第 49 卷 第 4 期
2022 年 4 月

湖南大学学报（自然科学版）
Journal of Hunan University (Natural Sciences)

Vol. 49 No. 4
April 2022

Open Access Article https://doi.org/10.55463/issn.1674-2974.49.4.24

The Effectiveness of Village-Campus Program in Bogor, West Java, Indonesia

P. Muljono[1*], A. T. Maulana[1], Y. Bakhtiar[2]

[1] Department of Communication and Community Development Sciences, IPB University, Bogor, Indonesia

[2] Center for Human Resource Development, IPB University, Bogor, Indonesia

Abstract: The village-campus program is a knowledge and technology transfer program, and IPB's innovation dissemination to the community helps provide solutions to general agricultural problems. The idea of the village-campus program was born from the rich availability of research results and innovation at the university. On the other side, many community conditions still require a touch of science and practical technologies. Therefore, the village-campus program aims to provide solutions for the community to the problems in the field that concern. The aims of this research are: (1) to determine the effectiveness of the village campus programs that have been taking place in the area around Bogor; (2) to analyze community empowerment around campus; and (3) to design strategies for developing village campus programs in the future. The method used to determine the effectiveness of the village campus program is to examine the process of planning, implementing, and evaluating the impact of activities felt by the participants and managers of these activities. This program requires the participation of the community. The concept of participation used the concepts of Cohen and Uphoff, which describes the planning, implementation, evaluation, and result relishing. The level of effectiveness is measured using indicators of understanding programs, a clear target, timely achievement goals, and output. The internal factors are the characteristics, such as age, gender, education level, attendance frequency, and profession. The external factors are linkages between stakeholders in the program organizer, sponsorship, and village facilitator. Based on a survey by Rank Spearman and Chi-Square test, only the frequency of attendance significantly correlates with participation. However, external factors and effectiveness have no significant correlation with participation level.

Keywords: effectiveness, external factors, internal factors, village-campus, participation.

印度尼西亚西爪哇茂物乡村校园计划的有效性

摘要：村校计划是一项知识和技术转让计划，茂物农业研究所向社区传播创新有助于为一般农业问题提供解决方案。村校园计划的想法源于大学丰富的研究成果和创新。另一方面，许多社区条件仍然需要一点科学和实用技术。因此，村校计划旨在为社区提供解决该领域问题的解决方案。本研究的目的是：(1) 确定茂物周边地区已开展的乡村校园计划的有效性；(2)分析校园周边的社区赋权；(3)设计未来发展乡村校园项目的策略。用于确定乡村校园计划有效性的方法是检查计划、实施和评估活动的参与者和管理者感受到的活动影响的过程。该计划需要社区的参与。参与的概念使用了科恩和乌普霍夫的概念，描述了计划、实施、评估和结果享受。有效性水平是使用了解计划、明确目标、及时实现目标和产出的指标来衡量的。内部因素是特征，如年龄、性别、教育程度、出勤率和职业。外部因素是项目组织者、赞助商和村庄促进者中的利益相关者之间的联系。根据斯皮尔曼等级和卡方检验的一项调查，只有出勤频率与参与度显着相关。然而，外部因素和有效性与参与程度没有显着相关性。

关键词：有效性、外部因素、内部因素、村-校园、参与。

Received: February 10, 2022 / Revised: March 9, 2022 / Accepted: March 11, 2022 / Published: April 30, 2022

About the authors: P. Muljono, A. T. Maulana, Department of Communication and Community Development Sciences, IPB University, Bogor, Indonesia; Y. Bakhtiar, Center for Human Resource Development, IPB University, Bogor, Indonesia

Corresponding author Pudji Muljono, pudjimuljono@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Indonesia has 80% of the rural area, and most people live in villages [1]. At present, the composition of the population is dominated by villagers by 56 percent and city residents by 44 percent. One of them, Bogor, has the largest population in the regency and city of Bogor. According to BPS [2] data on population-based on regency or city, the population of Bogor Regency amounted to 6,088,233 people, and the people of Bogor city amounted to 1,126,927 inhabitants. Village development is part of a series of national development and an effort to improve the quality of life and life for the greatest welfare of rural communities (General provisions in article 3 explanation 8 of Act No. 6 of 2014) concerning Villages.

BPS [2] shows that the percentage of Indonesia's gross enrollment rate for education in 2011-2019 tends to decrease. The decline in community participation in formal education is a problem. Especially education is needed by villagers in managing resources in their respective regions, given that villages play an important role in national development.

The society of the 21st-century world is a knowledge society and a lifelong learning community [3]. In rural contexts, education is often identified as favoring outmigration [4], the 'leaving discourse' being repeatedly identified in the research [5-8]. Rural education has been labeled with a deficit discourse; it is seen as a space of educational disadvantage.

Cheung [9] states that rural areas are the product of product development to a certain stage. Generally, rural areas are geographical areas located outside of cities and towns. The implementation of education for all has a profound impact on the development of rural primary and secondary education and improves the overall quality of the rural population. Literacy is the basis for improving the rural population's quality. Therefore, it can be seen that increasing teacher training and reforming rural education curricula have become fundamental approaches to rural education reforms in various countries.

Gokhale and O'Dea [10] suggest that community service presents a powerful pedagogy for enhancing student learning and development. While service-learning requires extra work from the instructor and the students, the rewards of seeing students learn and develop civic awareness and a sense of citizenship while meeting real community needs are well worth the effort.

A community is a learning place for people to develop a learning process consistent with local needs. Knowledge of the community is learning about problem management and community adaptation, also known as local wisdom. The wisdom from real experiences is integrated into physical, mental, social, and environmental knowledge based on culture [11]. Kiyasit et al. [12] stated that the learning paradigm of the community needs to be applied so that creative thinking skills can be improved.

Virtue, Maddox, and Pfaff [13] suggest that those administering learning communities should expand their data collection to measure retention, persistence, and graduation rates. They also should follow up with former participants to better understand how their first-year experience has potentially influenced their remaining years on campus. Hernández-Silva [14] also suggests the need to consider attendance and transition indicators as key elements for decision-making regarding the program's continuity, diversification, and improvement and the urgency of unifying the national goals in pursuit of coordinated implementation rural programs.

Faisala et al. [15] stated that non-formal education through life skills education had positively contributed to poverty reduction in rural areas. However, it still requires efforts to develop various life skills education models through research and development. That is based on the idea that improving the quality of the poor requires a development effort that is carried out in a planned, structured, and based on scientific and objective thinking.

Hopes to improve the quality of human resources are pursued through various development programs that the government and non-governmental organizations have carried out. One of the development programs to improve the quality of human resources that includes the community is a community college program that moves from and to the community, embodied in the "village-campus" model. According to Muljono [16], the village-campus is a program of transfer of knowledge and technology, the dissemination of innovations owned by institutions or institutions engaged in education to exchange information about potential among components (community, government, and private) to help and support activities that promote the society. The village campus is also considered as the school for the village reform team, used as a learning space for village actors.

The development of community-based schools is motivated by the philosophy that education is an entity that cannot stand alone and needs help from all elements of society. Community-based communities are expected to be able to develop their knowledge, competencies, expertise, and skills based on the potential of the region and the special needs of the community. Seeing the condition of the community, which in general still requires a touch of practical knowledge and technology, the village campus facilitates the community to be able to obtain knowledge as needed.

Implementing the village campus is certainly not separated from the role or community participation. That needs special attention, considering the village campus uses the principle of participation and self-reliance in carrying out the activities. The community

is positioned as the subject of development assisted by several involved parties, universities, regional governments, and the private sector.

Assessment of program suitability is one way to measure program effectiveness. The effectiveness approach is used to measure the extent to which the activity is effective. Cohen and Uphoff [17] stated that the level of community participation can be measured using participation theory, namely:

(1) Participation in planning centered on community participation in meetings, for example, giving ideas and evaluating choices, planning for making choices, formulating choices, and implementing planning activities choices. Participate in the implementation with a tangible manifestation of participation in property;

(2) Participation in implementation related to "input" of rural development. This stage is the most important in development because its core is its implementation. Participation in this stage can take the form of thought contributions, forms of material contributions, and forms of action as members;

(3) Participation in evaluation, community participation at this stage is considered as feedback that can provide input for the improvement of subsequent project implementation or the possibility of modifying a project; and

(4) Participation in enjoying the results related to the "output" of rural development. This stage can be used as an indicator of the success of community participation as the subject of development. The greater the project's benefits are felt, the more the project has succeeded in achieving the target.

Community-based education is known in several countries as Community College. Community college is a form of education carried out in a community format in Indonesia that can be applied in the form of a village school or community academy. Village schools use the principles of participation, openness, and inclusiveness in village management.

The Village-Campus Program is a knowledge and technology transfer program, and IPB's innovation dissemination to the community helps provide solutions to general agricultural problems [17]. The idea of a village-campus program was born from the community's still many conditions, which in general still require a touch of science and practical technologies. The village-campus program is based on the spirit of synergy in self-help in community empowerment, among various components, because this program is a non-project that does not have regular funding sources. The village-campus program was formed as a forum for transferring knowledge and technology to the community, practicing and internships, and sharing various topics. So far, the village campus has been carried out 60 times in villages and sub-districts in the Bogor city and regency.

The implementation of the village campus is carried out in rotation and continuously in several villages or "kelurahan" in Bogor. The village-campus program is held openly, so it is not uncommon for students and lecturers to have the opportunity to participate in activities. According to CHRD [18], the topics that have been submitted to the public include; family medicinal plants, entrepreneurial motivation, healthy chicken farming in narrow land, nursery businesses, nursery practices, native chicken farming, oshibana, plastics, benefits, hazards, and prevention, independent waste management by residents, posdaya food storage, carp cultivation, wedding souvenirs from plants, and herbal sringanis.

Bakhtiar [19] revealed that the material provided was carried out through three methods, namely plot demonstration, fieldwork, and joint consultation. Demonstration plots are to directly implement the material being discussed, for example, how to mix chicken food and the technique of administering vaccines. Fieldwork is carried out in the form of an internship. Participants can participate in practicing the material at the location of the village campus by working on the processes carried out by the resource person and the business owner. Finally, joint consultation allows participants to ask speakers about what they want to know about the topic of the village-campus that is being discussed until participants understand. The implementation of the village campus is usually held on weekends. CHRD-IPB University selects resource persons according to their expertise and experience in their fields.

The village campuses as empowerment programs are important for involving community participation as members. The level of community participation in the village-campus program is based on the stages of community participation according to Cohen and Uphoff [17], namely: 1) planning stage, 2) implementation phase, 3) evaluation phase, and 4) stage of enjoying the results. The author suspects that factors influence the level of participation, namely internal factors, and external factors. Internal factors are influenced by age, gender, education level, length of stay in a social environment, and income level. External factors are influenced by the support of program organizers, sponsorship support, and companion support. At the same time, the level of community participation relates to the effectiveness of village campuses as self-based, non-project programs. The effectiveness of the village-campus program can be identified based on the understanding of the program, on target, on time, achieving goals, and results after the program.

The urgency of the analysis of the participation of village-campus participants is needed to see the effectiveness of the village-campus program in creating a quality community. Based on this background, in this study, there were three research questions, namely:

1. What is the level of participant participation in

implementing the village-campus program?

2. What factors are related to participant participation in the village-campus program?

3. How is the level of participation of village-campus program participants related to the effectiveness of the village-campus program?

Based on the formulation of the problem above, the objectives of this study are as follows:

1. Analyze the level of participation in the implementation of the village-campus program.

2. Identify factors related to the level of participation in the village-campus program.

3. Analyze the relationship between the level of participation and the effectiveness of the village-campus program.

The hypothesis to be tested is formulated as follows:

1. There is a relationship between the internal factors of the village-campus participants (age, gender, education level, frequency of attendance, and type of profession) with the level of participation of village-campus participants;

2. There is a relationship between the external factors of the village-campus participants (program organizer support, sponsorship support, and companion support) with the participation of village-campus participants; and

3. There is a relationship between the level of participation of village-campus participants and the effectiveness of the village-campus program.

2. Method

This study uses a quantitative approach that is supported qualitatively. The method used is the census research method. The study was conducted in Bogor by purposive method, taking into account that Bogor is the only village-campus area as a medium for transferring knowledge and technology to the community. The village-campuses have been implemented in several Bogor regencies and Bogor City, among others; Cikarawang Village, Situ Gede Village, Cibanteng Village, Cimanggu Village, Bubulak Village, Sempur Village, Cilendek Timur Village, Pamoyanan Village, Loji Village, Cipaku Village, Kertamaya Village, Cihideung Udik Village, and Ciherang Village.

The unit of analysis in this study was individual participants who took part in the village-campus program from June 2020 to March 2021. According to the data obtained, the population of the village-campus participants was 45 village-campus participants from several villages and villages in the Regency and City of Bogor. This study uses the census method because it will examine all populations in the study area. The reason is the limited population and to avoid mistakes. Therefore, the selection of informants was made purposively, and the amount was not determined. Informants in this study were organizers of village campuses (CHRD-IPB University) and volunteers consisting of IPB Professors, researchers, lecturers, regional officials and practitioners, and people who helped organize the village campus. This information search stops when additional informants no longer produce new knowledge. Quantitative data is processed using Microsoft Excel 2013 and SPSS for Windows 16.0 applications. Qualitative data is analyzed through three stages: data reduction, presentation, and verification.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Overview of Research Locations

Bogor is administratively divided into two regions, namely City and Regency. The city of Bogor has 6 sub-districts, namely: Bogor Tengah, West Bogor, North Bogor, South Bogor, East Bogor, and Tanah Sareal, and has 68 villages that are scattered in each sub-district. The Bogor Regency region has 40 sub-districts, 417 villages and 17 sub-districts (428 villages) consisting of 3,639 RWs and 14,403 RTs. The area of Bogor Regency is ± 298,838.31 Ha with a variety of regional morphological types, from relatively low plains in the north to the highlands in the south.

The city of Bogor is in the middle of Bogor Regency, and its location is very close to Jakarta. The total area of Bogor City of 11,850 Ha consists of 6 sub-districts and 68 sub-districts. Administratively, the city of Bogor consists of 6 sub-districts, 31 families, and 37 villages (five of which are underdeveloped villages, namely Pamoyanan, Genteng, Balungbangjaya, Mekarwangi, and Sindangrasa), 210 dudun, 623 RW, 2,712 RT and surrounded by Bogor Regency.

According to Bogor City data in numbers, residents working in Bogor City are absorbed in trade and services. For example, 120,802 people worked in trade, restaurant, and hotel jobs, while those working in the service sector amounted to 119,126 people. According to education, the population working in Bogor is 60,117 junior high schools, 154,612 people have a high school education, and as many as 81,245 people are educated in academies and universities.

The potential of Bogor Regency includes food, plantations, livestock, fisheries, tourism, and mining. Bogor Regency is a producer of food crops consisting of vegetables, horticulture, and plantations. Rice plants spread in almost all sub-districts, for example in Rumpin, Cigudeg, Sukajaya, Pamijahan, Cibungbulan, Ciampea, Caringin, Jonggol, Sukamakmur and Cariu. Food crop commodities including corn plants spread in Darmaga, Cisarua, Megamendung, Cileungsi, Klapanunggal, Rancabungur, Cibinong, Ciseeng, Gunung Sindur and Rumpin. One livestock developed is PE goats centered in the Caringin, Cijeruk, Ciampea, Ciawi, Cigombong, and Cariu sub-districts. In addition, minapolitan areas have been developed in Ciseeng, Parung, Gunung Sindur, and Kemang sub-districts.

These conditions indicate that Bogor has a diverse

potential area. Therefore, along with various kinds of occupations and professions in the Bogor community, efforts are needed to transfer information through learning activities that are flexible and self-supporting. Furthermore, it would require that the potential of Bogor's different districts and cities be maximized if the technology is understood by the community independently.

3.2. Internal Factors of Village-Campus Participants

The respondents' internal factors were age, gender, education level, frequency of attendance, and type of profession. Based on the research that has been done, it can be seen that the majority of respondents or village-campus participants have internal factors that influence as follows: (1) middle-aged adults (30-50 years) as many as 34 respondents or equal to 75.6 percent, (2) as many as 28 respondents or 62.2 percent, (3) moderate education as many as 35 respondents or 77.8 percent, (4) the frequency of attendance of low participants was 21 respondents or 46.7 percent and (5) having a profession dominated as housewives by 17 respondents or 37.8 percent.

3.3. External Factors of Village-Campus Participants

The external factors of the respondents that were seen were the support of program organizers, sponsorship support, and companion support. Based on the research that has been done, it can be seen that the majority of respondents or village-campus participants have external factors that influence as follows:

1. High support from program organizers, amounting to 40 respondents or 88.9 percent. That shows that the interaction between participants and CHRD is high so that they feel satisfactory service from program organizers.
2. On the other hand, moderate sponsorship support equals 29 respondents or 64.4 percent. The agency that works with the village-campus program, namely PT Sidomuncul Bintang Tujuh and Dompet Dhuafa, while the media partner that has collaborated is Green TV. In addition, some volunteers participated in supporting the village campus program, namely IPB Mengabdi, volunteer Posdaya Bogor, and IPB students.
3. High companion support is equal to 41 respondents or 91.1 percent. That shows that facilitators respond responsibly to all forms of questions and exchange ideas with village-campus participants. In addition, the companion has delivered the material to the field. Besides that, the facilitator also motivates the participants to implement the material that has been delivered.

3.4. Village-Campus Participant Levels

Participation in village campus participants in this study refers to the opinions of Cohen and Uphoff [17], who divided participation into four stages. Namely, participation in planning, implementing, evaluating, and enjoying results. The level of participation in the planning stage shows a moderate category of 57.8 percent. At the implementation stage, it shows a moderate category of 40 percent. At the evaluation stage, it shows a moderate category of 60 percent. However, enjoying the results showed a high category of 68.9 percent. In the entire stages of participation, the level of participation of village-campus participants showed a moderate category of 53.3 percent. Participants stated that participating in the village campus aims to increase knowledge and skills and as a place of friendship between participants who are indeed from different villages or "kelurahan".

Most of the participants in the village campus are Posdaya cadres. They have a sense of responsibility to attend the village campus. Even though the location of the village campus is far away, participants are still present to increase their knowledge and skills. Additional information obtained is then conveyed to each Posdaya cadre's friends. The village-campus participants have a good awareness that the program is self-help. The program participants knew that with the village-campus program and increasing participants' knowledge, most participants claimed to add relationships and increase friendships between participants. The village-campus program is organized from and for the community, so participant involvement becomes a very important part of the village-campus program.

3.5. Level of Effectiveness of Village-Campus Programs

Effectiveness is a measurement in the sense of achieving predetermined goals or objectives. In this study, the village-campus effectiveness was measured based on the understanding of the program, right on target, on time, achievement of goals, and results.

3.5.1. Program Understanding

Understanding the program is the extent to which program participants know the village campus as a community empowerment program. The extent to which participants understand the program objectives and the use of the material obtained.

The results showed that some respondents stated that understanding of the village-campus program was included in the high category of 57.8 percent. Based on the data in the field, respondents realized that the village campus was once part of self-help empowerment activities. However, only a few respondents claimed to have searched the internet about village-campus programs in other areas.

3.5.2. Right on Target

Right on target is the extent to which program participants are right with the target needed by the

program. The target speed is seen from the participants who received the material presented in the village-campus activities. The activity of the village-campus is considered right on target if the target is a participant who needs information from the material presented by the resource person.

Some respondents stated that the targets' accuracy in the village-campus program was included in the high category of 57.8 percent. That is because the village-campus participants can understand the discussion material needed and know the material benefits if implemented. It also relates to the ability of participants to be aware of their individual material needs.

3.5.3. On-Time

Timeliness is the suitability of the implementation of the village campus with the schedule determined by the program organizer. Village campus activities are considered timely when providing information on the implementation of village campuses from program organizers to participants is the same as previously planned.

The results showed that respondents stated that the timeliness of the village campus program was included in the medium category at 77.8 percent. Respondents stated that the timeliness of the village-campus program was in the moderate category of 77.8 percent. Determination of the schedule is adjusted to the willingness of the resource person, CHRD readiness, and participants.

3.5.4. Program Objectives

The program aims to link the initial objectives and the results achieved. The suitability of the objectives is seen from the knowledge of the village-campus participants on the actual program objectives, the achievement of program objectives through the implementation of each material, and the effectiveness of the village-campus in increasing the participants' knowledge and skills.

The results showed that respondents stated that the objectives of the village-campus program were included in the high category of 53.3 percent. Almost all respondents who participate in the program have carried out program activities by their objectives. Namely, they know the objectives and implement them according to their initial objectives.

3.5.5. Results

Results are the maximum competencies generated from the activities of the village campus. An activity is said to be effective if the activity produces results. The study results showed that respondents stated that the results of the village-campus program were included in the medium category, which was 68.9 percent. Although not all the material received is implemented, respondents can manage it to overcome obstacles when implementing it. Some respondents claimed to benefit in the form of satisfaction with the material. The material benefits came from the field of the profession involved, the village-campus material that was implemented supported income following the type of each profession. The material benefits came from the field of profession that was occupied. The village-campus material implemented the supported income according to the type of each profession. Some participants who implement the material can see how participants can manage the implementation results and how participants overcome the problems faced.

3.5.6. Level of Effectiveness of the Village-Campus Programs

Based on the results of each measure of effectiveness, it can be seen that some respondents stated that the effectiveness of the village-campus program was included in the effective category of 30 respondents, or 66.7 percent. Understanding the village campus as one of the community empowerment programs is quite good; the program targets are also right. The implementation of activities follows a predetermined schedule, the program objectives are predetermined, and the participants feel the results. The village campus is carried out continuously until this research is conducted. Therefore, the highest program effectiveness is in program understanding and target accuracy, followed by aspects of program objectives, timeliness, and program results as the lowest aspects.

3.6. Analysis of Internal Factor Relations with Participant Levels

Internal factors are measured using individual characteristics, namely age, gender, education level, frequency of attendance, and type of profession. In contrast, participation is measured in the stages of planning, implementing, evaluating, and enjoying the results.

Based on the data obtained, the older the participants, the higher the participation rate. Women with moderate participation rates dominated participants in the village campus, but the high participation rate was among participants of the male gender. The relationship between education level and level of participation has an inverse relationship. The higher level of education does not affect the increase in participation. That is caused by participants knowing the topics to be delivered in advance, thus lowering participation rates. Therefore, the frequency of attendance is low with moderate participation rates.

Table 1 Correlation coefficients between age, education level, and frequency of attendance at the level of participation

Internal Factor	Level of participation	
	Correlation coefficient	Sig. (2-tailed)
Age	0.226	0.136
Education level	-0.056	0.713
Frequency of attendance	0.347*	0.020

* Significant correlation at 0.05 (2-tailed)

The Rank Spearman correlation test results showed no relationship between age, level of education, and level of participation. Only the frequency of attendance is related to the level of participation (Table 1). Facts in the field indicate that several factors do not cause significant relationships, including The age distribution of respondents is uneven. Hence, most respondents have the same participation due to the distribution of age, which is focused on the medium category, which is 32 to 50 years. Most of the participants in the village campus are posdaya cadres who are not limited by age.

There is no educational requirement for participation in village-campus activities. All circles from various levels of education may participate in each village-campus activity. Participants in the village campus are Bogor people willing to learn and enthusiastic about improving their knowledge and skills. Unfortunately, participants' level of education has an inverse relationship with the level of participation. The higher the education of participants, the lower the participation of village-campus participants. Because of higher education, the community is preoccupied with professional activities outside their respective professions; therefore, adjusting the schedule between participants, resource persons, and program organizers have difficulties.

The frequency of attendance has a significant relationship with the level of participation. Even though the location of the activity was carried out in the village or "kelurahan" in the Bogor city and district, participants continued to attend the village-campus activities. The participants' motivation to follow the village-campus addы new knowledge and information and stay in touch with other village-campus participants. The presence of village-campus participants showed a form of community participation in the activities of the village campus program. Analysis of sex and type of relationship with the level of participation uses the Chi-Square test.

Table 2 Contingency coefficient (C) between sexes on the level of participation of village-campus participants

Internal Factor	Level of Participation
	Asymp.Sig. (2-sided)
Gender	0.029
Profession	0.389

Based on these data shows that gender has a positive relationship with the level of participation. However, the type of profession does not have a significant relationship with the level of participation. Based on the results in the field. Women have more free time than men. Considering the type of profession is dominated by housewives. Therefore women are considered more diligent in attending village-campus activities than men.

3.7. Relationship Analysis of External Factors with Participants in Village-Campus Participants

External factors are measured using program organizer support, sponsorship support, and companion support indicators. In contrast, participation is measured in the stages of planning, implementing, evaluating, and enjoying the results. Based on the data obtained, the program organizers' support is in the medium category, with the participation of the village-campus participants being moderate. Sponsor support shows a high category with high participation rates. Likewise, companion support shows a high category with high participation rates. Therefore, the higher the level of sponsor support and accompanying support, the higher the level of participation. Analysis of the relationship of external factor variables with participation level variables using the Rank Spearman test.

Table 3 Correlation coefficients between program support, sponsor support, and companion support for the level of participation of village-campus participants

External Factor	Level of Participation	
	Correlation Coeffisient	Sig. (2-tailed)
Program organizer support	0.162	0.288
Sponsor support	0.245	0.104
Companion support	-0.193	0.204

Table 3 shows no significant relationship between external variables and the level of participation. However, companion support has a negative or inverse relationship. It is caused by several factors, including:

1. The village campus program is self-supporting. The community has its awareness to help implement the village campus. For example, for the provision of facilities and infrastructure, the community has the initiative to provide whatever is needed to carry out activities. So the program organizer is CHRD, IPB University.
2. More as a facilitator for program participants.
3. Participant participation does not depend on the presence or absence of influence provided by the sponsor. Most participants considered that partners who collaborated with village campuses were the task of program managers in management.
4. There is no personal closeness between participants and resource persons. Different sources depend on the topic of discussion in implementing the village campus. The inverse relationship shown by these variables is the intensity of meeting between informants and participants only during the implementation of village-campus activities.

3.8. Relationship Analysis of Participation Levels with the Effectiveness of Village-Campus Programs

The level of participation is measured through the stages of planning, implementing, evaluating, and

enjoying the results. In contrast, the program's level of effectiveness is measured using program understanding, target accuracy, timeliness, the accuracy of objectives, and results.

Table 4 Number and percentage of village-campus participants according to the level of participation and effectiveness of the village-campus program

Level of effectiveness the village-campus	Level of Participation					
	Low		Medium		High	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Less effective	0	0	0	0	0	0
Effective enough	1	100	10	41,7	4	20
Effective	0	0	14	58,3	16	80
Total	1	100	24	100	20	100

Table 4 shows that most levels of participation with the level of effectiveness of the village-campus program are at a sufficient level with a high category participation rate of 80 percent. This result shows a sign of a positive relationship. The motivation of participants to take part in the village campus is to acquire new knowledge and skills, the emergence of a sense of responsibility for participants to deliver material to other friends, and as a medium of communication and friendship between participants in other areas. Analysis of the relationship between the level of participation variables and the village-campus program's effectiveness using the Rank Spearman test.

Table 5 Correlation coefficient between the level of participation of village-campus participants on the effectiveness of the village-campus program

	Effectiveness of the Program	
	Correlation Coeffisient	Sig.(2-tailed)
Level of participation	0.279	0.064

The results of the analysis in Table 5 show no significant relationship between the level of participation of village-campus participants and the effectiveness of the village-campus program. That is due to the motivation of village-campus participants to be involved in the same average program. The distance between the implementation of activities is not strategic, considering the participants of the village campus come from various regions of the City and District. Participants experience mobility difficulties with different discussion topics in each meeting that affect the implementation by the village-campus participants. Some participants implemented, and some participants did not. That also relates to the different needs of each village-campus participant.

4. Conclusions

Based on the research results on the effectiveness of the village-campus program, conclusions were obtained as follows. Internal factors that have a relationship with the level of participation are gender and frequency of attendance. In contrast, age, education level, and type of profession have no relationship to the level of participation. The frequency of attendance has a significant relationship with the level of participation of village-campus program participants.

External factors do not have a significant relationship with the level of participation. Therefore, the relationship between the participation of village-campus participants and the effectiveness of the village-campus program has an insignificant relationship. It shows that the involvement of participants in the activities of the village campus does not support the achievement of village-campus effectiveness. However, the relationship between the two variables shows a sign of a positive relationship.

Based on the study results, there are several suggestions put forward by researchers, including the following. First, we recommend that village-campus participants can always actively participate not only when meeting with a companion but can be consistently active in establishing a relationship with the resource person. Other factors, such as the distance in carrying out activities, are difficult to reach. That can be done by arranging the meeting place for planning a strategy and its achievement by the participants.

The frequency of attendance of participants has a significant relationship with the level of participation. However, the study showed a low frequency. That can be done by determining the topics of discussion that are more interesting and more supportive of the type of professional participants.

Monitoring is needed by sending a companion to participants who are implementing the material received by the participants of the village-campus program. That will increase the participants' success in implementing the material according to the field they are engaged.

Research that measures effectiveness through participant participation must be examined more deeply, especially internal and external factors. Again, it must be seen how the influence of characteristics and support related to the program. That can be a reference for program organizers regarding the factors related to the smooth implementation of the village-campus program.

References

[1] BADAN PUSAT STATISTIKA. *Angka Partisipasi Kasar Indonesia terhadap Pendidikan 2011-2019*, 2019. https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/28/303/1/angka-partisipasi-kasar-a-p-k-.html

[2] BADAN PUSAT STATISTIKA. *Jumlah Penduduk Menurut Kabupaten/Kota (Jiwa)*, 2020. https://jabar.bps.go.id/indicator/12/133/1/jumlah-penduduk-menurut-kabupaten-kota.html
[3] CHANTARASOMABAT C., UDOMBUNYANUPARB N., and KENCHAIWONG N. Development of Innovation enhances Learning Achievement of Educational Schools in Northeastern Thailand under the Office of the Basic Education Commission. *Journal of Education, Mahasarakham University*, 2017, 11(2): 171–183.
[4] CORBETT M., & FORSEY M. Rural youth outmigration and education: challenges to aspirations discourse in mobile modernity. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 2017, 38(3): 429-444. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2017.1308456
[5] GULLØV J. M. Local Traditions and renewal of Rural Education in Denmark. Proceedings of the European Conference for Educational Research, Copenhagen, 2017. https://eera-ecer.de/ecer-programmes/conference/22/contribution/41543/
[6] HARGREAVES A. Primary Education in Small Rural Schools: Past, Present and Future. In: *Life in Schools and Classrooms*. Springer, Singapore, 2017: 223-243. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316733931_Primary_Education_in_Small_Rural_Schools_Past_Present_and_Future
[7] ECHAZARRA A., & RADINGER T. Learning in Rural Schools: Insights from PISA, TALIS and the Literature. *OECD Education Working Paper*, 2019, 196. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/learning-in-rural-schools_8b1a5cb9-en
[8] ROBERTS P. Looking for the Rural: Epistemic absences and cultural silence. In: *The Australian Curriculum: Promises, problems and possibilities*. Australian Curriculum Studies Association, Canberra, 2018: 201-210. https://researchprofiles.canberra.edu.au/en/publications/looking-for-the-rural-epistemic-absences-and-cultural-silence
[9] CHEUNG A. C. K. How Should Education in Rural Areas be Reformed? *Science Insights Education Frontiers*, 2021, 9(1): 1113–1117. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1306511.pdf
[10] GOKHALE S., & O'DEA M. *Effectiveness of Community Service in Enhancing Student Learning and Development*. Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, Indiana, 2016. https://peer.asee.org/effectiveness-of-community-service-in-enhancing-student-learning-and-development.pdf
[11] SIRI R., & CHANTRAPRAYOON O. S. Local community participatory learning with a nature interpretation system: A case study in Ban Pong, Sansai district, Chiang Mai, Thailand. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 2017, 38(2): 181–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2016.04.003
[12] KIYASIT K., KULTANAN P., VAJARINTARANGOON K., WANNUPATAM B., SOSUTHA C., & CHUSUWAN S. A Paradigm Development of Community Learning Management in the Small Sized School in Buri Ram Province Thailand. *Tadris: Jurnal Keguruan dan Ilmu Tarbiyah*, 2018, 3(2): 197-205. https://doi.org/10.24042/tadris.v3i2.2986
[13] VIRTUE E. E., MADDOX G., and PFAFF K. The Lasting Effects of Learning Communities. *Learning Communities Research and Practice*, 2019, 7(2): 6. https://washingtoncenter.evergreen.edu/lcrpjournal/vol7/iss2/6
[14] HERNÁNDEZ-SILVA D. Education for the rural development: A critical analysis of the implementation process of the Escuela Nueva program in Colombia. *Revista Innova Educación*, 2020, 2(4): 526-542. https://doi.org/10.35622/j.rie.2020.04.002
[15] FAISALA F., RISAL A., HARDIATO, and ELIHAMI. Nonformal Education and Reduction of Poverty in Rural Areas. *Jurnal Edukasi Nonformal*, 2019, 1(1): 106-114. https://ummaspul.e-journal.id/JENFOL/article/view/213
[16] MULJONO P. *Cuplikan Berita Posdaya dan Kampus desa di Media Massa*. Institut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor, 2018.
[17] COHEN J., & UPHOFF N. Participation's place in rural development: Seeking clarity through specificity. *World Development*, 1980, 8(3): 213-235. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(80)90011-X
[18] CENTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT. *Monitoring of the Village-Campus*. Institut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor, 2018.
[19] BAKHTIAR Y. *The Village Campus as the means for Disseminating the Results of Research*. Pusat Pengembangan Sumberdaya Manusia, Bogor, 2018.

参考文:

[1] 巴丹普萨特统计. 2011-2019年印度尼西亚教育总入学率, 2019. https://www.bps.go.id/indicator/28/303/1/angka-partisipasi-kasar-a-p-k-.html
[2] 巴丹普萨特统计. 摄政/城市总人口（灵魂）, 2020. https://jabar.bps.go.id/indicator/12/133/1/jumlah-penduduk-menurut-kabupaten-kota.html
[3] CHANTARASOMABAT C., UDOMBUNYANUPARB N., 和 KENCHAIWONG N. 创新的发展提高了基础教育委员会办公室下泰国东北部教育学校的学习成果。教育杂志，玛哈沙拉堪大学, 2017, 11(2): 171–183.
[4] CORBETT M., 和 FORSEY M. 农村青年外迁与教育：移动现代性中对愿望话语的挑战。演讲：教育文化政治研究, 2017, 38(3): 429-444. https://doi.org/10.1080/01596306.2017.1308456
[5] GULLØV J. M. 丹麦乡村教育的地方传统与更新。欧洲教育研究会议论文集，哥本哈根, 2017. https://eera-ecer.de/ecer-programmes/conference/22/contribution/41543/
[6] HARGREAVES A. 农村小学校的初等教育：过去、现在和未来。在：学校和教室的生活。新加坡施普林格, 2017: 223-243. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/316733931_Primary_Education_in_Small_Rural_Schools_Past_Present_and_Future
[7] ECHAZARRA A., 和 RADINGER T. 在农村学校学习：来自国际学生评估、教学和学习国际调查和文献计划的见解。经合组织教育工作文件, 2019, 196. https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/education/learning-in-rural-schools_8b1a5cb9-en
[8] ROBERTS P. 寻找农村：认知缺失和文化沉默。在：澳大利亚课程：承诺、问题和可能性。堪培拉澳大利亚课程研究协会, 2018: 201-210. https://researchprofiles.canberra.edu.au/en/publications/looking-for-the-rural-epistemic-absences-and-cultural-silence

[9] CHEUNG A. C. K. 农村教育该如何改革？科学洞察教育前沿, 2021, 9(1): 1113–1117. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1306511.pdf
[10] GOKHALE S., 和 O'DEA M. 社区服务在促进学生学习和发展方面的有效性。印第安纳州普渡大学工程技术学院, 2016. https://peer.asee.org/effectiveness-of-community-service-in-enhancing-student-learning-and-development.pdf
[11] SIRI R., 和 CHANTRAPRAYOON O. S. 带有自然解释系统的当地社区参与式学习：泰国清迈三斋区班邦的案例研究。农业社会科学杂志, 2017, 38(2): 181–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2016.04.003
[12] KIYASIT K., KULTANAN P., VAJARINTARANGOON K., WANNUPATAM B., SOSUTHA C., 和 CHUSUWAN S. 泰国武里南省小型学校社区学习管理的范式发展。塔德里斯：教师培训和塔比亚科学杂志, 2018, 3(2): 197-205. https://doi.org/10.24042/tadris.v3i2.2986
[13] VIRTUE E. E., MADDOX G., 和 PFAFF K. 学习社区的持久影响。学习型社区研究与实践, 2019, 7(2): 6. https://washingtoncenter.evergreen.edu/lcrpjournal/vol7/iss2/6
[14] HERNÁNDEZ-SILVA D. 农村发展教育：对哥伦比亚新学校计划实施过程的批判性分析。创新杂志教育, 2020, 2(4): 526-542. https://doi.org/10.35622/j.rie.2020.04.002
[15] FAISALA F., RISAL A., HARDIATO, 和 ELIHAMI. 农村非正规教育与扶贫。非正规教育杂志, 2019, 1(1): 106-114. https://ummaspul.e-journal.id/JENFOL/article/view/213
[16] MULJONO P. 大众媒体中波斯达亚和乡村校园的新闻片段。茂物茂物农业研究所, 2018.
[17] COHEN J., 和 UPHOFF N. 参与在农村发展中的地位：通过特殊性寻求明确性。世界发展, 1980, 8(3): 213-235. https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(80)90011-X
[18] 人力资源开发中心. 村校园监控。茂物农业学院, 茂物, 2018.
[19] BAKHTIAR Y. 乡村校园作为传播研究成果的手段。茂物人力资源发展中心, 2018.