Analysis of the Factors Affecting Poverty in Cinunuk Village

Chindchanok Anantamongkolkul[1]
Phuket Rajabhat University

Kanyapat Pattanapokinsakul[2]
Phuket Rajabhat University

Correspondence : Chncdchanok Anantamongkolkul (chidchanok.a@pkru.ac.th)

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to identify the elements that contribute to poverty in Cinunuk Village, Cileunyi District, and Sumedang Regency, either independently or concurrently. This study employs quantitative methodologies, including descriptive and linear approaches. The Slovin model was used to determine the sample size in this investigation. Validity and reliability tests are used to evaluate data processing processes. The SPSS application was used to examine the data. The study's findings show that if natural resources are not properly managed, they can have a negative impact on poverty levels; human resources include the quality and quantity of a region's workforce; and human resources who do not have access to education, skills, and training will find it difficult to obtain welfare.

Keywords: Poverty , Education , Skills , Human Resources

Introduction

During the conventional economic era, the rate of rise in gross national product (GNP), both as a whole and on an individual basis, was the sole measure by which economic growth was evaluated (Mahendra, 2017). It is assumed that an increase in GNP will naturally result in the creation of jobs and other economic opportunities, thereby promoting the many conditions required to produce a more equitable distribution of the benefits of economic and social growth (Achmad et al., 2022; Fretes, 2017). The term "trickledown effect" relates to this basic principle. Meanwhile, the new economic view maintains that the primary goal of economic development is not only to increase the gross national product (GNP), but also to reduce poverty, eliminate income inequality, and provide employment within the context of a growing economy (Hanandita & Tampubolon, 2016; Todaro, 2000).

Natural and human resources are crucial issues in development because, on the one hand, they can be an asset or capital for development, but they can also be a burden for development. To produce a multiplier impact for economic improvement, the resources owned must be of high quality (Achmad, 2022a; Prasetyo, 2008). In contrast, low resource quality might be one of the causes of low income, which has an impact on the income middle trap in Indonesia. In Indonesia, the dimension of human development stresses education, health, and mental revolution. Where the implication is the problem of poverty and unemployment (Saputra, 2017).

Even in some developing countries, a lack of knowledge is one of the root reasons of economic poverty. According to Kurniawan and Managi (2018), the causes of poverty traps in Indonesia are education, health, geographic conditions, total assets, and social capital. Poverty is a national issue that must be addressed immediately; poverty is clearly at the foundation of many social problems in

Indonesia (Nasution, 2014). Poverty is permanent or occurs on a regular basis. Even the SDGs (sustainable development goals), which aim to be a continuation of the MDGs (millennium development goals), highlight poverty as a development goal (Achmad, 2022; Ishatono & Raharjo, 2016). Poverty is one of the MDGs agenda items that will not be resolved until 2025.

In comparison to other regional countries, Indonesia's rapid economic expansion in the recent decade has not been able to considerably lower poverty levels. Indonesia's economic growth has not delivered quality economic growth capable of considerably reducing poverty and creating broad employment possibilities, nor has it eradicated the level of imbalance between the rich and the poor (Prianto, 2020).

Because of the complexities of the poverty issue, integrated policies and strategies are required, such as initiatives to promote productive employment prospects, human empowerment, and ease of access to current socioeconomic chances (Indra, 2001). Poverty alleviation programs and poverty-focused policies require a priority scale due to various government constraints. Poverty has been highlighted and is the subject of much debate. The diverse definitions of poverty reflect a range of ideological viewpoints. A quantitative approach to defining poverty has also been hotly discussed by a number of experts interested in the subject.

Suparlan (2000) defines poverty as "the complete lack of valuable assets and objects suffered by a person or group of people living in an environment that is all poor or lacks capital, in terms of money, knowledge, social power, politics, the law, and access to facilities." Government services, economic opportunities, and employment. Furthermore, poverty is defined as a condition in which individuals or groups lack the ability, freedom, assets, and access to satisfy their future needs and are very sensitive to dangers and pressures such as disease and abrupt spikes in the cost of food and school fees.

There are various types of poverty, depending on the target group. This sort of poverty classification is aimed to guarantee that each program objective has different purposes and objectives. Sumodiningrat (1999) divides poverty into three categories: absolute poverty (income below the poverty line and inability to meet basic needs), relative poverty (poverty situation above the poverty line based on the distance between the poor and non-poor in a community), and structural poverty (this poverty occurs when people or groups of people are hesitant to improve their living conditions until assistance is provided to push them out of these conditions).

Sumedang Regency is a district in the process of development. The purpose of development is to improve community welfare and bring services closer to the people. Even though the government's aims are good, the community still has social problems such as an imbalance in income distribution, problems with education and health services, illiteracy, stunting, and illegal labor, all of which contribute to the problem of communal poverty. Soesilo et al. (2008); Yudhistira & Sofiyandi (2018) believe that the greatest poverty is in rural areas, hence there are policies that can help the community.

Cinunuk hamlet in Sumedang district is an example of a community's inability to meet basic and other needs. The agriculture industry provides a living for the majority of the residents in Cinunuk village. The agricultural pattern of the town is conventional, with crops oriented toward short-lived crops such as rice, corn, and beans. Due to the restricted production scale, the farming method is oriented toward self-consumption rather than market consumption. People's lifestyles have been passed down from generation to generation, and the processing approach has not changed in response to improvements in science and technology. The upshot is limited production capacity, self-consumption for households in the near term, people's earnings decreasing and becoming unstable, and as a result, many people remain impoverished. The World Bank defines poverty as earning less than $2 per day.

Meanwhile, the Indonesian government defines poverty as having an income of less than US$1 per day for urban people and less than US$80 per day for rural residents (Majid et al., 2019; Soesilo et al., 2008).

Another aspect that lends credence to the idea is that the majority of the Cinunuk village community receives government social assistance in cash for parents (BLT), community health insurance help (Jamkesmas), and educational assistance for school children. The goal is to use the general public and schoolchildren as a catalyst to fulfill the right to education, health, food, sanitation, and clean water. Various real government initiatives for the needy are still being carried out, including help programs for beneficiaries of livable housing, as well as assistance for animals or pets such as cows and goats as a support for the family's future.

Poor people's efforts to get out of poverty via various methods. The causes of community poverty are limited natural resources because rainfall has a very short time limit, human resources due to minimal creation of economic opportunities, minimal economic infrastructure such as markets, and regulatory factors that are unfavorable to small communities. The study's goal was to investigate the impact of natural resources, human resources, and infrastructure on poverty.

Methods

For this investigation, a quantitative methodology was used. The investigation was conducted out in Cinunuk Village, which is located in the Sumedang Regency. Following the Slovin formula calculations, it was established that the study had a population of 175 people and a sample size of 100 people. Secondary data received from the Cinunuk village office, which pertains to poverty and other data, is another piece of corroborating evidence. The two types of analysis techniques used here are simple linear regression and multiple linear regression. The analytic tool allows you to determine the effect of the independent variable (X) on the dependent variable (Y) partially and concurrently.

Descriptive statistics and multiple regression were employed to analyze the data. Multiple regression is used to quantify the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable when descriptive statistics are employed to explain the data. The Validity and Reliability tests are used in this study. The Classical Assumption test, which included the Normality, Multicollinearity, and Heteroscedasticity tests, as well as the Autocorrelation test, was then performed (Deny, 2008).

Following that, multiple linear regression testing was performed using the F statistical test. If the sig. 0.05, the research model is considered practical, and it may be concluded that all independent variables have a simultaneous influence on the dependent variable. Meanwhile, if the sig. each independent variable is 0.05 in the t test, it can be argued that the independent factors have some influence on the dependent variable (Ghozali, 2013). The findings of this study are used to assess how indicators can represent variables in a variety of criteria..

Results and Discussion

Natural resources have an impact on the lives of living things around or in other words natural resources have an important role in life including humans and other needs. Likewise, uncontrolled exploitation will have an impact on the environment and the sustainability of humans and other living things. As stated by Ilyasa et al. (2020); Wijaya et al. (2020), that excessive exploitation of natural resources creates a serious effect on the poverty level of the surrounding community. This is because natural damage affects the availability of water sources, drought, erosion and agricultural production capacity has decreased drastically.

The results showed that the poverty of the Cinunuk village community was due to excessive resource exploitation due to traditional and shifting agricultural patterns. The effect is that drought always hits agricultural areas and possible actions for the development of market-based agricultural cultivation are very limited. The majority of the people who work as farmers can only utilize short-lived agricultural crops (rice, corn and beans) for a limited period of time because the rainy season is very

short. The following is the result of an analysis of the factors that influence the level of poverty in Cinunuk Village, Sumedang District (Table 1).

Table 1. Results of Analysis of Natural Resources for Poor Families

Constant	Regression Coefficient	Regression Coefficient Value (R)	R Square (R^2)	Adjusted R Square	Sig. Value
2,443	0.087	0.045	0.002	0.007	0.459

The correlation coefficient (R) between the variables of natural resources and poverty is 0.045, indicating that the association between natural resources and poverty is relatively weak. Furthermore, the R Square value (coefficient of determination) is 0.002, indicating that natural resources may explain 0.2% of the variation between high and low levels of the poor population, while the remaining 99.8% is explained by other variables.

Unstandardized The coefficients obtained a Constant value of 2.443 and a natural resource coefficient value of 0.087, indicating that if natural resources change by one unit, the poor population changes by 0.087 units, implying that 8.7% of the size of the poor population variable (y) is influenced by the source variable natural resources (x1) and the remaining 91.3% is influenced by other x variables not included in this research model. While 2.443 indicates that if the value of the natural resource variable does not change, the poor population variable will remain at 2.443. This number is used to evaluate the regression coefficient to see if natural resource factors have a meaningful effect. The generated t value is compared to the t table value or probability (Sig) at a level of 0.05, and the t value is used to assess the regression coefficient. The analysis results show that the t value for the natural resource variable is lower than the t table (0.459 1.983), indicating that the hypothesis is not supported and that the natural resource variable has no significant impact on those who are economically disadvantaged.

These findings contrast those of Ilyasa et al. (2020), who found that as natural resources increase, the poor population decreases, and as natural resources diminish, the poor population increases. This is reinforced by the premise that natural resources have a small impact on the poor, given that the impoverished own very little land, have very few cattle, and grow very few crops. As a result, the number of poor will either remain constant or increase from year to year. According to the notion of kinds of poverty According to Hadi et al., (2015); Todaro, (2000), there are two types of poverty depending on their nature: natural poverty and artificial poverty. Natural poverty is produced by a lack of natural resources, but artificial poverty is caused by a modernizing system that denies people numerous opportunity to employ current resources.

Human resources are another aspect that has a significant impact on community poverty. According to Aziz et al. (2016), human resources have a key role in development. This indicates that when it comes to addressing poverty, the human resource aspect is critical in developing answers. Table 2 shows the findings of research and analysis of human resource data on poverty in Takarai village.

Table 2. Results of Human Resource Analysis for Poor Families

Constant	Regression Coefficient	Regression Coefficient Value (R)	R Square (R^2)	Adjusted RSquare	Sig. Value
2,433	0.127	0.089	0.0079	-0.001	0.363

The correlation coefficient (R) between the variable human resources and the poor is 0.089, indicating that the association between human resources and the poor is extremely weak. Furthermore, the R Square (coefficient of determination) value is 0.0079, indicating that the variation between high and low levels of poverty is 0.79%, which may be explained by human resources, and the remaining 99.21% by other variables.

The constant value for unstandardized coefficients was 2,433, while the human resource coefficient value was 0.127. It was explained that if human resources changed by one unit, the poor population changed by 0.127, implying that the variable size of the poor (Y) was influenced by the human resource variable (X2). While the number of 2.433 indicates that if the value of the human resource variable does

not change, the poor population variable will remain at 2.433. By comparing the estimated t value to the t table value or probability (Sig) at a significance level of 0.05, this value is utilized to assess whether or not the human resource variable has a significant effect on the regression coefficient. The analysis results show that the t value for the human resource variable is less than the t table (0.089 1.983) at 95% confidence level, or the probability value is 0.363 > 0.005, indicating that the hypothesis is rejected and the resource variable is not significantly related to the dependent variable. Humans have little effect on the destitute.

Sumarsono (2009) says, based on his thesis, that human resources have an impact on the poor since human resources include people who can supply services or work. Being competent to work includes being accountable for actions with monetary worth; these activities offer commodities and services to meet societal needs. Based on the preceding statement, it is possible to conclude that human resources are unimportant for the poor, because other factors affect the poor, such as the distance between the school and their place of residence, which leads to a sense of hopelessness and a lack of sufficient funds, so that many poor people still rely on primary school education. According to this belief, persons with a greater level of education will have access to better jobs and higher pay.

Another key indication that leads to poverty reduction is the availability of infrastructure (Purnomo et al., 2021). The availability of natural resources and the readiness of human resources are insufficient without the support of infrastructure (Table 3).

Table 3. Results of Infrastructure Analysis for Poor Families

Constant	Regression Coefficient	Regression Coefficient Value (R)	R Square (R^2)	Adjusted RSquare	Sig. Value
1,331	0.433	0.254	0.065	0.054	0.008

The correlation coefficient (R) between the infrastructure variable and the poor is 0.254, indicating a weak association between infrastructure and the poor. Furthermore, the R Square value (coefficient of determination) is 0.065, indicating that the range between high and low levels of poverty is 6.5%, which may be explained by Infrastructure, and the rest 93.5% by other variables.

The constant value of 1.331 and the infrastructure coefficient value of 0.433 can be interpreted as follows: if the infrastructure changes by one unit, the impoverished population changes by 0.433. This means that infrastructure influences 43.3% of the magnitude of the poor population variable, whereas the remaining 56.7% is influenced by other X variables not included in the research model. Meanwhile, the value of 1.331 shows that the value of the variable indicating the impoverished population will remain stable at 1.331 even if the value of the infrastructure variable does not change.

The study's findings show that the actual t value for the education level variable is greater than the t table value (0.254>1.983) in terms of degrees of freedom. This shows that the hypothesis can be accepted, implying that the variable has a link with education level. The lack of proper infrastructure has a significant influence on the less fortunate.

According to (Mardiana et al., 2018), because infrastructure is the engine that propels economic progress, it has an impact on low-income areas. Infrastructure development as the major underpinning for social and economic systems occurs in an environment that is both linked and comprehensive. It is hard to separate a country's economic growth rate from the availability of infrastructure, which comprises, among other things, transportation, telecommunications, energy, and sanitation. This industry's expansion must come first since it provides the framework for future economic success.

Conclusion

Several conclusions can be reached based on the research findings and subsequent discussion of the factors that determine poverty in Cinunuk village, Cileunyi sub-district, Sumedang district. These findings include the findings that natural resource variables have no influence on the poor, human resource variables have no effect on the poor, and infrastructure has a large effect on the poor. There are

other aspects that are not observable that contribute to the complexity of the issue of community poverty, in addition to natural resources, human resources, and infrastructure. expanding the capability of natural resources to reduce poverty; expanding the amount of human resources to reduce poverty; and restricted infrastructural availability, resulting in an ever-increasing number of people living in poverty.

References

Achmad, W. (2022a). Dimensi sosial dalam pengembangan masyarakat di wilayah pesisir. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, *6*(2), 4985-4994.

Achmad, W. (2022b). Social action and social solidarity: Community empowerment in the digital age. *Neo Journal of Economy and Social Humanities*, *1*(3), 30–35.

Achmad, W., Nurwati, N., Fedryansyah, M., & Sumadinata, R. W. S. (2022). Women's Social Capital for Empowering Poor Households. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, *6*(1).

Aziz, G. A., Rochaida, E., & Warsilan, W. (2016). Faktor faktor yang mempengaruhi kemiskinan di Kabupaten Kutai Kartanegara. *INOVASI*, *12*(1), 29–48.

Fretes, P. N. D. (2017). Pengaruh dana perimbangan, pendapatan asli daerah, dan pertumbuhan ekonomi terhadap indeks pembangunan manusia di Kabupaten Kepulauan Yapen. *Jurnal Akuntansi & Ekonomi FE. UN PGRI Kediri*, *2*(2), 1–33.

Ghozali, I. (2013). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate dengan Program IBM SPSS 21 Update PLS Regresi*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Hadi, R., Wahyudin, U., Ardiwinata, J. S., & Abdu, W. J. (2015). Education and microfinance: an alternative approach to the empowerment of the poor people in Indonesia. *SpringerPlus*, *4*(1), 1–9.

Hanandita, W., & Tampubolon, G. (2016). Multidimensional poverty in Indonesia: Trend over the last decade (2003–2013). *Social Indicators Research*, *128*(2), 559–587.

Ilyasa, F., Zid, M., & Miarsyah, M. (2020). Pengaruh eksploitasi sumber daya alam perairan terhadap kemiskinan pada masyarakat nelayan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Lingkungan Dan Pembangunan*, *21*(1), 43–58.

Indra, P. (2001). *An Analysis Towards Urban Poverty Alleviation Program in Indonesia*. University of Southern California.

Ishatono, I., & Raharjo, S. T. (2016). Sustainable development goals (SDGs) dan pengentasan kemiskinan.
Share: Social Work Journal, *6*(2), 159.

Kurniawan, R., & Managi, S. (2018). Economic growth and sustainable development in Indonesia: an assessment. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, *54*(3), 339–361.

Mahendra, A. (2017). Analisis pengaruh pertumbuhan ekonomi, pendapatan perkapita, inflasi dan pengangguran terhadap jumlah penduduk miskin. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi & Keuangan*, 113–138.

Majid, M. S. A. M., Dewi, S., & Kassim, S. H. (2019). Does financial development reduce poverty? Empirical evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, *10*(3), 1019–1036.

Mardiana, M., Militina, T., & Utary, A. R. (2018). Analisis pengaruh pengeluaran pemerintah daerah sektor pendidikan dan kesehatan serta infrastruktur terhadap tingkat pengangguran serta

tingkat kemiskinan. *Inovasi*, *13*(1), 50–60.

Nasution, Z. (2014). Pertumbuhan ekonomi dan kemiskinan. *ECOBISMA (Jurnal Ekonomi, Bisnis Dan*

Manajemen), *1*(2), 1–10.

Prasetyo, P. E. (2008). The quality of growth: Peran teknologi dan investasi human capital sebagai pemacupertumbuhan ekonomi berkualitas. *JEJAK: Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Kebijakan*, *1*(1).

Prianto, A. (2020). Menakar kualitas pertumbuhan ekonomi Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Usahawan Indonesia*, *42*(1), 23.

Purnomo, S. D., Wijaya, M., & Setiawan, H. (2021). Infrastruktur dan kemiskinan di Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Majalah Imiah Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *18*(1), 10–19.

Saputra, R. (2017). Knowledge spillover terhadap pertumbuhan ekonomi di Aceh. *Jurnal Ilmiah MahasiswaEkonomi Pembangunan*, *2*(2), 276–284.

Soesilo, Y. H., Suman, A., & Kaluge, D. (2008). Penyebab kemiskinan masyarakat tani (studi di Dusun Ngebrong, desa Tawangsari, Kecamatan Pujon, Kabupaten Malang). *Journal of Indonesian Applied Economics*, *2*(1).

Sumarsono, S. (2009). *Teori dan kebijakan publik ekonomi sumber daya manusia*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.Sumodiningrat, G. (1999). *Kemiskinan: teori, fakta, dan kebijakan*. Impa.

Suparlan, P. (2000). Kemiskinan perkotaan dan alternatif penanganannya. *Seminar Forum Perkotaan: Departemen Permukiman Dan Prasarana Wilayah*.

Todaro, M. P. (2000). *Pembangunan ekonomi di dunia ketiga edisi ketujuh*. Jakarta: erlangga.

Wijaya, D. R., Paramita, N. L. P. S. P., Uluwiyah, A., Rheza, M., Zahara, A., & Puspita, D. R. (2020). Estimating city-level poverty rate based on e-commerce data with machine learning. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 1–27.

Yudhistira, M. H., & Sofiyandi, Y. (2018). Seaport status, port access, and regional economic development in Indonesia. *Maritime Economics & Logistics*, *20*(4), 549–568.