



THE ANALYSIS ON VILLAGE FUND USE ALLOCATION IN PROMOTING SOCIAL RESILIENCE, ECONOMIC RESILIENCE AND ENVIROMENTAL RESILIENCE AT JENEPONTO REGENCY

¹Santi Bantaeng, ²Didi Rukmana, ³Indraswati Tri Abdireviane

¹*Magister of Resource Economics, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia. E-mail: santy.bantaenk@gmail.com*

²*Economics and Business Faculty, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia.*

³*Economics and Business Faculty, Hasanuddin University, Indonesia.*

KeyWords

Community Development, Economic Resilience, Enviromental Resilience, Social Resilience, Village Development, Village Fund.

ABSTRACT

The research aimed at investigating and describing the influence of the village fund use allocation in the fields of the village development and empowerment on the improvement of the social resilience, economic resilience and enviromental resilience atand empowerment on the improvement of the social resilience, economic resilience and enviromental resilience at Jeneponto Regency.

Data used in the research were the secondary data with the multiple linier regression method representing the combination of the time series data of 2017 and 2018 and the cross section of 74 villages at Jeneponto Regency. The data were analysed using Chow's test and Hausman's test to the obtain the regression result by the method of the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) and Random Effect Model (REM).

The research result indicates that the village fund use allocation in the field of the village development has the positive influence of the social resilience and economic resilience, but it has the negative effect in the enviromental resilience. Whereas, the village fund use allocation in the field of the community empowerment does not have the influence on the social resilience, economic resilience and enviromental resilience at Jeneponto Regency.

I. Introduction

The village is a place where various kinds of national economic development are available, where the village can be used as a benchmark in the form of community welfare development in general. Some consider village development to be a place of development and development, which means building good infrastructure for human development. This also underlies the village community no longer needs to leave the village potential because it will automatically create jobs there.

In rural areas there are various problems and needs of the community ranging from problems of education, health, economy, environment and others. The community hopes to be free from these problems. Meanwhile, in the village there are actually a variety of potential resources, there are potential natural resources or environmental resources, human resources, development resources and social resources. Village development covers various fields of community life. Development includes the private citizens and their environment, development to improve the welfare of its citizens (Labombang, 2011).

Seeing this, it is deemed necessary for government support and protection of rights in the village in the hope that the village can become stronger, independent, democratic, advanced and competitive so as to create a solid foundation of life in carrying out the development process and governance in the village towards a just society prosperous and prosperous.

According to Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, defining villages and customary villages or what are referred to by other names, hereinafter referred to as villages, is a legal community unit that has the territorial limits that are authorized to regulate and administer government affairs, the interests of local communities based on community initiatives, original rights, and / or traditional rights recognized and respected in the system of government of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia.

Village progress is a benchmark and / or parameter for the development of the Indonesian nation. For this reason, since the enactment of village regulations, the source of budgeting to villages originating from the state budget is called village funds, which are directly managed in the village by the village government together with the community through programs and activities to develop village infrastructure infrastructure and empower the village community both at the education, health, village spatial planning, agriculture, animal husbandry, and informatics transportation sectors in accordance with village authority. This is to be able to answer the problem of poverty and vulnerability resulting from development inequality that has occurred. Thus, development activities in the village will run more smoothly because it has been supported by the existence of stimulant funds from the government so that it is not impossible that development will be centered and start from the bottom starting from the village to the area and will be seen as a whole as a chain of economic growth from the development of a village one with the other village. This can also encourage the creation of a holistic and sustainable development from both the social, economic and environmental aspects.

In fact, the government that seeks to make the village independent through development programs and community empowerment and through the allocation of village funds sourced from the APBN has not been able to release dependency and underdevelopment status to develop or advance and become independent. Benchmarks for backwardness can be seen from the measurement of village development which is carried out annually through the Village Development Index (IDM).

The Village Development Index (IDM) is an index used to determine the development of village development from three aspects of development using three dimensions of development namely the Social Resilience Index (IKS), the Economic Resilience Index (IKE) and the Environmental Resilience Index (IKL). IDM then made a benchmark for evaluating the implementation of development in the village at the expense of government spending. Through the Village Development Index (IDM), it has become a concern for the government aimed at poverty alleviation, equitable development, and reduction of disadvantaged villages as well as increasing rural development to become more developed and independent villages (Hamidi, 2015)

Jeneponto Regency is one of the many districts in Indonesia that is responsive to village demands. Since 2015 Jeneponto Regency has allocated funds for villages called Dana Desa (DD), as transfer funds sourced from the central government to villages as stimulant funds in the hope that development will be more evenly distributed to the village level. Not only that, the villages with underdeveloped status each year get additional funds called affirmation funds to help release out of underdeveloped status. Given the amount of village funds channeled with a large enough value, the government in stages needs to evaluate the effectiveness of the allocation, management and use of village funds, whether village funds have a significant impact on improving public infrastructure, employment in the village and on community empowerment and village institutional development that has implications for social, economic and environmental resilience in Jeneponto Regency.

In addition to the increasing village budget each year, through government policies directed to spend / budget activities based on the priority scale of needs. The purpose of prioritizing the use of village funds every year is to facilitate and oversee village development in achieving the direction of government policies as set out in the 2014-2019 RPJMN in accordance with village needs and village typologies in achieving the level of development and village independence in all aspects. This is also intended to bring villages out of the status of disadvantage in order to be more developed, advanced and independent.

The village fund policy is a new policy but originated from the development of previous policies aimed at improving the welfare of rural communities, the quality of human life, and poverty alleviation. Such policies are generally supported by funding from the World Bank in the context of poverty alleviation and achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) goals. Judging from its purpose, the village funding policy has similarities as in Myanmar (2011) called the Local Development Funds policy. Similar to village funds, LDFs are fiscal policies that are carried out through inter-government fund transfers, by providing development funds directly to local governments and communities. LDFs are used to fund small-scale infrastructure projects such as bridges and inter-village connecting roads, drainage, drinking water and irrigation projects (Robertson, et.al. 2015). Whereas in Laos it is called Village Devel-

opment Funds or VDCs in the form of soft assistance sourced from the World Bank and the Finnish government which aims to alleviate poverty (Paavola, 2012).

However, in this study it was found that threats and challenges that need to be addressed through such a large village budget are how village funds have a positive impact in increasing rural social, economic and environmental resilience and are able to contribute to bringing Jeneponto out of underdeveloped status.

II. Theoretical Review

The village is used as an object in village development with centralized planning. The Village Law was then born as one solution to overcome various problems in the village in the economic, political, socio-cultural and environmental fields. Furthermore, as one of the efforts to accelerate village development in the context of accelerating public welfare and intellectual life of the nation and of course as part of the revised agenda for law number 32 of 2004 concerning regional government. Village development is an effort to improve the quality of life and life for the maximum welfare of the village community (Village Law, 2014).

The important meaning of village development is to create a more prosperous and independent village, increase the role of village government officials in supporting regional autonomy, realize the village as the frontline in nation development and increase community participation in development starting from the planning, implementation and control stages. According to Nurman (2015) there are three rural development models, namely: first the "Community Development" model. this model teaches rural populations about social, economic and political skills to create a modern society. Both models are "People's Participation in Development". This model is an empowerment or community empowerment that carries the theme of development from below or community participation known as the term "boot-up". The three "Decentralized" models in which the central government gives authority to lower level local governments to carry out planned programs.

According to Gant in Suryono (2001), the purpose of development is twofold. First, development is essentially to save poverty. If this goal has begun to be obtained, then this means new opportunities to succeed and all needs are met. To achieve the success of the development, several aspects or things must be considered, which must be agreed by the community involved in development. This means that, if the community is involved in development planning, there will be control over the development.

Rural Social Development Theory

According to Koentjaraningrat (1984), the village is interpreted as a small community that stays permanently somewhere. Another opinion about the village was stated by Hayami and Kikuchi (1987), that the village is the basic unit of life for the smallest groups in Asia. The meaning of the village in this context is emphasized on aspects of social and economic dependence in the community which are represented by important concepts in the village community, namely the scope that is small and dependency in the social and economic fields.

Landis (1948), proposed three village definitions for different analytical purposes, namely statistical analysis, social psychological analysis and economic analysis. Meanwhile, according to Roucek and Warren (1962), it states that to understand the village community can be seen from the characteristics: the magnitude of the role of primary groups, geographical factors as the basis for group formation, relationships are intimate and lasting, homogeneous, families as economic units and populations of children in greater proportion. In addition, to be able to see villages in a categorical context, there are various types of villages such as self-help villages, self-help villages and self-sufficient villages.

Social resilience is the ability of a community to overcome risks due to social, economic and political changes. According to Baharsyah (1999), a form of community resilience in the future is the fulfillment of community needs for total dynamic, sensitive and comprehensive social services, the formation of a social development system for each individual so that they are able to make automatic adjustments to social change very quickly, while improving the quality of human life in accordance with universal human rights.

Rural Economic Development Theory

Economic development must be widely seen and include all aspects of life in it. Through the concept of economic development, the direction and strategy of development has shifted to a new development strategy with a focus on integrated rural development, intermediate technology, appropriate education, labor for expansion, small industries and export promotion, employment generation, nutrition and health development, social and human resources development, income distribution and institutional change (Kian, 1983).

Rural Environment Development Theory

Rural development that has an environmental impact is a process of creating a rural environment that not only stands up and advances the economy of its people but also creates an ecological system of sustainable development that is development that does no harm and negatively impacts the environment.

The concept of sustainable development (sustainable development) is development (economic growth) which emphasizes aspects of economic development and environmental aspects that are integrated into the socio-cultural aspects. Therefore, proportional development is sustainable development which contains three aspects, namely: economic, environmental and socio-cultural aspects (Siahaan, 2004). According to Salim (1981), observing that environmental problems are of two main things namely the development of technology and population explosion.

Village Fund Budget

Village Funds are funds sourced from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget which are intended for villages that are transferred through the Regency / City Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget used to finance government administration, development implementation, community development and community empowerment. Village funds as referred to in their use are prioritized for expenditure expenditure in the field of implementation of village development and community empowerment (PP 60, 2014).

According to Todaro (1985) in his book entitled *In Economics for Developing Countries*, revealed that rural development programs must focus on development in sectors that can increase income, both in agriculture and outside agriculture, in business fields that can accommodate labor employment, health services, improvements in education, and infrastructure development. Without the development of rural areas that are integrative (integrated rural development), industrial growth will not run smoothly and if it can, industry growth will create various internal gaps that are very severe in the economy concerned.

Wu (2013) states that government spending in the education sector, government spending in the health sector, and the number of poor people has a positive effect on HDI. Although it has a positive effect on government spending in the education and health sector, it still has a small effect on HDI, this indicates that spending on the sector has not been optimal both in terms of its use and allocation.

In relation to the implementation of governmental tasks and the task of providing public services, it is clear that there needs to be a number of budget funds needed to finance them (Currstine, Lonti, & Joumard, 2007). Thus, development expenditure is a government expenditure to meet funding needs in an effort to carry out development (Putra, 2017).

Village Building Index

The Village Development Index was compiled to support the government's efforts to address the alleviation of disadvantaged villages and the promotion of independent villages. The aim is to determine the status of village progress and independence and to provide basic data and information for village development (Minister of Rural Development and Transmigration Ministerial Regulation Number 2, 2016).

The Village Development Index is a composite index constructed from social, economic and cultural dimensions. The three dimensions consist of variables, and each variable is reduced to an operational indicator. The Village Build Index classifies villages in five (5) statuses, namely: (i) Highly Disadvantaged Villages; (ii) Underdeveloped Villages; (iii) Developing Villages; (iv) Maju Village; and (v) Desa Mandiri. The Village Classification is to show the character diversity of each village in the range of scores from 0.27 to 0.92 Building Village Index. The classification in the 5 village statuses is also to sharpen the determination of the status of village development and at the same time recommendations for policy interventions needed by the government. (Hamidi, et al, 2015).

III. Research methods

The analysis was carried out by analyzing descriptively the relationship between social resilience, economic resilience and environmental resilience of each village with the amount of village funds received and realized in 2017 and 2018. Aspects of social resilience include indicators of education, health, social capital and settlement. The aspects of economic resilience include the economic indicators themselves consisting of the dimensions of the diversity of rural community production, the availability of trade service centers, access to distribution / logistics, access to financial and credit institutions, economic institutions and regional openness, while the aspects of environmental resilience include indicators of environmental quality and potential disaster prone and disaster response. Quantitative analysis used by using multiple linear regression analysis techniques with panel data using computer data analysis software. This technique examines the use of village funds on the Social Security Index, the Economic Resilience Index

and the Environmental Resilience Index. To see the analysis relationship between the variables used are the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of village development (X_1), the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of community empowerment (X_2) to the Social Security Index (Y_1), the Economic Resilience Index (Y_2) and the Index Environmental Resilience (Y_3); indicated in the relationship formulation as follows:

$$Y_1 = f(X_1, X_2) \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

$$Y_2 = f(X_1, X_2) \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

$$Y_3 = f(X_1, X_2) \dots\dots\dots (3)$$

In nonlinear equations:

$$eY_1 = X_1\alpha_1 X_2\alpha_2 e^{\alpha_0+\mu_1} \dots\dots\dots (4)$$

$$eY_2 = X_1\beta_1 X_2\beta_2 e^{\beta_0+\mu_2} \dots\dots\dots (5)$$

$$eY_3 = X_1\gamma_1 X_2\gamma_2 e^{\gamma_0+\mu_3} \dots\dots\dots (6)$$

Linear Equation as follows:

$$Y_1 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln X_1 + \alpha_2 \ln X_2 + \mu_0 \dots\dots\dots (7)$$

$$Y_2 = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln X_1 + \beta_2 \ln X_2 + \mu_1 \dots\dots\dots (8)$$

$$Y_3 = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \ln X_1 + \gamma_2 \ln X_2 + \mu_2 \dots\dots\dots (9)$$

Where;

Y_1 = Social Security Index, expressed in percent

Y_2 = Social Security Index, expressed in percent

Y_3 = Environmental Sustainability Index, expressed in percent

X_1 = Allocation of Use of Village Funds in the Field of Village Development (Rp/budget year)

X_2 = Allocation of Use of Village Funds in the field of Community Empowerment (Rp/budget year)

α_0, β_0 and γ_0 = constants

$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta_1, \beta_2, \gamma_1$ and γ_2 = Variable Measurement Parameters, and

μ_0, μ_1 and μ_2 = Error term.

IV. Results and Discussion

Data analysis method in this research is panel data regression analysis using Microsoft Excel software and eviews-8. The hypothesis test used for each variable is the Chow, Hausman and Lagrange test, which explained that for each hypothesis test is as follows:

- Chow Test
 H_0 = Common Effect Model
 H_1 = Fixed Effect Model
- Hausman Test
 H_0 = Random Effect Model

H1 = Fixed Effect Model

- Lagrange Test

H0 = Common Effect Model

H1 = Random Effect Model

The Social Resilience Index (Y1) variable was obtained in the Chow test and the Hausman test received H1 at a probability value F of $0.0000 < 0.05$ so that the model used was the Fixed Effect Model (FEM). Furthermore, the Economic Resilience Index (Y2) variable was also found in the Chow test and the Hausman test received H1 with a probability value F of $0.0000 < 0.05$ so that the model used was the Fixed Effect Model (FEM), while the Environmental Resilience variable (IKL) the level of model testing continues until the Lagrange test. The Lagrange test was continued because the Hausman test obtained a F probability value of $0.5277 > 0.05$ using the Random Effect Model (REM), but the Lagrange test results also showed the same results on the F probability value of $0.1050 > 0.05$ or accept H1 so that the model used on the IKL variable is the Random Effect Model (REM).

Variable	Coefficient	Probability	Description
X1 → Y1	27.3200	0.0000***	Significant 1%
X2 → Y1	0.0577	0.9468	Not Signifikan
X1 → Y2	31.3985	0.0000***	Significant 1%
X2 → Y2	0.7562	0.4120	Not Signifikan
X1 → Y3	-6.6036	0.0018***	Significant 1%
X2 → Y3	-0.1185	0.7041	Not Signifikan

Source: Eviews-8 (Data Processed).

Analysis shows that prioritizing the use of village funds in the field of village development has a positive effect on the Social Security Index. This is in line with research conducted by Kusumastuti (2015), which indicates that forms of social capital in the form of trust, interaction, and cooperation between group members become a force to respond collectively to rural infrastructure development. Furthermore, it is exemplified that the development of infrastructure (such as water, electricity, and roads) will foster community attitudes to develop trust in work and mutual cooperation, strong interaction between members and the existence of norms / rules that indicate the type of social capital bonding. This bound social capital produces adaptation capacity, which includes: cooperation, participation of all elements of society, the use of technology in accordance with community needs, the principle of mutual care and the ability to mobilize collective resources in group members. Some things that can influence the assessment of IKS rather than indicators of social capital owned by rural communities in Jeneponto Regency are having social solidarity, tolerance, a sense of security of the population and social welfare.

The effect of the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of village development on the Economic Resilience Index also shows results that are in accordance with the hypothesis that the allocation of village funds in the field of village development has a positive effect on the Economic Resilience Index. This can be caused by a policy in the implementation of development to carry out cash-intensive work activities, which allocates 30% of workers' wages from the total physical development so that it can affect the community's income, especially workers and beneficiaries in various development activities carried out in the village. The purpose of cash-intensive programs in development especially for poor and marginal households is to be productive which prioritizes the use of local resources, labor, and technology to increase income, reduce poverty and improve people's welfare. Along with the increasing social resilience of the community in the village can also improve the economic resilience of the village, and vice versa. Narayan & Pritchett (1999), states that social capital in rural areas can be useful for increasing community incomes and having a broad impact not only in economic terms, but also in non-economic aspects such as knowledge and information. Several development implementation activities through the allocation of the use of village funds in Jeneponto Regency that can support village economic development activities / the local economy of the village include construction work / maintenance / improvement of village and farm roads, electricity supply and irrigation of rice fields. This is in line with Pinstrup-Andersen and Shimokawa (2006),

which states several rural infrastructure that play an important role for development including road and transportation facilities, electricity, water, and the use of technology in agriculture have an impact on the relationship between indicators of aspects of social security with aspects of economic security. In addition, the existence of road construction both in the form of village roads and farm roads led to more openness in the area in terms of access to transportation and communication as well as transportation of goods produced from the village which could have an impact on village economic activities. In this case, regional openness is one of the dimensions of the indicator set in the composite economic resilience index.

The influence of the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of village development on the environmental resilience index has a negative effect. The absence of a positive influence from the allocation of the use of village funds to the environmental resilience index can be caused by the lack of allocation of activities that support the improvement of the rural environment aspects. The assessment indicators in the Environmental Resilience Index consist of environmental pollution, potential for disaster prone and disaster response. This means that of the many allocations for the use of village funds in the development sector, there is no support that has the effect of overcoming / reducing the occurrence of environmental pollution, assessment of potential disaster prone and activities on disaster response. The dense development of village infrastructure every year can affect the quality of the environment such as the occurrence of water pollution, soil pollution, river pollution, etc. Thus, the higher frequency of implementation of rural infrastructure development has the potential to reduce environmental quality. This is because in the village there is no spatial planning for rural areas in the implementation of development that can increase the quality of the village environment and not damage nature.

In addition, an analysis of environmental impacts is needed at each stage of development planning in the village. According to Renda and Umamur (2017), since the development of the sustainable development model (sustainable development), environmental issues are considered very important in the development process. Analysis of environmental benefits and impacts in each investment activity is an absolute requirement that must be met. This is based on a thought that environmental (physical) preservation is considered to be very crucial to the sustainability of investment and operational activities, especially with regard to the sadness of raw materials.

If you look at the relationship to the indicators and dimensions of the environmental resilience index to activities in the field of village development, then generally the types of activities carried out in each village do not show any intervention that leads to encouraging an increase in the environmental resilience index in Jeneponto Regency, especially in terms of disaster response to village authority.

The results show that there is no influence in the use of village funds in the field of community empowerment on the social resilience index. The results found can occur because the indicators in the assessment of it, especially in the field of empowerment are still weak in their implementation in the field. The indicators in question are health and education. In terms of health, rural communities in Jeneponto Regency are still lacking in ownership of access to social protection and health so that awareness is needed from the village government through intervention techniques in facilitation or outreach activities and education on ownership of social security protection for the community. However, the authority over ownership and membership of the BPJS itself is the authority of the regional government not the authority of the village.

In general, health indicator data shows BPJS membership and other social security for rural communities in Jeneponto Regency are at a score of 0.62 lower than the maximum score that should be of each indicator item, namely score 1. Another thing is the lack of health workers in the village that can be empowered such as medical workers, village midwives and other health workers. The average village only has 1 village midwife per village and other community health workers whose existence is around 22 percent of the average population in Jeneponto Regency. Meanwhile, in terms of education the village government still lacks access to education services to the community in obtaining skills / courses to increase the capacity of village communities. The same was stated by Mardikanto and Soebianto in soleh (2014), formulating three main efforts in every community empowerment, which he called Tri Bina, namely: human development, business development, and environmental development. Human development is the first and foremost effort that must be considered in every effort to empower the community. This is based on the understanding that the purpose of development is to improve the quality of life or human well-being so that in human development efforts all activities included in efforts to strengthen / develop capacity. Capacity development includes: individuals, institutional / institutional capacity building and system capacity development (networking). The types of community empowerment activities that are relevant in assessing the social security index are courses and training activities carried out in villages for community groups. Data on the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of empowerment shows that village governments are still concentrating on training village government institutions both in terms of planning, implementation of activities and village financial management. Some empowerment activities are targeted at community groups, but the implementation period and methods are not sustainable so the effect is not immediately apparent. Some assessment indicators in the Social Resilience Index that need to be considered by local governments as a program of community empowerment activities in villages are: the level of BPJS participation and the availability of health workers who are still lacking in the health dimension; access to non-formal education (packages A, B and C) and

access to secondary education which is still low in the educational dimension; plus access to electricity and internet availability in the village for residents who have not been adequate in the dimensions of the settlement.

The use of village funds in the area of community empowerment also has no effect on the Economic Resilience Index. The village economic empowerment activities by forming Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDesa) in all villages in Jeneponto Regency as a form of empowerment through the inclusion of village government capital on village economic institutions and business actors in the village have not been able to increase the Economic Resilience Index. This is because the elected BUMDesa administrators are still beginners, chosen because of the proximity to the village government and not a few who have minimal skills and skills in developing a business as well as several types of businesses that are run without going through a business feasibility study. Generally BUMDesa has stagnated after capital participation and there are still many BUMDesa that have not been able to carry out their responsibilities and bring in PAD for the village. In the sense that BUMDesa in Jeneponto Regency cannot be used as an instrument in moving the wheels of the village economy and has not been able to positively influence the economic resilience index. In the sense that BUMDesa in Jeneponto Regency cannot be used as an instrument in moving the wheels of the village economy and has not been able to positively influence the economic resilience index.

It is important to note that the capacity building provided does not only limit knowledge but also the ongoing provision of training techniques and methods, especially those that require implementation. The theory of community empowerment activities by Soebiato in Soleh (2014) which explains that empowerment includes: commodity selection, type of business feasibility study and business planning, establishment of investment planning business entities and determination of financial resources, management of human resources and career development.

Regional openness due to development has been able to push the economic resilience index. For this reason, input on activities from the field of empowerment is needed that can also encourage economic resilience through the improvement and availability of economic institutions and logistical distribution access to be in the village. This of course requires the role of all parties, especially the village government in empowering the existing potential in the village. Village government through the empowerment of village economic institutions, namely BUMDesa and can not be separated from the local government in order to provide access to financial and logistical institutions in the village as its authority.

In the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of community empowerment did not affect the Environmental Resilience Index. This is also not in accordance with the hypothesis which states that the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of community empowerment has a positive and significant effect on the environmental resilience index. However, it turns out that there is a theory about the absence of the influence of village funds on the environmental resilience index, discovered by Jumiadin and Asuhadi (2018) in their research on the Study of Environmental Aspects in Measurement of Village Development in Wakatobi District, showing that the amount and increase of village budgets have not contributed to the increase environmental resilience index.

In this study, more details were found that there was no influence of the allocation of village funds in the field of community empowerment to increase the environmental resilience index. This can also be caused by indicators in the assessment of the index of environmental resilience namely environmental quality, potential / disaster-prone and disaster response are generally still vulnerable to be implemented in the village because it is awaiting local government policy to carry out activities in the field of disaster management, urgent and emergency as a list activities which are under the authority of the village to be funded through the village budget.

In terms of empowerment, the village government does not have an Early Warning System (EWS) in disaster management, so that although the community and the village government are aware of the high potential for disaster-prone occurring, there is no effort to deal with the response such as the absence of a post of disaster center, the absence of evacuation routes and disaster preparedness groups for disaster mitigation needs and the absence of training and education counseling to the community about the environment and potential / hazard and disaster response such as the preparation of community-based disaster maps.

Conclusion

The allocation of the use of village funds in the field of village development has been quite optimal in encouraging an increase in the social resilience index and the economic resilience index. However, the allocation of the use of village funds in the field of village development has not been able to encourage an increase in the environmental resilience index, on the contrary the allocation has reduced environmental resilience index. This can be caused by the absence of village spatial planning and village government policies in the utilization and preservation of the environment so that development activities in the village have implications that continuously affect environmental damage.

The allocation of the use of village funds in the field of community empowerment has not been optimal so that the expected effect on increasing social security index, economic resilience index and environmental resilience index has not yet been seen. It seems that the influence can not yet be caused by the empowerment activities carried out through the allocation of village

funds have not been maximized both in quantity and quality. In addition, the potential for an increase in the social, economic and environmental resilience index in the field of empowerment is also more influenced by assessment indicators outside the intervention of village authority so that effectiveness in encouraging the improvement of IKS, IKE and IKL must be done together in accordance with their authority.

References

- [1] Baharsyah, Justika. 1999. Towards Social Resilient Communities Lessons from the Crisis. The Indonesian Ministry of Social Affairs. Jakarta.
- [2] Curristine, T., Lonti, Z., & Joumard, I. 2007. Improving Public Sector Efficiency: Challenges and Opportunities. *OECD Journal on Budgeting*, 7(1), 1-41.
- [3] Government Regulation Number 60 Year 2014 concerning Village Funds Sourced from the State Revenue and Expenditure Budget.
- [4] Hamidi, Hanibal, et al. 2015. Village Development Index. Ministry of Rural Development of Disadvantaged Areas and Transmigration. Jakarta.
- [5] Hayami, Yujiro and Kikuchi Masao. 1987. Village Economic Dilemma. Indonesian Torch Foundation. Jakarta.
- [6] Jumiadin and Sunarwan Asuhadi. 2018. Study of Environmental Aspects in the Measurement of Village Development in Wakatobi Regency. *Ecogreen Journal* Vol. 4 No. 2, October 2018.
- [7] Kusumastuti, Ayu. 2015. Social Capital and Adaptation Mechanisms for Rural Communities in Infrastructure Management and Development. LabSosio, Sociology Study Center FISIP-UI, Jakarta.
- [8] Kian, Kwik Gie, 1983. Economic Development and Equality. LP3S. Jakarta.
- [9] Labombang, M. 2011. Impact of Rural Infrastructure Development on the PNPM Mandiri Rural Program in Toli Toli Regency. *Journal MEKTEK* XIII No. 1.
- [10] Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2014 concerns Villages.
- [11] Landis, Paul H. 1948. Introduction to Rural and Agricultural Sociology. PT. Gramedia Main Library. Jakarta.
- [12] Minister of Rural Development and Transmigration Ministerial Regulation Number 2 of 2016 concerning Village Development Index.
- [13] Narayan, D., & Pritchett, L, 1999. Cents and sociability: Household income and social capital in rural Tanzania. *Economic development and cultural change* 47(4):871-897.
- [14] Nurman, 2015. Regional Development Strategy. Rajawali Press. Jakarta.
- [15] Paavola, M. (2012). The Impact of Village Development Funds on Community Welfare in the Lao People's Democratic Republic. Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry of the University of Helsinki, Finlandia, Publisher: Viikki Tropical Resources Institute (VITRI) University of Helsinki, Finland, ISBN 978-952-10-7609-1, ISSN 0786-8170.
- [16] Pinstrup-Andersen, P., & Shimokawa, S., 2006. Rural infrastructure and agricultural development. World Bank.
- [17] Putra, Windhu. 2017. Impact of Government Expenditures on Economic Growth and Human Development Indexes in the Indonesian Border. *Journal of Economics, Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol. 6. No. 2, 120 - 138.
- [18] Renda, Soleman Bili and Dekki Umamur Ra'is. 2017. Impact of Village Funds on Community Empowerment. *JISIP: Journal of Social and Political Sciences*. ISSN. 2442-6962 Vol. 6, No. 3.
- [19] Robertson, B. Joelene, C. & Dunn, L. 2015. Local Development Funds in Myanmar: An Initial Review. Discussion paper no. 9, The Myanmar Development Resource Institute's Centre for Economic and Social Development (MDRICESD) and The Asia Foundation.
- [20] Roucek, Joseph S dan Warren, Roland L, 1962. *Sociology: An Introduction*. Totowa, N.j: Littlefield, Adams And Co.
- [21] Salim, Emil. 1981. Environment and Development. Mutiara, Jakarta.
- [22] Siahaan, N.H.T, 2004. Environmental Law and Development Ecology. Erlangga Jakarta.
- [23] Suryono, Agus. 2001. Development Theory and Issues. Malang: Malang Press University.
- [24] Soleh, 2014. Dieklektika Development with Empowerment. Fokusmedia. Bandung.
- [25] Todaro, Michael P. 1985. Economics for Developing Countries. Akademika Pressindo. Jakarta.
- [26] Wu, Treena 2013. Construction of Human Capital Investment in Developing Countries: Using The Asian Financial Crisis in Indonesia as a Natural Experiment. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*. Volume 49, No. 1, 2013. ISSN: 1472-7234.