ISSN: 18158129 E-ISSN: 18151027
Volume 18, Issue 03, March, 2022

SOCIO-CULTURAL FACTORS INFLUENCING COMMUNITY FOREST SUCCESS (HKm) AT THE TANAH LAUT FOREST MANAGEMENT UNIT (FMU)

Daniel Itta[1*], Zainal Abidin[2], Denny[3]

Department of Forestry at Lambung Mangkurat University[1,2,3]

Corresponding Author: 1*

ABSTRACT— Community forest is one of the schemes of the social forestry program that provides legal access to communities to manage forests. Through this program, communities farmers can increase their income and sustainably manage forests. In the Tanah Laut Forest Management Unit, there are 25 Community Forest Permits granted to 31 forest farmer groups with an area of 5,970 hectares. 18 groups had these permits for 5 years, so it is necessary to evaluate their implementation and the social and cultural factors that influence the success of HKm. An evaluation was carried out using a questionnaire containing criteria and indicators including planning, area management, business governance, forest protection, empowerment, institutions, and other obligations. The assessment uses the method published by the Nusa Tenggara Community Foundation. The results of the assessment of 18 groups became a reference in assessing the success of HKm. Analysis of socio-cultural factors influencing the success of HKm using Multiple Linear Regression with a 95% confidence level or = 5%. The results obtained by the socio-cultural factors that influence include: education level of administrators, amount of assistance, distance to HKm area, average income, the intensity of meetings, and completeness of group administration.

KEYWORDS: Community Forest, socio-cultural, Forest Farmer Group, Linear Regression.

1. INTRODUCTION

The community empowerment approach changes the paradigm of forest development from timber-based forest management to community based forest management. One of the community empowerment activities carried out by the Ministry of Forestry is the Social Forestry program or social forestry and Community Forest (HKm) is one of the Social Forestry schemes. Community forests contribute substantially to the livelihoods of millions of rural people in the developing world. Development agencies have estimated that forests provide substantial livelihood benefits to more than half a billion people, many of them are very poor [17], [20]. In South Kalimantan Province, there is 10,125 ha of forest land managed by the community under the HKm scheme [13- 15]. Meanwhile, in the Tanah Laut KPH, there is 5,970 ha of forest managed by 25 KTH. The implementation of HKm needs to be evaluated to know the extent of its implementation and the factors that influence its success.

Community forests are often contrasted with forests under open access, government ownership, or ownership by private bodies. But forest management in practice is complex within these broad categories and can combine elements across them [18].

In addition to Hkm development, it also functions ecologically, for preservation, efforts to protect the forest, and the function of the position or position of the community determined by economic activities, education

and income to overcome critical land, as an effort to alleviate poverty by empowering local communities. In practice, Hkm development has limited capacity, and the capacity of the community in and around the forest often causes obstacles, this in forestry development causes the practice of participation to be sometimes loaded with manipulation of the resources it has [18], [10].

The Forest Principles, signed at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in1992, recommend sustainable forest management (SFM) to meet the social, economic, ecological, cultural, and spiritual needs of the present and future generations [12].

This study aims to determine the factors that influence the success of HKm using Multiple Linear Regression analysis.

2. Material and Methods

This study uses primary data obtained from direct interviews with respondents using questionnaires related to planning criteria, area governance, business governance, forest protection, empowerment, institutions and other obligations. The data is to assess the success of HKm implementation. And a questionnaire on social and cultural factors such as HKm permit area, management education, amount of assistance, number of KTH members, number of commodities, distance to HKm area, average income, type of work, the intensity of meetings, completeness of group administration and number of female members. Purposive sampling (purposed sample), ie respondents are selected based on their ability to answer and provide information about the problem and research objectives.

The assessment was carried out on 18 KTHs in the Tanah Laut KPH area that have had an HKm permit for 5 years or since 2017. The HKm assessment uses the assessment method published by SAMANTA in collaboration with the Ford Foundation. Meanwhile, this study aims to determine the factors that influence the success of HKm using Multiple Linear Regression analysis.

3. Results

The results obtained from the questionnaire by the KTH management that have been carried out on each group (the 18 KTH and their scores) is presented in the table. 1

Table 1. HKm Success Assessment

No	KTH	Score
1	Ingin Maju	744
2	Suka Maju	624
3	Karya Usaha	883
4	Harapan Bersama	714
5	Suka Makmur	701
6	Karya Jaya	619
7	Kariya Jaya	905
8	Gawi Makmur	401
9	Garu Makmur	420
10	Mekar Sari	577
11	Batu Kura	858
12	Galam Rimbun	603
13	Bina Bersama	770

14	Mekar Sari	875
15	Gawi Sabumi	576
16	Pinang Muda	988
17	Pinang Habang	424
18	Harapan Baru	869

Multiple linear regression analysis on social and cultural factors that affect the success of HKm is shown in Table 2

Table. 2. Results of Respondent Data Processing

Regression Statistics	
Multiple R	0,993853072
R Square	0,987743928
Adjusted R Square	0,965274463
Standard Error	33,38805916
Observations	18

ANOVA

	df	*SS*	*MS*	*F*	*Significance F*
Regression	11	539047,0361	49004,28	43,95939	7,89246E-05
Residual	6	6688,574968	1114,762		
Total	17	545735,6111			

	Coefficients	*Standard Error*	*t Stat*	*P-value*	*Lower 95%*	*Upper 95%*
Intercept	378,4740	209,5503	1,8061	0,1209	-134,2772	891,2251
X1	0,1286	0,2238	0,5746	0,5864	-0,4190	0,6762
X2	-78,0095	15,6567	-4,9825	0,0025	-116,3201	-39,6989
X3	-51,4941	20,4602	-2,5168	0,0455	-101,5585	-1,4298
X4	2,3095	1,5550	1,4852	0,1880	-1,4955	6,1144
X5	-16,7391	7,2284	-2,3157	0,0598	-34,4264	0,9482
X6	-58,4373	9,6080	-6,0821	0,0009	-81,9473	-34,9273
X7	212,1124	30,1101	7,0446	0,0004	138,4355	285,7892
X8	18,2196	48,4297	0,3762	0,7197	-100,2836	136,7228
X9	57,1214	17,3216	3,2977	0,0165	14,7371	99,5058
X10	136,1775	39,7507	3,4258	0,0140	38,9112	233,4439
X11	7,4013	8,1786	0,9050	0,4004	-12,6110	27,4136

Description:
X1 = area of HK
X2 = educational level
X3. = amount of help
X4 = number of HKm. group members
X5 = number of commodities planted
X6 = distance to HKm. location

X7 = average income of administrators and members
X8 = member's job type
X9 = intensity of the meeting
X10 = administrative completeness
X11= number of female members.

4. Discussion

Various HKm studies have discussed that participation of rural communities in the management of forests may vary according to socioeconomic backgrounds of the group/community [1], [4], [5], [10]. Further, individual community members' characteristics may influence the success of HKm. Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis carried out, the R square value is 0.98 or 98% indicating that the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable has a close relationship. The factors that have been determined (11 factors) have a close relationship with the total scoring of the assessment of the implementation of Community Forests. For the significance value F or count of 7.892E-05, when compared with F table 0.05 (significant level 5%) the value was smaller which means that the overall factors that have been determined significantly affect the successful implementation rate of Community Forests.

If we examine further, not all factors significantly influence the success of HKm. Looking at the p-value, it shows the factors that affect the success of the implementation of HKm. A p-value of less than 0.05 will affect it significantly while a p-value of more than 0.05 does not affect it significantly [9]. 6 variables that have a p-value of less than 0.05, namely X2 or the educational level factor with a coefficient value (-) which means the higher the education level of the management will reduce the assessment of HKm success. This is because the group has been assisted by the government through forestry extension workers and activity assistants [8]. So that administrators with low education will find it easier to receive input and direction. In addition, administrators with low education generally have better experience in land management. X3 or the amount of assistance with a coefficient value (-), the amount of assistance provided is mostly in the form of business development activities so that with the assistance of many groups, the focus will be geared on business development and they will ignore the development of the area even though the HKm assessment is based on business and area development [16]. X6 or Distance to the HKm area with a coefficient value (-) meaning that the HKm area close to the settlement will increase the assessment of the success of the HKm [5], [16]. X7 or the average income with a coefficient value of (+) means that increasing the income of the management and members will increase the success of HKm [2], [3], [6], [7]. Because it will increase group activities. X9 or the intensity of the meeting with a coefficient (+) means that by frequently holding meetings and discussing activity plans, communication between the management and members will go well and will increase the assessment of the success of HKm [2]. X10 or administrative completeness with a coefficient value (+) means that it will increase the assessment of the success of HKm because all documents and activities are recorded properly and will make it easier to carry out monitoring and evaluation activities [2], [9]. So partially there are 6 factors (variables) that affect the success rate of HKm, namely: level of education, amount of assistance, distance to HKm locations, the income of administrators and members, holding meetings, and administrative completeness, detailed in Table 2

5. Conclusion

1. Implementation of Community Forest in Tanah Laut KPH is Fairly Good. Of the 18 KTHs that have been assessed, 6 KTHs have received a Good score, 9 KTHs have received a Fairly Good rating and 3 KTHs have received a Poor rating.
2. Factors that affect the success of HKm are: a) level of education of management and members, b) amount of government assistance, c) distance to HKM locations, d) income, e) frequent meetings, f) and administrative

completeness

6. Suggestion

It is necessary to increase business development activities so that they can increase added value for groups and provide more intensive mentoring activities.

7. References

[1] Anwar, Ismail. (2010). Social Forestry Towards Restoration of Sustainable Forestry Development. Center for Climate Change and Policy Research and Development. Bogor.

[2] Bambang S, Apik K, Erna R. (2018). The Impact of Social Forestry. Economic, Social and Environmental Perspective. Directorate General of PSKL, Ministry of LHK. Jakarta.

[3] Corryanti, D. Waluyani. (2015). Managing Forests with the Community: Has it been successful?. Center for Research and Development of Perum Perhutani, Semarang.

[4] Dony A, Endah EN. (2017). Analysis of Community Plantation Forest Policy Development (HTR) on Improving Community Welfare in West Kalimantan and D.I Yogyakarta. Swarnabhumi Journal vol.2 no.1 February 2017. Palembang.

[5] Dwi Sudarsono, (2016). Guidelines for Monitoring and Evaluation (Monev) of PHBM. SAMANTA. Mataram.

[6] Eny P, Christine W, Arief D, Irwan SB. (2017). Socio-Economic Aspects of the Agroforestry System in the Community Forest Work Area (HKm) of West Lampung Regency, Lampung Province. Journal of Sylva Lestari vol.5 no.3 July 2017 (95-103).

[7] Jarian Permana, (2019). Strategy for the Success of the Community Forest Program in Pakpak Bharat Regency. Thesis of the Department of Forest Management, Faculty of Forestry, University of North Sumatra.

[8] Joko W, Hairul B, Dahlan. (2012). Potential and Strategy of Community Forest Development in Bireuen District, Aceh Province. Journal of Land Resource Management vol.1 no.1 June 2012 pp 1-9.

[9] Mahadianto S. (2013). Dependency Parametric Analysis with SPSS Program. King Grafindo Persada. Depok.

[10] Muhsi, Muayat Ali. (2017). Legal Review of Social Forestry. Multistakeholder Forestry Program 3 (MFP3). Jakarta.

[11] Mulyadin. (2016). Study of Community Forests as a Source of Income: Case in Gunung Kidul Regency, Yogyakarta: Journal of Forestry Social and Economic Research, Vol. 13, No. 1, April 2016. pp. 13-23.

[12] Park M, Lee H. 2014. Forest policy and law for sustainability within the Korean Peninsula. Sustainability. 6(8):5162–5186.

[13] Republic of Indonesia (2016), Decree of the Minister of Environment and Forestry Number P.83/Menlhk/Setjen/kum.I/2016 concerning Social Forestry.

[14] Republic of Indonesia (2018). Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry Number P.89/Menlhk/Setjem/Kum.I/8/2018 concerning Guidelines for Forest Farmer Groups.

[15] Republic of Indonesia (2019). PPID Press Release number SP.162/Humas/PP/HMS.3/4/2020 Indonesian Forests and Deforestation in 2019.

[16] Primary (2018). The Influence of the Social Forestry Program on the Socio-Economic Life of Forest Farmers. IPB. Bogor.

[17] Ryke Nandini, (2013). Evaluation of Community Forest Management (HKm) in Production Forest and Protection Forest on Lombok Island. Journal of Plantation Forest Research vol.10 no.1 March 2013 : 43-55.

[18] Sulistya E. (2020). Together Building Social Forestry. Center for Research and Development of Socio-Economic Policy and Climate Change. IPB Press. Jakarta.

[19] Syahrizal. (2015). Strategy for Community Forest Development (HKm) with Agroforestry Patterns in Amal Village, Sindue District, Donggala Regency. Journal of Science and Technology Tadulako vol.4 no.1 January 2015.

[20] Sri Susilo Y., Nairobi. (2019). The Impact of Social Forestry on Community Income. ISEI Economic Review Journal Vol.III No. March 1, 2019. Page 16-27