table 3. Level of Community Participation in Natural and Human Resources Optimization**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Potential of Natural Resources** | **%** | **Potential of Human Resources** | **%** |
| Agriculture: Rice, Palawija | 75% | Youth Group: Karang Taruna | 75% |
| Animal Husbandry: Catel, Goat | 75% | Ronda/siskamling Group | 80% |
| Tourism Potential Flory Goddess | 85% | Dasa Wisma Group | 85% |
| Culinary Potential: Bali Ndeso, Gudeg | 80% | PKK, Arisan, Takmir Group | 85% |
| Posyandu | 80% | Framer Group, KWT | 70% |
| Ronda/Security | 80% | Kelompok Ternak | 75% |
| Poslansia | 75% | Pokdarwis Dewi Flory Group | 75% |

Table 3 shows some of the potential possessed by Tlogoadi village from natural resources and human resources. Some natural resources are seen as a potential for rural development, namely: agriculture, animal husbandry, has the culinary potential of Balindeso, Gudeg, a tourist attraction of the flory goddess. While the potential of human resources such as youth groups, youth groups, guardian groups, flory goddess tour groups, and other productive groups. These productive groups can also be interpreted as social capital that can support human development. Social capital or productive group means as the ability of the community to relate to one another so that it becomes a very important force, not only to the economic aspects but also to every other aspect of social existence. Economic aspects, obviously for economic improvement such as the PKK group, Dasa Wisma, while groups with social existence aspects such as the patronage group or jimpitan siskamling.

**Village Development Program Evaluation**

The social capital in Tlogoadi village which is realized from the active group or community can also be interpreted as village development capital. The implications of development activities need the involvement of group members or community participation so that there is a close relationship between social capital and community participation. Based on the results of data analysis from Tlogoadi village development activities and social capital and community participation, Tlogoadi's village development activities or programs are divided into several fields including social, educational development programs, environmental, health, and productive fields. Economics, nationalism and poverty reduction. As for Table 4 as follows.

**Table 4. Results of Village Development Evaluation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Activity** | **Skor** |
| Social Program | Letter of recommendation to the community: arranging waivers of school fees, divorce, marriage, etc. Social Assistance, Jamkesmas | 80% |
| Education | TPA, PAUD | 80% |
| Environment | Utilization of yards, road hardening, waste Bank | 80% |
| Healthy | Posyandu, Toddler, Poslansia | 85% |
| Productive Association | Association of Farmer, Livestock, KWT | 80% |
| Economic Program | Saving and Loan, Cooperation, USEP | 85% |
| National Insight | Merti Dusun, Indonesian Independence Day Celebration on August 17 | 75% |
| Disaster Mitigation | Volunteer Organisation, Risk Mitigation Pos, Tagana | 75% |

Table 4 shows the results of the evaluation of the village development program from each field. 80% of the social field shows, which means that the average hamlet head actively recommends their citizens' dispensation, including relief from school tuition. The education sector shows that 80% means the success of PAUD and TPA programs supports rural development. Of course, this program will not work if there is no community involvement. In the economic field, 85% of cooperative activities such as savings and loans and USEP support rural development. This shows that social capital in the form of cooperatives, savings and loans goes well and community involvement in this activity is also conducive. National insight activities such as Indonesian Independence Day on August 17, or Merti Dusun are jointly celebrated by the community. 75% of community participation in supporting national insight activities. Likewise for the field of disaster mitigation supported by the community.

Based on the results of data analysis on the evaluation of the Tlogoadi village development program, Mlati District, Sleman Regency shows that social capital and community participation are closely related to the success of village development. The social capital in Tlogoadi village has the potential of both natural resources such as agriculture, livestock, has the culinary potential of Balindeso, warm, and flory goddess tourist attractions as well as reviewed from human resources such as youth groups, Ronda / siskamling groups, flory goddess tour groups, and other productive groups, both natural resource potential and human resources if optimized as development capital, the potential as social capital that has the ability of society to relate to one another so that it becomes a very important force, not just economic aspects, but also to every other aspect of social existence. The ability of social capital in Logoadi village to reach 80% on average is able to support rural development which ultimately reduces poverty. This is in line with the study of Ahmad, N., and Sadaqat, M., (2016; p.467-482) which proves that social capital has a major influence on poverty compared to individuals.

In addition to social capital, the level of community participation is also able to realize rural development that can reduce poverty. As much as 80%, the participation of the Tlogoadi village community in supporting the activities of national insight. Likewise for the field of disaster mitigation supported by the community in accordance with the objectives of development, namely to improve the welfare of the community or reduce poverty because the development process must begin with the willingness, ability and opportunity to develop the village. Development remains principled in the implementation planning to evaluation and focusing on the people, by the people and for the people (Gunawan, S, 2014: p. 14) and the goal of development is to reduce poverty.

**CONCLUSION**

This study was conducted using 12 research subjects in the hamlet heads in the village of Tlogoadi, Mlati District, Sleman Regency. This study evaluates the percentage of the success of the village development program that has been implemented by reviewing the optimization of the natural resource potential of human resources in developing the village.

The potential of natural resources that are used as social capital to carry out rural development are agriculture, fisheries, the use of flory village recreation and so on while the potential of human resources as social capital in development is a productive group from the areas in Tlogoadi village both from youth groups, groups PKK women, Dasa Wisma, and other productive groups, while community participation is from community involvement from the activities of the productive groups in implementing village development programs in an effort to reduce poverty.

The results showed that on average 80% of social capital could support Tlogoadi village development activities and 85% involved community participation. Evaluation based on the utilization of the resource potential carried out by the Tlogoadi village shows that 75% of the potential of natural resources and human resources used in rural development can reduce poverty. This is indicated by the level of achievement of the results of filling out questionnaires from respondents based on self- rating.

Subsequent studies should use subjects to community leaders in the village area from each hamlet to find out the reciprocal results of the development program that has been carried out, especially in supporting poverty reduction activities.
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