



## International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-7302

available at <http://www.serialsjournal.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 15 • Number 10 • 2017

### The Effect of Implementation of Rural Development Policy of the Village Welfare in Indonesia (A Case Study in the Villages in West Bandung Regency)

**Bambang Sudaryana**

*Polytecnic LP3I Bandung West Java Indonesia, E-mail: [Sudaryana.b@gmail.com](mailto:Sudaryana.b@gmail.com)*

**Abstract:** Based on the government policies as described in the Government Regulation No. 43 of 2014, that the government allocates the village fund in the budget revenue and expenditure every year the budget reserved for the village to be transferred through the budget revenues and expenditures of the regency/city. In the process of implementation of this policy occurs a misappropriation conducted by unscrupulous village heads and local government officials and this is caused by the human resource of the village government that cannot afford to handle the financial management and do not understand the purpose of the village fund. This study aims to determine the effect of rural development policy for the welfare of rural communities. The method used is qualitative method. The conclusion of this research is the implementation of rural development policy influences significantly to the welfare of society in Indonesia

#### INTRODUCTION

The Allocation of Revenue of the village on Budget of the Republic of Indonesia, is the implementation of Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning the village. The village fund is intended to have a source of revenue to fund the authority given to the village, especially the authority based on the origin of the rights and autonomy of the local village scale. In accordance with Law No. 6 of 2014 article 72 paragraph (2), the allocation of funds from the state budget is by effecting a program based on the village equally and equitably. The village funds sourced from the state budget could be used to fund governance, the implementation of development, social development and community empowerment. However, because of the efforts given in the short term it is important to make efforts to boost the economy and welfare of the community, then under Regulation No. 60 of 2014 as amended by Regulation No. 22 Year 2015, the priority use of the village fund is directed to development, and community empowerment. The village fund from the state budget is set at 10 percent of the funds and outside Transfer to Regions (on top) gradually. The village fund budget is

calculated based on the number of villages and allocated by watching the number of population, poverty, area, and degree of difficulty geographically in order to improve the welfare and equitable rural development.

In order to fulfill the mandate of Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning the village, in the revised budget 2015 has allocated Rp. 20.766.2 billion, or 3.23 percent of the transfers to regions. Furthermore, to meet the village fund budget by 10 percent of transfers to regions, the Government has drawn up a road map of the village fund allocation 2015 until 2019 as outlined in the Government Regulation No. 22 Year 2015 on the Amendment of the PP 60 of 2014 on the village fund from the state budget. Based on the road map, the government committed to allocate the village fund increased gradually until it reaches 10 percent of the transfer to the regions in 2017. For the village fund policy in 2016 one of which is directed to increase the budget of village fund from the State Budget, namely of at least 6 percent of the budget transfer to regions. By increasing the budget of the village fund, the allocation is expected to be received by each village can be increased by an average of nearly 2-fold than that received in 2015. This increase is expected to be used by the villagers to expedite the implementation of development activities and community empowerment in accordance with provisions and legislation.

In addition to increasing the amount of the budget village fund, the government is also improving the quality of basic data used for the allocation of the village fund, both at the stage of allocation from the centre to the districts / cities and at the stage of allocation of districts / cities to each village. The basic data quality improvements through:

1. The updating data used in the calculation of the allocation of the village that includes a data number of villages, the data population, poverty, area and village level geographic difficulty, and
2. The changes in the data base of the population, poverty, vast geographical area and the difficulty level of the village, from the original using the data into data per district per village.

The Improvement of the quality of basic data is intended that the calculation of the village fund can generate the allocation value in every regency/city and the allocations would be more accurate. The number of villages used in calculating the allocation of the village is the amount of data that have definitively been established by the Ministry of Home Affairs. While the data of population, poverty level, area, and degree of difficulty are geographically village which uses the data provided by BPS and the Ministry of Home Affairs. The formulation of the village fund allocation from the central government to regencies/cities, and from the regencies/cities to the village, conducted under the Regulation No. 60 of 2014 as amended by Regulation No. 22 of 2015. In PP No. 22 of 2015, the village fund each regencies/ cities are calculated based on number of villages having regard to population, poverty, area, and degree of geographical difficulty of every village. Furthermore, technically the village fund allocation has been regulated in Finance Minister Regulation No. 92 Year 2015 on Procedures for Allocation, Distribution, Use, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Village Fund.

In order to improve the welfare and equitable development of the village, the village fund allocation is calculated using a formula based on equity of 90 per cent (basic allocation), and 10 percent based on population, poverty, area, and the difficulty level of geographic (allocation based on a formula). Calculation of the allocation of the village based on a formula using a variable number of people with a weight of 25 percent, the poverty rate to 35 percent weight, area with weights of 10 percent, and the index of geographical difficulties with the weight of 30 percent. The results of calculation of the village fund allocation every

regency /city after the amended budget will be set forth in the Presidential Decree on details of the state budget. Based on the village fund allocation per regency/city, then regent/mayor of the village fund make distributions to every village in their authority. The result of the allocation calculations performed by regents / mayors are defined in regulation regents / mayors on the allocation of village funds to each village. To support the good governance of village finances and at the same time to increase the effectiveness of the fund, then in 2016 the policy of the fund also directed to improve the timeliness of the channeling of the village fund, better distribution of National Public Cash Plan to Cash Plan Public Area of regencies / cities, as well as the distribution of Cash Plan Public Area of regency / city to the village treasury account. In the second year of implementation of the Law on the fund it is expected that each regency / city can already be included in the budget of the Village Fund, and the regulations regents / mayors regarding the division of the village fund in a timely manner. On the other hand, every village is also expected to be able to prepare and establish village budget timely manner, with the plan for the use of the village fund for community development and empowerment. Thus, documents budgeting required for basic implementation can already be filled at the beginning of the year, so that the distribution of the village fund of National Public Cash Plan to Cash Plan Public Area, and from Cash Plan Public Area to Cash Plan of Village can be done according to the schedule that has been set, that the first phase of the slowest in the second week of April amounted to 40 percent, the second phase later than the second week of August by 40 percent, and phase III later than the second week of October by 20 percent. The village fund budget allocation in the draft budget 2016 is planned for Rp.46.982,1 billion (6.4 percent of and outside Transfer to Regions), an increase of 126.2 percent from the budget in the revised budget by 2015. [Source: Financial Memorandum Proposed Budget 2016].

During this time, the finance of the village is supported by two main sources, namely the village revenues (collection, the wealth of the village, mutual cooperation and nongovernmental organizations) and the help of government. But, empirically there are some problems related to it.

First, the amount of the village budget is very limited. The village revenues are very little, partly because the village does not have the authority and capacity to explore the potential of the financial resources. Due to the limited budgets, the village is not able to fulfill the welfare needs, the public services, especially the welfare of the village. The village budget is insufficient to support basic services such as education, health and housing. In other words, there is a fiscal gap between government finances of Village super and local government (Village).

Secondly, there is a gap between responsibility, responsiveness and the public participation in the budget. The villagers' participation in the development budget is enormous, while the accountability and responsiveness is very little. The majority of the village development budget, especially the development of physical (infrastructure), supported by mutual cooperation or non-governmental sources.

The amount of government funding is very small and functioned as a stimulant to deploy (mobilization), non-governmental funds. The strength of funds from the public is very limited since most of the village residents find it difficult to finance their basic needs (shelter, clothing, food, education and health) for each family.

Thirdly, the scheme of government funding to the Village is less encouraging the empowerment. There used to be the village development funds (Instruction of Village Development) for 30 years, divided

evenly throughout the Village of Rp 10 million (last in 1999), which have been determined and controlled from the top, so that the village cannot be freely and efficiently use the budget.

Both the poor village and rich village will get the same allocation. Because of its long duration (30 years), the scheme as it is ingrained in the paradigm and the government policies over the village, it caused the village cannot raise the welfare and independence of the village.

The local governments (regency/city) also have a budget based on bottom-up planning (village). Both State Budget and The Local Government budget generally pay less attention to the village. 60% - 70% of the government and local budget is consumed for shopping the apparatus (regular shopping).

The remaining 30% to 40% of local budgets are used for public spending to the public, the composition of roughly 30% for indirect costs (administration) and 70% for shopping directly to the public. 70% of direct expenditure for the construction, if calculated roughly, consists of several plafonds: 20% of politics (to Parliament and Regional Head); 70% for the sectoral (education, health, the economy of the people, small industries, local infrastructure, and so on); and 10% for the through a spatial Village through the fund allocation. While the majority (70%) of sectoral plafonds are used for physical infrastructure, which is not directly related to the prevention of the poverty. From the rough composition of the budget shows that the concern of the government towards the village and the poor in the village is still very weak.

The village financial constraints become a serious problem, which becomes the careful attention both from the village government, district and national governments as well as the “third sector” (academics and NGOs) concerned about the village. It turned out the government is willing to give a positive response.

At the time of the old Act and the law of no. 22/1999, we only know the concepts and schemes of government assistance to financially support the village, even in financial terms the area is already known to the financial balance of central and local. The concept of “aid” is certainly not clear, it is very dependent on the benevolence of the government, as well as showing that the village does not have the right to government money.

Although Law 22/1999 has not the mandate of the balance or allocation of funds to the village clearly, but since 2001 a number of regency / city government innovation fund allocation policy gave birth to the village (ADD) in proportion to the amount that is greater than before.

Good experiences of many of these areas are well adopted by law 32/2004 and this law fix the weaknesses contained in the Law 22/1999, which changed the concept of “aid” to become “part”, which means that the village has the right to obtain a partial allocation of equalization funds received by the regency / city.

The Village Fund Allocation Policy (ADD) is increasingly punctuated in Government Regulation No. 72/2005, which states that one of the financial sources of the village is “part of the financial balance of central and local received by regency / city to the village at least 10% (ten percent), after being reduced by employee expenses, which the distribution to every village proportionally as the village fund allocations “. This Clause regulation is used as a legal basis for the Village Fund Allocation (ADD).

The Village Fund Allocation (ADD) is certainly a mandate regulations to be implemented by the local regency / city. Although not all regencies / cities do it, but after the Government Regulation No. 72/2005 was born, more and more regencies / cities implement the policies following the the Village Fund Allocation.

ADD ( the Village Fund Allocation) certainly give an injection of fresh blood and pumping new impetus to the government and the villagers. The Village Fund Allocation (ADD) obviously becomes more advanced and more integrated with the regional planning and budgeting systems, and the funds did not come from debt.

This new innovation is inseparable from a variety of diverse encouragement: a regent initiatives, encouragement of the central government, technical assistance from donors, as well as the pressure from civil society and the local associations. Since the 2005 / 2006-2012, there is no reason for local governments to create policies of the Village Fund Allocation (ADD) because it has obtained the mandate, but there are still many who have not run the Village Fund Allocation (ADD) and the grass root community has not known what is the policy of the Village Fund Allocation (ADD).

Certainly the implementation of the Village Fund Allocation does not escape from many problems. One of them that arises is the gap between the regional planning with local needs and planning. When the Village Fund Allocation ideas start rolling generally the regency bureaucracy / municipal offices mainly technical controls policy and sectoral development budget, do strong resistance, not because of long-term vision, but because they feel they will loss some plots.

Psychological reluctance of technical offices is apparently still ongoing when the the Village Fund Allocation launched. By taking the shelter in the Village Fund Allocation , or because the village has had its own funds, technical offices get away from it and give less responsive to the needs of the village. On the other hand, other problems also arise in the village, especially the problem of the lack of government accountability in managing the Village Fund Allocation . Therefore, several regencies that have experienced on running the Village Fund Allocation or have just issued the policies of the Village Fund Allocation are extremely sensitive (read: worry) to the financial accountability of the village, forcing them to make signs more strict in the management of the Village Fund Allocation , although this step is not in accordance with the principle of managing block grant.

Although many of the problems and distortions arise, the Village Fund Allocation in many regencies still provide many valuable lessons that lead to the strengthening of the independence of the future village.

- First, the experience of the Village Fund Allocation has encouraged the reconstruction of the meaning and the format of the transfer of funds from the government supraDesa to the village.
- Second, the Village Fund Allocation has been pushing the efficiency of public service delivery, compliance programs to local needs, while also increasing local ownership.
- Third, the Village Fund Allocation is particularly relevant to one of the major objectives of decentralization, which brought the planning areas closer to the local community. Learning from the experience in several districts indicate that the Village Fund Allocation increasingly making planning more meaningful and dynamic village. Institutionally the Village Fund Allocation has brought changes to the regional planning aspects, namely the emergence of patterns of village planning. The impact, this pattern of development planning closer to the village community, and vice versa, the village had less access closer to the center of planning.
- Fourth, the Village Fund Allocation has become a new arena for local learning to manage decentralization.

But funds of the Village Fund Allocation are certainly not comparable with the problems of underdevelopment and poverty of people in the village, so that based on the calculation of nominal the Village Fund Allocation is only like “putting the salt to the sea”. The Fund amounting to 100 million to 200 million is obviously not enough to overcome the problem of poverty and lack of basic services. The Village Fund Allocation would not necessarily create equitable prosperity for all the people.

Implementation is an action or execution of a plan that has been prepared carefully and in detail. Implementation of planning is usually done after already considered fixed. Study of implementation is a process or program change ideas about the actions and how the possible ways to run the changes. Implementation of the policy is also a process of public policy that lead to the implementation of policies that have been created. In practice, the policy implementation is a very complex process, even less so politically charged due to the intervention of various interests. Eugene revealed the complexity of the implementation process as follows:

“It is enough to create a program and public policy that looks good on the paper. It is more difficult to formulate in words and slogans that sound awkward for the ears of the leaders and voters who listen to it. And it is much more difficult to implement in the form which satisfy everyone “(Agustino, 2006: 153).

The essence of the implementation of a series of activities planned and gradually carried out by the implementing agency to be based on the policy defined by the authority. It is as expressed by Mazmanian and Sabatier in their book

***Implementation and public policy*** published in 1983 defines the implementation of the policy as:

“The implementation of the basic policy decisions, usually in the form of legislation, but can also in form of orders or decisions of the important executive or judicial decision. Typically, the decision to identify issues to be addressed, mention is expressly goals or objectives to be achieved, and various ways to structure or organize the implementation process “(Agustino: 2006: 153)

Van Meter and Van Horn defines the implementation of the policy as follows:

“The actions carried out by public organizations aimed at achieving the objectives that have been set in the previous decision. These actions include the efforts to transform decisions into operational actions by a certain time and in order to continue efforts to achieve changes large and small that are set by policy decisions “(Agustino, 2006: 153).

## **MATERIALS AND METHODOLOGY**

### **Location Research**

The research location is determined intentionally (purposive) In West Bandung District. The choice of location is based on the consideration that West Bandung District could represent the people.

### **Population and Sample**

Method of sampling done is proportional random sampling method. Number of samples / respondents drawn is as many as 50 people including the Head of Village and the employees. This amount is deemed to have metas expressed by Singarimbun and Effendi (1995) that samples with greater than 30 are included in a large sample.

### **Method of collecting the data**

The data used in this research is quantitative and qualitative data that is the data obtained from both primary and secondary sources. The primary data is obtained by observation, questionnaires, and interviews. While secondary data is obtained from the village office, district offices, the West Bandung local Government, Stakeholders and other related institutions.

This study uses survey, by interview using a questionnaire. Sampling method in this research is done by using purposive sampling, the sampling technique with a certain consideration. The method can be used if the sources or respondents interviewed are people who are experts or working in a field, for example research on food then the data source or resource person is the person who dietitian (Sugiyono2010). Purposive sampling method or judgment, in which the determination of sample obtained from consideration of the interviewer, with a note that the respondents who were interviewed are people who are experts or working in the field of research that is being studied or the late respondent meets the criteria specified by the interviewer (Fauzi 2001).

$$n = \frac{N}{N(d2)+1}$$

The data used in this research is primary data and secondary data according to the governor (2011) in Yuliriane (2012), the primary data were the data obtained directly from study subjects using a measuring device or appliance makers as a source of information of data such as interviews, questionnaires, or observation. Secondary data were obtained with a literature study of the relevant agencies. Primary data were obtained from the respondent, while secondary data obtained from relevant agencies such as the Central Bureau of Statistics(BPS), the Local Government Office of West Bandung District , and the books that are relevant to the research.

### **Statistical Analysis**

Data obtained from the results of the study were analyzed using quantitative descriptive method. Descriptive method aims to tell and interpret data with respect to the situation in a systematic, factual and accurate information on the facts and the relationship between variables to get the truth, whereas quantitative methods aimed at raising the facts, state variables, and the phenomena that occur when current and present what their (Sugiono 2003).As for the criteria that should be analyzed in this study are described in the next section.The instrument by using the formula Pearson Product Moment Correlation (Pearson Product Moment Correlation).as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2\} \{N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2\}}}$$

Structural equation model to be tested take the form of  $Y = \sum y x_1 X_1 + \sum y x_2 X_2 + \sum y^2$ . And The Multiple Linear Regression Analysis as follows:  $Y = a + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \Sigma$ .

**RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS**

**1. Correlation between The Implementation of Policy (X1), the Development of Village Program(X2), with Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y)**

By usingSPSS17, it is known that there is a correlation coefficient multiple between variables. The Implementation of Policy (X1), the Development of Village Program(X2), with Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y) are showing the table as follows

**Table 1**  
**Correlations**

			<i>Strategy</i>	<i>Policy</i>	<i>Welfare</i>
Spearman's rho	Policy	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.732**	.821**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000
		N	55	55	55
	Development	Correlation Coefficient	.732**	1.000	.771**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000
		N	55	55	55
	Welfare	Correlation Coefficient	.821**	.771**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.
		N	55	55	55

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on Table 1, the results of correlation Kendall's tau b is known that variable The Implementation of Policy (X<sub>1</sub>) has a very close relationship with the variable Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y) of 0.938, or by 93.80% and variable The Development of Village Program (X<sub>2</sub>) also has close links with the variable Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y) of 0.874 or 87.40% and the Strategy (X<sub>1</sub>) has a close relationship with the variable The Development of Village Program (X<sub>2</sub>) of 0.817 or 81.70%.

Multiple correlation coefficient of 0.989 means that the relationship between The Implementation of Policy (X1), the Development of Village Program (X2), with Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y) is very close. Value R<sup>2</sup>=0, 989 means that changes to Improving the Welfare of the village society by 98.90% due to changes in the Implementation of policy (X<sub>1</sub>) and The Development of Village Program (X<sub>2</sub>).

**2. The Implementation of Policy ( X<sub>1</sub>) significant influence on Improving the Welfare of Village Society (Y)**

Based on the correlation data that the influence of variables The Implementation of Policy (X<sub>1</sub>) to Improving the Welfare of the Village society(Y) which is calculated with a correlation coefficient of 0,989 or (r<sub>x1y</sub>) = 0,989. This suggests the effect is very closely, when compared with the coefficient as follows:

1. 0,00 - 0,20 the relationship is very small and can be ignored
2. 0,20 - 0,40 small relationship (not tight)



- 3. 0,40 - 0,70 the relationship is moderate (close enough)
- 4. 0,70 - 0,90 tight relationship
- 5. 0,90 - 1,00 a very close relationship

Meanwhile, to declare the size of the contribution of variable  $X_1$  to Y variable or determinant coefficient =  $r^2 X$  100% or  $(0,766) 2 \times 100\% = 58,68\%$  while the remaining 41.32% is determined by other variables. Then to find significant levels of correlation coefficients  $X_1$  on Y with methods one side (one tailed) of output. Measured probability yields 0.00 figure. Because the probability is much below 0.05, then the influence of The Implementation to Improving the Welfare of the Village Society is significant.

**Table 2**  
**Model Summary<sup>b</sup>**

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adjusted R Square</i>	<i>Std. Error of the Estimate</i>	<i>Durbin-Watson</i>
1	.766 <sup>a</sup>	.806	.917	1.54556	.532

a. Predictors: (Constant), Implementation Policy, Development

b. Dependent Variable: Welfare

**Table 3**  
**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

<i>Model</i>		<i>Unstandardized Coefficients</i>		<i>Standardized Coefficients</i>			<i>Collinearity Statistics</i>	
		<i>B</i>	<i>Std. Error</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Tolerance</i>	<i>VIF</i>
1	(Constant)	1352	1.496		.509	.707		
	Implementation	.611	.319	.733	13.323	.000	.412	2.430
	Development	.427	.323	.723	9.284	.000	.412	2.430

a. Dependent Variable: Welfare

From the coefficient table illustrates that simple regression equation as follows:

$$\hat{Y} = a + b_2 x_2 = 13,52 + 0,723 X_2$$

Is:

$X_2$  = The Development of Village Program

Y = Improving the Welfare of the Village Society

Constants of 13,52 states that there is no increase in the value of the variable The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ), then the value of Improving the Welfare of the Village Society(Y) is 13,52. The regression coefficient of 0,723 states that any additions (for the sign+) of the scores or grades Quality of care would give rise to a score of 0,723.

t test to test the significance of constant and variable Y(Improving the Welfare of the Village Society). Coefficient test the following variables:

Ha: The Development of Village Program significantly affect Improving the Welfare of the Village Society

Ho: The Development of Village Program does not significantly affect Improving the Welfare of the Village Society

The hypothesis in statistical form:

Ha :  $r_{x_2y} \neq 0$

Ho :  $r_{x_2y} = 0$

Basis for decision making: by comparing the value of arithmetic with table as follows:

If the t count > t table, then Ho is rejected it means a significant regression coefficient

If the value of < t table, then Ho accepted means of regression coefficients were not significant

Value=7.230 (taken at coefficient value for the variable ( $X_2$ ))

\* The level of significance ( $\hat{\alpha}$ ) =0.05

\* df (degrees of freedom) amount  $n-2=55-2=53$

\* Test done one side, so that the value table=1.671

**Decision:** Because the value of count > t table, or 7,230 > 1.671, then Ho is rejected seen in the column sig (significant) coefficient sig 0.000 or less than the probability value 0.05 or 0.05 value > 0,000, then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted meaning that the regression coefficient is significant. Thus The Development of Village Program significantly affect Improving the Welfare of the Village Society.

Thus the regression equation is:

$$\hat{Y} = a + b_1x_1 + b_2x_2 = 13,52 + 0,766 X_1 + 0,723X_2$$

is :

$X_1$  = The Implementation of Policy

$X_2$  = The Development of Village Programs

Y = Improving the Welfare of the Village Society

Constants of 16.44 states that if there is no increase in the value of the variable The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ), then the value of Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y) is 13,52. The regression coefficient to f 0,766 and 0,723 states. That any additions (for the sign+) of the scores or grades The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ), will give rise to a score of 0,766 and 0,723

### 3. **The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ), together –equally significant influence on Improving the Welfare of the Village Society(Y)**

F test in the ANOVA table to test the significance of the constants and the dependent variable (Improving the Welfare of the Village Society). Test criteria regression coefficient of the Implementation of Policy and The Development of Village Programs to Improving the Welfare of the Village Society is as follows:

Hypothesis to three proposed is

Ha: The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ) together – equally significant influence on Improving the Welfare of the Village Society(Y)

Ho: The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ) together - equally not significant influence on Improving the Welfare of the Village Society(Y)

The hypothesis in statistical form:

Ha :  $r_{x_1x_2y} \neq 0$

Ho :  $r_{x_1x_2y} = 0$

**Table 4**  
**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

<i>Model</i>		<i>Sum of Squares</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Mean Square</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	Regression	6979.349	2	3489.675	1023.433	.000 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	156.936	55	2.092		
	Total	7136.286	53			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Implementation Policy, Development program

b. Dependent Variable: Welfare

Taken from the table anova<sup>b</sup> F count=10,23 Basic decision-making: by comparing the value of F arithmetic with F table value, as follows:

If F count > F table, then Ho is rejected it means a significant regression coefficient

If the value of F arithmetic < F table, then Ho accepted means of regression coefficients were not significant. Finding the value of F calculated using the F table with the formula:

Significance level ( $\alpha$ ) = 0.05 significance level ( $\alpha$ ) = 0,05

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\text{table}} &= F(1 - \alpha)(dk=k), (dk = n-k-1) \\ &= F(1 - \alpha)(dk = 3), (dk = 55 - 2 - 1) \\ &= F(1 - 0,05)(3, 52) \end{aligned}$$

How to find F table = 3, as the numerator and the denominator 52

F table = 4.08 (interpolation)

**Decision :** It turned out that F count > F table, or 10,23 > 4.08 then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted that The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ) together - equally significant influence on Improving the Welfare of the Village Society(Y). It appears that at column Sig (a significant) in the table Anova<sup>b</sup> the Sig. 0,000 or smaller than the probability value 0.05 or 0.05 value > 0.000, then Ho is rejected and Ha accepted, meaning that multiple regression coefficient is significant. So The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ) together – equally significant influence on Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y)

## CONCLUSION

And discussion of research findings indicate various conclusions as follow:

1. That there is a relationship / correlation is very strong / strong between The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs( $X_2$ ) together with variable Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y) of 0.766 or 76,60% and the remaining 23.40% are other factors that are not included in the research model (Epsilon).
2. That there is significant influence of variables The Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) to Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y)
3. That there is significant influence of variables The Development of Village Programs ( $X_2$ ) on Improving the Welfare of the Village Society (Y)
4. That Implementation of Policy ( $X_1$ ) and The Development of Village Programs(  $X_2$ ) there is significant influence of variables together toward Improving the Welfare of the SVillage Society (Y)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We are gratefully acknowledged to Local Government of West Bandung . Special thanks to the Regent of the respective Public Administration Institution,Local Government of West Bandung District and all subjects who participated in the study are gratefully acknowledged. Conflict of interest declaration: There is no conflict of interest among the authors. Funding: This study received no specific grant from any funding agency.

Authors' contributions Bambang Sudaryana, conception of study, data collection, analysis and interpretation of results, drafting of manuscript, review of manuscript and interpretation of results.

## REFERENCES

### ***Government Regulation***

- Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 43 Tahun 2014 tentang Peraturan Pelaksana Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 60 Tahun 2014 tentang Dana Desa Yang Bersumber Dari Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara <http://finance.detik.com/read/2014/12/24/191301/2787058/4/jokowi-naikkan-dana-desa-122-jadi-rp-20-triliun-di-2015>,
- Jokowi Naikkan Dana Desa 122% Jadi Rp 20 Triliun di 2015, Maikel Jefriando, Diakses Tanggal 03 Maret 2015. <http://desa.membangun.or.id/2014/04/tata-kelola-desa-dalam-uu-desa/>,
- Tata Kelola Desa Dalam Undang-Undang Desa, Diakses pada tanggal 17 Februari 2015. <http://bedisasrawan.blogspot.com/2014/07/16-pengertian-desa-menurut-para-abli.html>,
- Sasrawan, 16 Pengertian Desa Menurut Para Ahli, diakses tanggal 17 Februari 2015. <http://bpkad.lamongankab.go.id/?p=2415>,
- Undang-Undang Desa dan Implikasinya, diakses tanggal 03 Maret 2015. <http://Republika.co.id>, Penggunaan Dana Desa Diaudit BPK, Diakses tanggal 20 Februari 2015. <http://Antaranews.com>,
- Menteri Marwan siapkan petunjuk penggunaan dana desa, Diakses tanggal 20 Februari 2015. <http://www.setarajambi.org>, Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa : Harapan dan Kekhawatiran, diakses tanggal 19 Maret 2015. <http://www.kompas.com>,
- Sabrina Asril, Mulai 2015, Pemerintah Rencanakan Dana Desa Rp 20 Triliun, diakses tanggal 03 Maret 2015. <http://www.antaranews.com/berita/483372/bpk-belum-siapkan-regulasi-pemeriksaan-dana-desa>,

- Rosa, BPK Belum Siapkan Regulasi Pemeriksaan Dana Desa, diakses tanggal 24 Maret 2015. <http://www.kancantaradio.com/?p=915>, BPK Akan Ikut Audit Dana Desa, diakses tanggal 24 Maret 2015. 28 Tulisan Hukum/UJDIH/Imelda Reaso <http://kartonmedia.blogspot.com/2014/02/keistimewaan-undang-undang-desa-terbaru.html>,
- Keistimewaan Undang-Undang Desa Terbaru No. 6 Tahun 2014, diakses tanggal 24 Maret 2015. <http://www.mediakalimantan.com/artikel-751-alokasi-dana-desa-dan-tantangannya.html>,
- Sopian Hadi SH, Alokasi Dana Desa dan Tantangannya, diakses tanggal 11 Mei 2015.