e-ISSN 2795-4362
p-ISSN 2795-4340




10.5281/zenodo.14245860 Vol. 07 Issue 10 Oct - 2024 Manuscript ID: #01639

# Community Perceptions about Social Forestry Activities In the Working Area of the UPTD KPHP Sub-Watershed Belayan, East Kalimantan Province Forestry Service

**Legowo Kamarubayana, Djumansi Derita, Tomy Miharja, Zuhdi Yahya**
*Forestry Study Program, Faculty of Agriculture,*
*University of 17 Agustus 1945 Samarinda*
**Email**:*legowo68@gmail.com; djumansi66@gmail.com; markebo68@gmail.com*

**Corresponding Author** : *Djumansi Derita*

## Abstract

The research aims to determine community perceptions of the benefits, driving factors, inhibiting factors, and community involvement in social forestry in the Belayan Sub-Watershed KPHP Working Area, Kutai Kartanegara Regency. This research was descriptive and was carried out in the UPTD KPHP Sub-Watershed Belayan Working Area of the Forestry Service of East Kalimantan Province, Indonesia. The stages of research activities are as follows: research preparation, observation, determining samples/respondents, collecting primary and secondary data, data analysis, drawing conclusions, and reporting. Determining the sample (respondents) used the Non-Probability Sampling method with a purposive sampling technique of 80 respondents. The method used is a descriptive approach. Community perception of social forestry was measured using the Likert scale method, namely: 1 = don't know/don't understand/disagree, 2 = don't know/don't understand/don't agree, 3 = unsure, 4 = know/understand/agree, and 5 = very knowledgeable/very understanding/strongly agree. The results of the research show that (1) The public's perception of social forestry knowledge is 27.25% don't know/don't understand and don't know/little understand, 39.38% are unsure, and those who know/understand and really know/very understand as much as 33.38%; (2) people's perceptions about the benefits of social forestry activities, namely don't know/don't understand and don't know/don't understand as much as 7.63%, doubtful as much as 45.00%, and those who know/understand and really know/very understand are 47 .37%; (3) community perception regarding the inhibiting factors and driving factors for social forestry activities, namely don't know/don't understand and don't know/don't understand as much as 8.87%, doubtful as much as 37.63%, and those who know/understand and really know/ very understand as much as 52.60%; (4) community perception regarding community involvement in social forestry activities, namely don't know/don't understand and don't know/don't understand as much as 5.00%, doubtful as much as 34.75%, and those who know/understand and really know/very understand as much as 60.25%.

***Keywords:*** *Community Perception, Social Forestry, KPHP of Belayan Sub-Watershed Area.*

**How to cite**: Kamarubayana, L., Derita, D., Miharja, T., & Yahya, Z. (2024). Community Perceptions about Social Forestry Activities In the Working Area of the UPTD KPHP Sub-Watershed Belayan, East Kalimantan Province Forestry Service. *GPH-International Journal of Agriculture and Research*, *7*(10), 45-58. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14245860

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Forests with various abundant resources, both in the form of wood and non-timber forest products and including vegetable or animal objects in the forest, are a source of economic fulfillment for communities around the forest for their living needs. Forests are natural resources that provide ecosystem services that are fundamental to the livelihood and welfare of communities around the forest. Community interaction with forests has been going on for quite a long time because the existence of forests has provided many benefits for people's lives. Villages around the forest. In general, people living around forests have a very high dependence on forest products (Munawaroh et al, 2011).

Forests and forestry play an important role in poverty alleviation efforts by increasing income, increasing food security, reducing vulnerability, and improving the sustainability of natural resources which contributes to improving community welfare (Warner, 2000). However, in reality, many people who live around forests and people who already have local wisdom (customary forests) still live less prosperously and have less education ((Suyanto and Specificiyah 2006). Forest problems arise as the population increases, demanding that food and household needs be met. Firewood, carpentry wood needs, and residential areas (Senoaji, 2011), result in forest encroachment which causes forest degradation.

Therefore, community involvement in forest management is very important, considering that the intensity of interaction between forest communities and forests is very high in all regions of Indonesia (Aji et al. 2014; Ekawati et al. 2015).

To empower communities and overcome poverty around forests, the government through the Ministry of Environment and Forestry launched a Social Forestry program, this is aimed at reducing the rate of forest destruction while increasing the involvement of communities around forests in forest management. The legal basis for implementing the Social Forestry program is the Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation Number P.83/MENLHK/SETJEN/KUM.1/10/2016 concerning Social Forestry. The social forestry program implemented by the government consists of five schemes, namely, Customary Forest (HA) in the form of forests managed by customary law communities, Village Forests (HD) managed by Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes), Community Forests (HKm) managed by Forest Farmer Groups (KTH), Community Plantation Forests (HTR) managed by individuals or cooperatives and Forestry Partnerships (KK) which are managed by communities who live and live around partnership forests.

The research aims to determine community perceptions of the benefits, driving factors, inhibiting factors, and community involvement in social forestry in the Belayan Sub-Watershed KPHP Working Area, Kutai Kartanegara Regency.It is hoped that the results of this research will be useful for the UPTD KPHP Belayan Sub DAS as evaluation and comparison material with Social Forestry activities in the working area of the UPTD KPHP Belayan Sub-watershed.

## 2. RESEARCH METHODS

### 2.1. Time and Location

The research was carried out in the UPTD KPHP Sub-watershed Belayan Working Area of the Forestry Service of East Kalimantan Province, Indonesia.

### 2.2. Research Activities

The stages of research activities are as follows: research preparation, observation, determining samples/respondents, collecting primary and secondary data, data analysis, drawing conclusions, and reporting.

### 2.3. Determination of Sample (Respondents)

The sampling method (respondents) used was the Non-Probability Sampling method with a purposive sampling technique. According Sugiyono (2015), taking respondents in research uses a purposive sampling technique, that is, sampling respondents is not random or deliberately adjusted to the research objectives. The calculation results obtained 80 respondents, namely 62 men and 18 women.

### 2.4. Data collection

The data collected consists of (1) primary data: types and development of Social Forestry activities from 2020 to 2023 in the working area of UPTD KPHP Belayan Sub-watershed, East Kalimantan Provincial Forestry Service, namely knowledge about Social Forestry activities, utilization of social forestry, inhibiting factors and community drivers, and the level of community participation; (2) secondary data, namely the Village monograph and Location of the UPTD KPHP Work Area for the Belayan Sub-watershed Forestry Service of East Kalimantan Province on the UPTD KPHP Work Area Map for the Belayan Sub-watershed.

Community perception of social forestry is measured using the Likert scale method, namely by describing several question items that have been prepared in the questionnaire, and for each question item a score is given according to the respondent's choice, namely: 1 = don't know/don't understand/disagree, 2 = don't know/don't know. don't understand/don't agree, 3 = unsure, 4 = know/understand/agree, and 5 = really know/very understand/strongly agree.

### 2.5. Data analysis

The data collected was tested for validity and reliability. According to Sugiyono (2005), a validity test is a testing tool for a questionnaire instrument that is formed in such a way as to measure the accuracy, accuracy, and validity of a questionnaire instrument. Reliability testing is a test tool used to test or measure the trustworthiness of a questionnaire instrument which is an indicator of a variable or construct that is useful for determining the consistency of the measuring instrument and if the measurement is repeated from time to

time. The method used in the reliability test is the Cronbach Alpha method. According to Ghozali in Fanani, Djati and Silvanita (2016), decision-making for reliability testing is as follows: Cronbach's alpha < 0.6 = poor reliability; Cronbach's alpha 0.6 - 0.79 = acceptable reliability; and Cronbach's alpha 0.8 = good reliability.

Data analysis uses a descriptive approach method, namely to describe and analyze descriptively the types and development of Social Forestry activities from 2020 to 2023 in the UPTD KPHP Work Area, Belayan Sub-watershed, East Kalimantan Provincial Forestry Service.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1. KPHP Unit III Belayan Sub DAS

Regional Technical Implementation Unit KPHP Unit III Belayan is the technical management unit of the Regional Forestry Service of East Kalimantan Province which is at the site level which includes planning, organizing, implementing as well as controlling and supervising to implementationof government policies at the site level and contribute directly to improving community welfare through production of wood forest products (HHK) and non-timber forest products (HHBK) as well as environmental services.

The KPHP area of almost 1 million hectares consists of protected forests of around 207,736.35 hectares (20.81 percent). There are 264,457.10 hectares of Production Forest (264.49 percent). Limited Production Forests are around 507,745.40 hectares (50.87 percent) and Convertible Production Forests are 18,145.56 hectares (1.82 percent). Determination of the Belayan Sub-watershed KPHP area as a KPH by the Minister of Forestry regarding the determination of the area of the Protected Forest Management Unit (KPHL) and Production Forest Management Unit (KPHP) in East Kalimantan Province and Regent Regulation Number 25 of 2013 concerning the institution of the Mahakam Delta KPHP and the Belayan Sub DAS KPHP. The Belayan Sub-watershed KPHP area is in a forest area covering six sub-districts in Kukar Regency, namely Kota Bangun, Muara Wis, Muara Kaman, Kenohan, Kembang Janggut and Tabang Districts.

### 3.2. Respondent Characteristics

Based on the results of research on 80 respondents consisting of 62 male (77.50%) and 18 female (22.50%). The condition of the respondents based on age is: 20-25 years old, 9 respondents (11.25%); 26-30 years old were 14 respondents (17.50%); aged 31 - 35 years were 38 respondents (47.50%); aged 36 – 40 years were 14 respondents (17.50%) and aged 41 – 45 years were 5 respondents (6.25%); The condition of the respondents based on occupation is: farmers as many as 17 respondents (21.25%), traders as many as 18 respondents (22.250%), civil servants as many as 9 respondents (11.25%), private employees as many as 15 respondents (18.75%), not working as many as 2 respondents (2.50%) and others as many as 19 respondents (23.75%).

## 3.3. Respondents' Perceptions

### 3.3.1. Knowledge of social forestry activities

The results of research regarding respondents' responses to the level of knowledge about social forestry activities carried out, namely to determine the distribution of information known to residents about social forestry activities, are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Respondents' Responses to Knowledge about Social Forestry Activities**

| Statement | Answer Score of Respondent | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| I am aware of the existence of a social forestry program in the area where I live (X 1.1) | 8 | 2 | 27 | 30 | 13 |
| I understand the purpose of social forestry (X1.2) | 10 | 5 | 30 | 19 | 16 |
| I understand the potential benefits of social forestry (X1.3) | 9 | 11 | 26 | 24 | 10 |
| I understand social forestry schemes (X1.4) | 15 | 19 | 30 | 12 | 4 |
| I know the boundaries of the social forestry program village forest and where the residents live (X1.5) | 11 | 15 | 36 | 11 | 7 |
| I know the rights to manage social forestry (X1.6) | 14 | 18 | 27 | 15 | 6 |
| I know the legal basis/regulations for social forestry utilization (X1.7) | 10 | 16 | 35 | 17 | 2 |
| I am aware of the facilities provided by the government to support the development of Social Forestry (X1.8) | 6 | 9 | 33 | 21 | 11 |
| I am aware of the formation of KUPS in social forestry (X1.9) | 7 | 12 | 35 | 17 | 9 |
| I am aware of the formation of LPHD in social forestry (X1.10) | 10 | 11 | 36 | 15 | 8 |
| Average | 10,00 | 10,80 | 31,50 | 18,10 | 8,60 |
| Percentage | 12,50 | 14,77 | 39,38 | 22,63 | 10,75 |

*Source*: Processed Primary Data (2024)

The research results in Table 1 show that the average respondents' answers regarding social forestry knowledge are as follows: don't know/don't understand/disagree, namely 10.00 respondents (12.50%); don't know/don't understand/don't agree, namely 11.80 (14.75%); undecided, namely 31.50 respondents (39.38%); know/understand/agree = 18.10 respondents (22.63%) and very know/very understand/strongly agree, namely 8.60 respondents (10.75%). Based on these data, residents' knowledge of social forestry activities in the Belayan Sub-Watershed KPHP area shows that there are still some local communities who are still not/little aware of the existence of social forestry activities around where the community lives (27.25%), and residents who still undecided, namely 39.38%. This is due to the lack of intensity of counseling provided by related parties, so the public's understanding of social forestry is very low. The availability of information has a real influence on the level of public perception. The relationship between the availability of information and the intensity of counseling is felt to be very influential because the intensity of counseling is low, and the availability of information obtained by the public is also low so the perception that is built is also low.

The research results also show that several residents understand and are very aware of the existence of social forestry activities (33.38%), but there are still many residents who do not understand the social forestry activity programs that have been planned by the government. Therefore, there is a need for more intense outreach regarding social forestry activity programs from both the government and related institutions to all local communities so that they can maximize the potential contained in social forestry activity programs optimally. Several efforts to increase community knowledge/understanding include social forestry assistance, village forest information planning, and Forum Group Discussions (FGD).As stated by the Director of Social Forestry Assistance at the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (2018), social forestry assistance is an activity carried out with the community continuously for sustainable forest management in state forest areas or private/customary forests, so that the community can organize itself and groups in accessing market information, technology, capital, and other resources as an effort to increase productivity, business efficiency, income and welfare as well as increase awareness and independence in preserving environmental functions.

### 3.3.2. Benefits of Social Forestry Activities for the Community

The results of research on respondents' responses to the benefits of social forestry activities for the community, namely to find out the form of use of social forestry for the local population, are presented in Table 2.

**Table 2. Respondents' Responses to the Benefits of Social Forestry Activities**

| Statement | Answer Score of Respondent | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| With social forestry activities, the community can have equal and broad access to forest and land management (X2.1) | 5 | 0 | 30 | 35 | 10 |
| The existence of social forestry activities apart from short-term benefits in the form of wood, forests also provide long-term benefits (X2.2) | 3 | 0 | 23 | 24 | 30 |
| The existence of social forestry activities increases the welfare of the community, especially around the forest (X2.3) | 4 | 5 | 37 | 27 | 7 |
| If there are social forestry activities, the community can apply for rights to the Community Forest (X2.4) | 0 | 3 | 43 | 23 | 11 |
| With social forestry activities, the community can apply for rights to the Village Forest (X2.5) | 0 | 3 | 43 | 23 | 11 |
| With social forestry activities, the community can apply for rights to Community Plantation Forests(X2.6) | 0 | 3 | 43 | 23 | 11 |
| With social forestry activities, the community can have legal access to manage forest areas (X2.7) | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 26 |
| The existence of social and economic forestry activities in the community has increased (X2.8) | 2 | 4 | 36 | 25 | 13 |
| The existence of social forestry activities as a solution to tenure problems (X2.9) | 5 | 13 | 37 | 22 | 3 |
| The existence of social forestry activities is expected to accelerate community economic | 2 | 3 | 40 | 27 | 8 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| development (X2.10) | | | | | |
| Average | 2,10 | 4,00 | 36,00 | 24,90 | 13,00 |
| Percentage | 2,63 | 5,00 | 45,00 | 31,12 | 16,25 |

*Source*: Processed Primary Data (2024)

Based on Table 2, shows that the average respondents' answers regarding the benefits of social forestry for residents are as follows: don't know/don't understand/disagree, namely 2.10 respondents (2.63%); don't know/don't understand/don't agree, namely 4.00 respondents (5.00%); undecided, namely 36.00 respondents (45.00%); know/understand/agree = 24.90 respondents (31.12%) and very know/very understand/strongly agree, namely 13.00 respondents (16.25%).

Similar research results reported by Novayanti et al (2017) show that the community admitted that with a permit, they felt comfortable and safe in managing the forest. Based on data obtained in the field, respondents in the four villages, namely Budi Lestari, Sinar Ogan, Jati Baru, and Srikaton, had a medium level of perception, while high perception was only found in Jati Indah Village. The perception is formed because the public still believes that currently, HTR activities are still more profitable for the government than the benefits obtained by the community.Furthermore, it was reported by Wahyudi et al (2021) that respondents had a moderate perception of the condition of the forests around Kutamanah Village and the benefits of the social forestry program because the implementation of social forestry was considered to be going less well. This happens because the community does not receive adequate socialization about social forestry and has never received training in sustainable forest management. The results of other research on community perceptions regarding the use and level of dependence on forest resources were reported by Serkadifat et al (2024) that the most answers in the quite agree category 60 respondents followed by the disagree category 50 respondents. The percentage of agreement level from respondents' answers was 59.3%, meaning that of the 46 respondents used as samples, 59.30% of them utilized and depended for their livelihood on existing forest resources.

### 3.3.3. Inhibiting and Encouraging Factors in Social Forestry Activities

The results of research on respondents' responses to the inhibiting and encouraging factors in social forestry activities, namely to determine the behavior of residents towards social forestry activities, are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3. Respondents' Responses to Inhibiting and Encouraging Factors for Social Forestry Activities**

| Statement | Answer Score of Respondent | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| I saw that people can use water sources (wisely) from the village forest where I live (X3.1) | 2 | 8 | 35 | 20 | 15 |
| I saw that the community is supporting the government regarding forest utilization which can improve the quality of the environment around community forest areas (X3.2) | 1 | 2 | 23 | 30 | 24 |
| I saw that people can take non-timber products (within certain limits) from the community forest where I live (X3.3) | 2 | 10 | 34 | 25 | 9 |
| I saw that people can use river water that comes from the village forest where I live (X3.4) | 2 | 8 | 27 | 26 | 17 |
| I saw that people can farm in the forest (in designated use zones) from the social forestry scheme where I live (X3.5) | 1 | 7 | 40 | 18 | 14 |
| I saw the results of community forests being used by residents to improve the family economy (X3.6) | 0 | 3 | 25 | 34 | 18 |
| I saw local people piling up inorganic waste around the community forest where I live (X3.7) | 0 | 4 | 22 | 36 | 18 |
| I saw that the community was given training about non-timber forest products for survival in the area(X3.8) | 2 | 4 | 21 | 35 | 18 |
| I saw people burning land to enrich the soil in the community forest where I live(X3.9) | 0 | 13 | 40 | 24 | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I saw that people can take wood (within certain limits) from the community forest where I live (X3.10) | 0 | 2 | 34 | 37 | 7 |
| Average | 1,00 | 6,10 | 30,10 | 28,50 | 14,30 |
| Percentage | 1,24 | 7,63 | 37,63 | 35,63 | 17,87 |

*Source*: Processed Primary Data (2024)

Based on Table 3, it shows that the average respondents' answers regarding the inhibiting and encouraging factors of local communities towards social forestry are as follows: don't know/don't understand/disagree, namely 1.00 respondents (1.24%); don't know/don't understand/don't agree, namely 6.10 respondents (7.63%); undecided, namely 30.10 (37.63%); know/understand/agree = 28.50 respondents (35.63%) and very know/very understand/strongly agree, namely 14.30 respondents (17.87%)

Based on the research results, several factors that either inhibit or encourage the community in social forestry activities in the Belayan Sub-Watershed KPHP area show that 53.50% of people agree and strongly agree about social forestry if forest products can be utilized jointly within reasonable limits. And wise. In forest utilization, there needs to be certain restrictions so that both in the extraction of forest products and the use of forest areas as new employment areas; Meanwhile, those who disagree and disagree are 7.10%.

Factors driving the community at the research location towards social forestry activities include the community being able to use springs, being able to harvest non-timber products, being able to farm, and social forestry is expected to improve the community's economy; while the inhibiting factors are forest burning by several communities, and the community's habit of throwing inorganic waste in forest areas.

### 3.3.4. Population Participation in Social Forestry Activities

The results of research on respondents' responses to the level of participation of residents in social forestry activities are presented in Table 4.

**Table 4. Respondents' Responses to the Level of Population Participation in Social Forestry Activities**

| **Statement** | **Answer Score of Respondent** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| I agree if community forests are used as a tourist attraction (Y1) | 0 | 10 | 30 | 20 | 20 |
| I agree if the government focuses on creating programs to preserve forests through social forestry schemes (Y2) | 0 | 4 | 25 | 23 | 28 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I agree if local communities create programs to preserve community forests (Y3) | 1 | 4 | 25 | 35 | 15 |
| I agree that the existence of rivers in the forest can be used as a source of water for the lives of local communities (Y4) | 0 | 3 | 23 | 26 | 28 |
| I agree if there is a unit/container that receives harvests obtained by the local community (Y5) | 0 | 1 | 23 | 21 | 35 |
| I agree that the results of forest use can help local communities improve education (Y6) | 0 | 1 | 27 | 32 | 20 |
| I agree if the community creates a special place for disposing of inorganic waste (Y7) | 0 | 2 | 35 | 29 | 14 |
| I agree that local communities are always provided with knowledge regarding the sustainable use of forests social (Y8) | 0 | 1 | 21 | 35 | 23 |
| I agree if community forest use land is distributed equally to all residents (Y9) | 0 | 4 | 37 | 30 | 9 |
| I agree that there are sanctions for anyone who cuts down trees illegally (Y10) | 2 | 7 | 32 | 30 | 9 |
| Average | 0,30 | 3,70 | 27,80 | 28,10 | 20,10 |
| Percentage | 0,38 | 4,63 | 34,75 | 35,13 | 25,12 |

*Source*: Processed Primary Data (2024)

Based on Table 4, shows that the average respondents' answers regarding the level of participation of residents in social forestry are as follows: don't know/don't understand/disagree, namely 0.30 respondents (0.38%); don't know/don't understand/don't agree, namely 3.70 respondents (4.63%); undecided, namely 27.80 respondents (34.75%); know/understand/agree = 28.10 respondents (35.13%), and very know/very understand/strongly agree, namely 20.10 respondents (25.13%).

The results of observations based on community attitudes regarding social forestry activities in the Belayan Sub-Watershed KPHP area show that the majority of the community strongly agree with the existence of Social Forestry Activities that can be carried out, such as

the opening of tourist attraction areas with a level of doubt reaching 37.5%; The use of the area by the entire local community requires the provision of knowledge with a level of agreement of 43.75%, and the provision of strict sanctions for those who damage forest sustainability which reaches a level of agreement of 37.50%. The level of community participation in forest use can influence the existence of forests.The results of the research show that the local community's statements state that there is a fairly high level of participation so the function of the forest is the backbone of community life. Social forestry activities such as community forests can be used as a means to earn a living for their lives. As stated by the Head of the Public Relations Bureau of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (2023), as a real effort to realize the government's vision of developing Integrated Area Development (IAD) based on Social Forestry in various regions. Collaboration between local governments, government institutions, and the community is the key to success in achieving sustainable development goals through the Social Forestry Program. Community participation in social forestry activities is very important because it can help in economic development, environmental sustainability, utilization of local knowledge, proximity to the forest, and sense of belonging.

## 4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### 4.1. Conclusion

Based on the research results and discussion, it is concluded as follows:

1. The public's perception of social forestry knowledge is 27.25% don't know/don't understand and don't know/little understand, 39.38% are unsure, and 33.38% know/understand and know/very understand. %.
2. Public perception regarding the benefits of social forestry activities, namely don't know/don't understand and don't know/don't understand as much as 7.63%, doubtful as much as 45.00%, and those who know/understand and know/very understand are 47. 37%.
3. Community perception regarding the inhibiting factors and driving factors for social forestry activities, namely don't know/don't understand and don't know/don't understand as much as 8.87%, doubtful as much as 37.63%, and those who know/understand and know/very understand as much as 52.60%.
4. Community perception regarding community involvement in social forestry activities, namely don't know/don't understand and don't know/don't understand as much as 5.00%, doubtful as much as 34.75%, and those who know/understand and know/very understand as much as 60.25%.

### 4.2. Suggestion

Based on the conclusions obtained, the author provides the following suggestions:

1. Continuous outreach, assistance, and technical guidance are needed to increase public awareness and knowledge about the importance of protecting and managing forest areas.
2. In managing forest areas, local community-based forms of area management and utilization can be implemented.

3. It is advisable to increase cooperation activities with related parties in social forestry activities.
4.Research is needed regarding economic and forest resource studies regarding community participation.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Munawaroh E., Saparita, R., and Purwanto, Y. 2011. Community Dependence on Non-Timber Forest Products in Malinau, East Kalimantan: An Ethnobotanical Analysis and Implications for Forest Conservation. LIPI, Bogor.
[2] Warner, K. 2000. Forestry and sustainable livelihoods. Unasylva 202, Vol. 51- 2000/3. FAO, Rome.
[3] Suyanto, S. and N Specialiyah. 2006. Rewards for Environmental Services for Poverty Alleviation. Journal of Agro Economics. 24 (1): 1- 28
[4] Senoaji, G. 2011. Socio-Economic Conditions of Communities Around the Bukit Daun Protected Forest in Bengkulu. Sociohumanities, 13(1): 1-18.
[5] Aji GB, Suryanto J, Yulianti R, Wiranti A, Abdurrahim AY, Miranda TI. 2014. Poverty reduction strategies in villages around forests. Development of PHBM and HKm models. Research Report. Population Research Center. Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Jakarta.
[6] Ekawati S, Budiningsih K, Sylviani, Suryandari E, Hakim I. 2015. Critical review study of forest management on the island of Java. Policy Briefs. Vol 9, No. 1 Center for Social, Economic, Policy and Climate Change Research and Development, Bogor.
[7] Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation Number P.83/MENLHK/SETJEN/ KUM.1/10/2016 concerning Social Forestry.
[8] Firdaus, A.Y. 2018. Practical Guide to Implementing Social Forestry Policy. CIFOR, Bogor, Indonesia.
[9] Sugiyono, P. D. 2015. Educational Research Methods: Quantitative, Qualitative, R&D Approaches (26th Printing). Alphabeta, Bandung.
[10] Sugiyono, P.D. 2005. Statistics for Research. Alphabeta, Bandung.
[11] Fanani, I., Djati, S. P. & Silvanita, K. 2016. The Influence of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment on Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) (Case Study of RSU UKI)', Fundamental Management Journal. 1(1):40-53.
[12] Director of Social Forestry Assistance, Ministry of Environment and Forestry. 2022. Social Forestry Assistance to Avoid Misdirection. https://dishut.sultengprov.go.id/berita/baca/B002#:~:text=Kemitraan%20Environment%20menelukan%20Princip%20Mendampingan%20Forestry%20Social,Plant%20People%2C%20Forest%20Traditional%20dan%20Partnership %20Forestry.
[13] Novayanti, D., I.S. Banuwa, R. Safe'I, C. Wulandari, and I.G. Febryano. 2017. Analysis of Factors that Influence Community Perceptions in the Development of Community Plantation Forests at KPH Gedong Wani. Journal of Forests and Society. Vol. 9(2): 61-74.

[14] Wahyudi, A.R. Sundawati, L. Trison and Soni. 2021. Kutamanah Village Community Perceptions of the Social Forestry Program at KPH Purwakarta. https://repository.ipb.ac.id/handle/123456789/110281.

[15] Serkadifat, Y. Y. Loppies, N. D. M. Patty, L.T. Daniel, and Z.K. Wambrauw. 2024 Community Perceptions of Social Forestry Applications for the Village Forest Scheme in Kuadas Village, Makbon District, Sorong Regency. Biopendix Journal. 10(2): 248-258.

[16] Public Relations Bureau of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry. 2023. Press Release. 28 December 2023. https://ppid.menlhk.go.id/berita/siaran-pers/7566/dari-perhutanan-social-untuk-hutan-lestari-dan-community-sejahtera#:~:text=Perhutanan%20Sosial%20not%20only%20only,%20economic%20local%20and%20regional centers.