COMMUNITY SOCIAL CAPACITY IN MANAGING COMMUNITY FOREST IN BANGGAI REGENCY, CENTRAL SULAWESI

Moh. Andika Lawasi*1

1Pusat Riset Masyarakat dan Budaya, BRIN

ABSTRACT

This study aims to describe and evaluate the extent to which the social capacity of farming communities has changed in managing Community Forests (HKm) in Nambo Lempek Village, Banggai Regency, Central Sulawesi. The approach used is a qualitative descriptive method. Data collection techniques using the method of observation, interviews and documentation. The triangulation technique of checking the data's validity is used. The data analysis method used is data reduction, data presentation and conclusion. The results showed no real empowerment through efforts to increase community capacity in the process of empowering communities in the forest carried out by the state communities around the forest through the Community Forest program in Banggai Regency. There is a fragility in the social capacity of forest farming communities in managing HKm, marked by a decrease in community collective self-confidence, low intensity of collaboration, weak management institutions, and the inability to manage HKm independently.

Keywords: Community forestry, community empowerment, social forestry.

INTRODUCTION

One of the primary efforts of forestry development, as well as in the context of alleviating poverty in communities around forests carried out by the government, is to provide opportunities for communities in and around forests to participate in forestry development through social forestry, especially in forest areas, in the form of community forest activities or community forestry activities, which is abbreviated as HKm. HKm is a forest management system by local communities to support life and welfare while still paying attention to forest sustainability (Habibatul, 2021; Safe'i et al., 2018). The purpose of implementing HKm is to promote community empowerment and trust local communities living in forest areas to cultivate state forests according to their needs, abilities and knowledge so that the sustainability of forest resources can be maintained (Haryani & Rijanta, 2019).

Referring to Government Regulation No. 6 of 2007 concerning Forest Management and the definition of the regulation of the Minister of Forestry No. P. 37/Menhut-II/2007 article 3 that the implementation of community forestry is intended to develop capacity and provide access to local communities in managing forests sustainably to ensure the availability of employment opportunities for local communities. to solve economic problems and social problems that occur in society. Furthermore, Article 4 states that community forestry aims to improve the welfare of local communities through optimal, fair and sustainable use of forest resources

---

* **Correspondence Address**
E-mail: andika.lawasi@gmail.com

while preserving forest functions and the environment.

Community empowerment is a development process in which the community takes the initiative to start the process of social activities to improve their situation and condition (Kusumastuti & Taufik, 2020; Simangunsong et al., 2019). In other words, community empowerment can only occur if its citizens actively participate. In the context of forestry, community empowerment is aimed at poor rural communities whose lives depend on forest resources, so it is hoped that changes in community welfare will occur and the creation of forest sustainability.

One of the government programs to empower the community is the Community Forest program, whose mechanism has been regulated in the Minister of Forestry Regulation no. P.37/Menhut-II/2007 concerning Community Forests, where substantially the main point of empowerment is carried out through two main aspects of the approach: capacity-building and providing community access to forest resource management. The first aspect, namely capacity building, is the point of discussion in this research, which is to describe how the actual implementation of the "empowerment idea" contained in the Community Forest program contributes to the development of the capacity of forest farmer communities after the HKm, including how the process takes place. Community empowerment is running and how it develops in the present context.

Based on the background description above, the purpose of this study is to describe, as well as evaluate, how the dynamics of changing community capacity in HKm management after the program was introduced in Banggai district, Central Sulawesi, especially in Nambo Lempek village, which is an area where HKm is held. By describing the capacity aspect, a complete picture of HKm in empowering communities around the forest, especially regarding the social capacity of the community as one of the essential elements to run a program.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Community-Based Forest Manage-ment (CBFM) is a concept that places the community around the forest as the leading actor in forest management. This concept emerged as the antithesis of State-Based Forest Management, which proved to be a failure. The concept of Community Based Forest Management (CBFM) has been accepted and recognized since three decades ago as one of the potential approaches to achieving forest sustainability (Awang, 2006). This approach is focused on efforts to provide livelihoods and improve the welfare of local communities in order to maintain the conservation of forest resources (Dewi, 2018).

This thinking is based on some facts that local communities are proven to be able to regulate the division of roles between them, guarantee fairness in the use and management of forest resources, and are responsible for maintaining the sustainability of forest resources (Hidayat, 2012; Mukhtar & Jannah, 2018). The community's success in managing and utilizing forest resources depends on the close relationship between the community and forest resources. Close relationships can be built through clarity of property rights and local rules, which align with community expectations and demands for forest resources (Golar, 2019).

Studies on local communities are essential in understanding how local communities treat the natural resources around them and how to "use" the positive things from them for the benefit of future generations (Rizal, 2012). In addition, knowing the patterns of interaction between local communities and the forest will identify several needs, which can be used as a reference in formulating forest resource management plans by placing an active role and community access through a combination of management and modern techniques with the concept of, patterns, and traditional techniques based on the characteristics of each community (Melyana et al., 2015).

At the 8th world forestry congress in Jakarta in 1978, a new approach to managing forest resources in the world was declared: forest for people. At the time of the congress, new terms emerged, such as Agroforestry, Social Forestry, and Community Forestry, as an alternative future for forest resource management systems that are more promising to meet the needs of community welfare

compared to the current forest management system, which is dominated by state knowledge (Awang, 2006).

Communities around the forest fall into the category of structural poverty due to very minimal land asset control. Therefore, it is necessary to change the paradigm of SDAH development thinking from a State-Based approach (approach to state power) to a Community-Based approach (a community approach). This difference in approach simultaneously ensures the elimination of the dominance of state/government knowledge over the knowledge of forest communities. The SDAH development paradigm with a Community Based approach is called Community Forestry (Awang, 2003). (The state later adopted the concept of Community Forestry into a program, one of which is Community Forestry (HKm).

The HKm program represents the Ministry of Forestry's version of Community Forestry (CF) thinking, not the community's initiative. All HKm locations are in state forest areas determined by the Minister of Forestry. HKm is considered the only CF model in Indonesia by the government, and other models have not yet received recognition. On the other hand, for some regions in Indonesia, HKm is not the only form of community forest because it consists of community, customary, family, village, and HKm (Awang, 2004).

HKm, as one of the schemes of Social Forestry initiated by the government, has become a mainstay in efforts to empower communities around forests (Mulyadin et al., 2016; Reski et al., 2017). HKm aims to empower communities around forests by legalizing access and developing the capacity of the community itself to manage the program (Dewi, 2018; Murti, 2018). The social capacity of the community is an essential element to be described comprehensively, considering that the community itself is the primary wheel that is both the subject and the object of management, so their capacity to implement the program must be confirmed first before giving them access to forest areas.

Theoretically, capacity building can occur within organizations, communities, geographic areas, and the nonprofit sector, as well as across all sectors of life. Capacity building involves individuals and groups of people, organizations and groups within the same field or sector, and organizations and parties from different fields and sectors (Nurasa, 2016). Capacity development (Capacity Development) is an approach that is currently widely used in community development (Community Development). The term capacity building has been used since the 1990s by donor countries to improve the capacity of partner countries (assisted countries). To understand the concept of capacity building, we first need to understand the meaning of capacity itself.

Capacitance is the process of forming the ability to participate so that people have the opportunity to move from object status (manipulated by external forces and passive victims of a social process) to subject status. Thus, capacitation is an opportunity for people to build their abilities to move from object status to subject status (guided by self-awareness) and become active change agents. Capacitance is used as a term for forming the capacity for participation. Furthermore, Syarif explained that, in general, there are three levels or three layers of capacity development: the individual, the organizational, and the community (JICA, 2004).

All these levels of capacity building are equally important, interdependent, and mutually supportive of one another. Because Indonesia is a country with a large population, diverse socio-economic and socio-cultural conditions, and an extensive service area, the approach used in capacity building in Indonesia is a group approach. Thus, in practice, the most capacity building takes place within groups. Through group facilitation, group capacity and individual capacity of group members can be developed simultaneously. However, regarding how the idea of community capacity is implemented in concrete practices of community empowerment, there are still many debates and brainstorming from several social experts.

METHODS

This study uses a qualitative-descriptive approach, where data collection is done through triangulation techniques, including in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and documentation. The results are reported

descriptively in order to describe the entire course of the process of the phenomenon under study. The research location is in Nambo Lempek Village, Banggai Regency, Central Sulawesi Province consideration that this location has implemented the HKm program since 2000, and it is necessary to evaluate the extent to which the social capacity of the community has changed in the corridor of fostering HKm management by the government and related stakeholders. This research was conducted in January - March 2018, with the research unit being the Putera Karya KTHKm cooperative which is a farmer's organization that manages HKm in the village of Nambo Lempek.

Because there is no standard reference regarding how to measure and assess the success of community empowerment through community capacity building, especially in the Community Forest program, therefore the use of general theories regarding community capacity in the use of public resources is used in this discussion to understand the phenomena that occur and happened in real and empirical.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study is to describe, as well as evaluate, qualitatively the condition of the social capacity of the Nambo Lempek village community, especially the forest farmer community who are members of the Putera Karya KTHKm cooperative, which is a farmer institution that holds a Community Forest management permit in Banggai Regency, Central Sulawesi. *Community social capacity* is defined as the community's internal ability to manage a program at the village level. Community social capacity is constructed from various theories that underlie community empowerment which include a) collective self-confidence, b) dynamics of cooperation, c) managerial/institutional ability, d) ability to identify problems/needs and e) community independence.

As initial information, the general objectives to be achieved in the management of Community Forests as stated in the General Plan of Community Forests in Banggai Regency are as follows:

a. Restore forest function, forest conservation, water sources reappear, reduce erosion.
b. Improving the community's welfare, obtaining timber, secondary crops, feed, and fruits.
c. Controlling forest area management.

In implementing Community Forest development in Banggai Regency at the beginning of its development, the community was not fully involved as the leading actor. What was revealed was that community participation was only limited to providing local labour and determining the types of Multi-Purpose Tree Species (MPTS) and intercropping plants commonly cultivated in the area. The role of the community as the leading actor began to emerge after all stages of HKm development were carried out. Each HKm participant was responsible for the care and maintenance of essential plants and MPTS plants. Each HKm participant gets an average of 1 ha of land and is fully responsible for the plants on that land.

In its journey until 2012, the Community Forest in Banggai Regency has had a Cooperative Institution which houses 6 Community Forest Farmers' groups and has pocketed a definitive IUPHKm for 35 years. Since the issuance of Permenhut No. P. 37/Menhut-II/2007 concerning Community Forests, the management of Community Forests in Banggai Regency also experiences a management orientation that has changed. Community forest management is not only based on the principle of involving the community as the leading actor. However, it has been refined into a community empowerment program, in which the implementation of community forests is intended to develop the capacity of local communities to manage forests sustainably to ensure the availability of employment opportunities for local communities to solve economic and social problems. Social events that occur in society.

How strategic is the element of community social capacity in the implementation of the HKm program, it needs to be explicitly evaluated regarding the extent to which the social capacity of the community can manage and run the HKm program well

and follow the expected empowerment targets. Furthermore, to what extent has the government intervened, particularly local governments and local actors, in developing the social capacity of the community.

Below are some indicators of community social capacity in managing the Community Forest (HKm) program in Banggai Regency, Central Sulawesi, which were obtained from the results of interviews and field observations that have been carried out.

Collective Confidence

In the context of community development, one of the leading indicators of increased community capacity is the presence of confidence in managing a program. From the results of in-depth interviews, it is known that most of the community (78.89%) or HKm participants have confidence that what they have done so far in managing HKm together will benefit forest sustainability and their welfare. However, for now, they have not received or experienced tangible benefits from the results of managing HKm, especially in economic matters, so their welfare has not changed. The findings in the interview also revealed that there is a sense of self-confidence that is built up in the community collectively to manage HKm, where this confidence is a social capital that has become part of people's daily lives as a manifestation of the value of togetherness in accepting shared responsibility in community life. HKm management.

However, although the community character is very positive (great collective self-confidence in managing HKm), this does not contribute to changes in their welfare while managing HKm. The interviews revealed that the community was tired of waiting for the natural results of the HKm that they had managed and worked on so far. So far, the results of HKm have not been felt by the community in real terms. Compared with the agricultural and plantation businesses that used to work on land that has now become HKm, this HKm business is much lower or even non-existent compared to agricultural businesses. This is not much different from the summary of in-depth interviews conducted with several key informants who also

emphasized that the community participating in HKm actually have an awareness that what they have been doing so far in managing HKm will provide benefits not only for forest preservation but also for improving their welfare. However, people are complaining about HKm, which has not yet provided economic benefits. Because after more than 14 years of planting has not yet yielded results.

Grootaert et al. (2003) argue that when the community is empowered, it is indicated by the existence of a collective belief/confidence that arises in joint actions that are believed to bring benefits to environmental sustainability and their welfare. It was further explained that empowered communities are people who are confident in all the actions they take and believe that they will give maximum results. This is a "Social Capital" needed by a community before building independence.

The findings in this identification which are also supported by the results of in-depth interviews with several key informants above show facts that meet the construction of Grootaert et al.'s views that have been described previously so that so far, it can be concluded that the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency has not been fully empowered, because even though they have confidence or self-confidence in their own business, as long as they have not received the benefits as expected in the management of HKm, it can only be said that the community is not yet fully empowered to manage HKm in Banggai Regency. However, the farming community has great potential to move from object to subject if given continuous guidance because of the power of confidence in joint efforts that are already included in social life.

Dynamics of Cooperation

The interviews and field observations show that most of the community or HKm participants are usually involved and work together to solve problems encountered in HKm management. However, the roles taken are not so optimal in solving problems. The results of this identification show that most of the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency are accustomed to working together in finding solutions to problems in HKm but are not optimal and are less active.

The interviews revealed that the community also took part in solving problems in HKm management. However, the role or actions they took were felt by themselves not to have made any significant changes in solving HKm problems in Banggai Regency.

The results of observations in the field again confirm that the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency is passive in finding solutions if they encounter problems managing HKm. This is relatively different from the summary of in-depth interviews conducted with several key informants, which also revealed that the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency has a spirit of Cooperation in HKm management. However, most of them tend to be passive. According to Grootaert et al. (2003), collectively empowered communities work together to solve a common problem. Meanwhile, according to Adian (2013) and Colbry et al. (2014), Cooperation essentially indicates the existence of two or more parties who interact dynamically to achieve a common goal. In that sense, three main elements are attached to a framework of Cooperation: elements of two or more parties, elements of interaction and elements of common goals. If one of these elements is not contained in an object under study, it can be assumed that there is no cooperation in that object.

In developing community capacity in the HKm program in Banggai Regency, the three elements referred to above are fulfilled from the construction of Grootaert's view of Cooperation in empowered communities. However, Grootaert emphasizes more on the active side of the community, which is fully involved in Cooperation, provides solutions and input, and is independently engaged in finding solutions.

The findings in this identification which are also supported by the results of interviews with several key informants above show facts that do not fully fulfil the construction of Grootaert et al.'s opinion that has been described previously so that so far, it can be concluded that the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency is not yet fully empowered. , but has the potential to be empowered because the community is still passive and tends to be the object of management even though the Cooperation and spirit of mutual assistance referred to by Adian (2013) and Colbry et al. (2014) in the theory of Cooperation in society is relatively good, and the elements are met. In other words, in the case of HKm management in Banggai Regency, the construction of Grootaert et al.'s theory of Cooperation has not been fully fulfilled. However, it has excellent potential if carried out consistently and continuously.

Management Institutional Condition

Formally organizing or institution-alizing farmers is the government's primary approach to farmer empowerment. In almost all programs, farmers are required to form groups, where the group becomes a tool for distributing aid (material or cash), and at the same time as a forum for interaction both between participants and with program implementers (Latang, 2012; Nuryanti & Swastika, 2011). So in other words, organizations or institutions are the most effective way to empower communities collectively because of active interactions that occur in an integrated manner (Mansbridge, 2014).

According to Ostrom (1990), institutions are rules and signs as a guide used by members of a community group to regulate relationships that are mutually binding or interdependent with one another. Several elements can determine institutional arrangements: operational rules for regulating the use of resources, collective rules for determining and enforcing the law or the rules themselves and for changing operational rules and regulating organizational authority relationships. According to the researcher, Ostrom's theory of institutions tends to be relatively implementable, so the study of institutional themes can be carried out in-depth and measurably through this theory. By looking at the background of Ostrom's theory above, the researcher tries to analyze the institutional management of HKm in Banggai Regency from two different perspectives, namely, the institution as an organization and the institution as the rules of the game, as mentioned above.

In the context of community capacity development in the Community Forest program in Banggai Regency, the researcher wants to examine how the community capacity development in the Community Forest program in Banggai Regency is seen from the construction of Ostrom's views regarding institutions, where empowered communities are understood as a group that has community management institutions that are empowered. Stable where there is a robust institutional infrastructure, a straightforward institutional arrangement, and a solid institutional mechanism.

The interviews show that most HKm institutions are not very actively involved in efforts to empower or develop people who participate in the HKm program. It can be interpreted that most HKm participants do not have a solid HKm management institutional capacity. This is seen from three criteria, namely, the existence of a solid institutional infrastructure, the existence of a clear and systematic institutional arrangement, and the existence of a solid institutional mechanism. Observations also show that HKm institutional infrastructure, such as cooperatives, KTH, Forestry Service, NGOs, traditional institutions, and universities, do not play a significant role in HKm affairs. The reality on the ground also shows the same conditions where the HKm cooperative is not running well, where the physical building of the secretariat is also not well maintained, weekly or monthly meetings are rare, there is no succession of administrators, and many members are no longer involved in the cooperative. However, a small number are still involved. Active. Local NGOs and Universities are also not seen in the technical development efforts in the management of HKm. The Banggai District Forestry Service seems to be still actively reviewing the HKm development site. However, the community claimed to be "bored" with the visit because there were no results or significant changes or no follow-up after the visit.

In addition, the institutional arrang-ement for HKm management is also felt poorly understood by most of the community participating in HKm. This is because socialization has not been comprehensive since the beginning of the physical development of HKm, which began in 1999. This can be interpreted that most people feel confused or do not understand the functions and authorities of officials related to HKm affairs, so they do not know how to coordinate in HKm management. The institutional management mechanism is not yet strong enough to regulate and manage the rules in society. The reality on the ground shows that some of the communities participating in HKm have bought and sold the HKm share land and the trees on it, and some have even cut down all the trees on their share of land to be planted with plantation and seasonal crops whose results are felt to be more profitable. Furthermore, harvest is faster than planting trees. This is an example of how the rules in the institutional mechanism for managing HKm are not very strong in binding every action taken by the community.

Institutions are generally widely discussed in sociology, anthropology, law and politics, organization and management, psychology and environmental science, which later developed into the science of community development because now many expert economists are starting to conclude that the failure of community development is generally due to institutional failure. In Ostrom's view (1985; 1986), institutions are rules and signs as a guide used by members of a community group to regulate relationships that are mutually binding or interdependent with one another. Several elements can determine institutional arrangements: operational rules for regulating the use of resources, collective rules for determining and enforcing the law or the rules themselves and for changing operational rules and regulating organizational authority relationships so that the implementation of Ostrom's theory of institutions can be extracted into two main substances, namely institutions as institutions and institutions as rules of the game.

In the context of developing community capacity in the HKm program in Banggai Regency, the community-owned HKm management institution is not very strong in protecting the community's needs. The findings in this identification which are also

supported by the results of interviews with several key informants above show facts that do not meet the construction of Ostrom's opinion on institutions that have been described previously so that so far, it can be concluded that the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency is not yet fully empowered, because the institutional HKm management in Banggai Regency has not yet achieved the qualifications of a solid management institution that can bind and guide the community in the context of HKm management. In other words, Ostrom's theory of institutions is not fulfilled in the case of HKm management in Banggai Regency.

Ability to Identify Problems and Needs

Lasker & Weiss (2003) explain that one of the main characteristics of communities experiencing capacity building is that they collectively can identify all the problems they face and understand their needs to be met through mutual cooperation. In the context of developing community capacity in the Community Forest program in Banggai Regency, researchers want to examine how community capacity development is seen from the perspective of Lasker and Weiss, where empowered communities are understood as groups that can identify problems and needs in the community or their groups independently.

The in-depth interviews show that most of the community or HKm participants do not understand their needs, so they need to be involved in forest management through HKm schemes or become HKm participants. Although some HKm participants are aware of their needs and need to be involved in managing forest resources, they also do not understand that these needs can be met through forest management using the HKm scheme. In general, these results indicate that most of the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency are unaware of their needs, so they must participate in HKm management. Findings in the interview revealed that they only joined in because it was a government program in their area and the "lure" would get more and more benefits for their welfare when compared to if they persisted with the farming pattern they had to try previously on the land that has been

turned into the HKm. This can also be implied that adequate socialization and information about HKm and the importance of conserving forests are not so embedded in the understanding of HKm participants.

Furthermore, observations show results that again reinforce the belief that people do not understand the reasons for being involved in managing forest resources through HKm schemes. People already understand the forest and its function as life support but do not understand the importance of the existence of HKm in their area. The results of this identification indicate that most of the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency do not understand the objectives of HKm management in their area. The interviews revealed that the community thought that the HKm, which was started in 1999 in Banggai Regency, was a timber plantation whose purpose was to take the wood so that later it could be sold by the community to improve their welfare. Aspects of the objectives of HKm management for forest sustainability, life support, and water management do not seem to be an essential part of people's minds. This is rational because, in the understanding of most community members who participate in HKm, the HKm in the Banggai district is a production forest area. The term "production" is understood to be for commercial timber. In line with the previous section's conclusions, socialization and adequate information about HKm and the importance of conserving forests were not so embedded in the understanding of HKm participants.

Furthermore, observations show that the plans and targets that are the needs of the community are not going well. The community revealed that the existing work program only stalled and had no progress in the last few decades. The results of this identification indicate that the target to be achieved in HKm management is not working well or does not meet the target. The findings in the interviews revealed that the community collectively has several targets to be achieved in HKm management, such as harvesting targets, replanting targets, profit sharing targets, as well as several other programs such as establishing productive business units such

as raising cattle, goats, poultry, joint furniture business, and so on. However, none of these has yet been realized because they are still constrained by IUPHHK-HKm, which has not yet issued permits, and there is no financial support from the local government to facilitate the establishment of productive business units that the community wants. In fact, according to the community's admission that the community very much needs the existence of such productive business units, besides being relatively quick to generate profits and income for cooperatives, it is also considered to be able to temporarily dispel the boredom of the community who have been waiting for actual results from HKm.

Lasker and Weiss (2003) explain that one of the main characteristics of communities experiencing increased capacity is that they collectively can identify all the problems they face and understand their needs to be met cooperatively. In this case, the researcher wants to see how the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency can independently identify problems and their needs in managing HKm. In the context of developing community capacity in the HKm program in Banggai Regency, the community does not understand why they should be involved in HKm management. This can be seen from in-depth interviews where the community revealed that their participation in HKm management was initially only because they wanted to participate in a government program that happened to be implemented in their area and because the initial socialization seemed so profitable, the community decided to participate in the program. Further observations revealed that the community did not understand how important the forest was in their lives.

The community only understands that the trees on HKm land are planted only for wood. This is again because the community did not get adequate information at the beginning of the HKm development, where the community was only asked to plant a particular type of tree (white teak) and was given a promise that after 5-6 years of planting, the community would be able to enjoy the results to the fullest. . This was the initial reason that motivated the community to

participate in the HKm program. Through the Putera Karya cooperative, the community has a written and clear work program, but it runs stagnant and in a vacuum. Observation findings indicate that the Putera Karya cooperative has several work programs and future HKm development targets. These are the result of consultations with the community, which are then agreed upon and written in working documents. Currently, the Putera Karya cooperative is still running and is extending its business entity license.

The findings in this identification which are also supported by the results of interviews with several key informants above, show facts that do not meet the construction of Lasker and Weiss (2011)'s opinion about the community's ability to identify problems and needs as a whole, where the attitude of the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency does not appear to be able to identify their problems and needs independently, this can be seen from the attitude of the people who seem to follow every existing program, seem to accept it as taken for granted or given without knowing what their needs are. So far, it can be concluded that the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency is not yet fully empowered. In other words, in the case of HKm management in Banggai Regency, Lasker and Weiss's (2011) theory about the community's ability to identify needs and problems has not been fulfilled.

Community Independence

One of the characteristics of a community that has the capacity, in Soetomo's view (2011), is a community that is independent and able to manage needs and formulate collective solutions without relying on outsiders. Regarding the social capacity of the community in the Community Forest program in Banggai Regency, the researcher wants to examine how community capacity development is seen from Soetomo's point of view, where empowered communities are understood as groups that can manage HKm independently and are not too dependent on the government.

The interviews showed that most of the community or HKm participants felt they could not manage HKM and still needed the role of outsiders and assistance from the

government in implementing HKm. The community revealed that they could manage HKm on the condition that there must be a role for the government to support it in terms of funding and technical management. The results of this identification show that most of the communities participating in HKm in Banggai Regency are not fully empowered and tend to still depend on outside parties. The interviews revealed that, in general, people still often complain about the management of HKm. One of them is in terms of funds to establish productive business units. Besides, community knowledge regarding developing agroforestry businesses on HKm land is still lacking. This is revealed by the community, who complain that the HKm land is now unable to produce anything except white teak trees, which have grown taller, while the results of HKm in the form of mature teak stands cannot be enjoyed at all. Complaints of this kind imply that the community participating in HKm generally does not have the initiative to manage and maintain the sustainability of HKm, especially the lack of knowledge of agroforestry.

The community also revealed that there are no financial resources managed or saved by the community for HKm management operations. The interview results revealed that there are finances managed and saved independently by the community but are limited, and the amount is small/not enough to finance HKm operations. Findings in the interviews revealed that community members who participated in HKm did, in a deliberative manner, collect some funds as savings for HKm management. However, it only happened in the early years of HKm development, then never again.

According to Soetomo (2011), community empowerment through capacity building should lead to the emergence of community independence and authority. Even though it leads to community self-reliance in managing development in capacity building, this does not close the door for external roles. If external stimuli are intended as a form of assistance, then the principle should be "help the people to help themselves".

In the context of developing community capacity in the HKm program in Banggai Regency, it was revealed that the community still really hopes for government assistance, especially from the Banggai Regency forestry service regarding HKm issues, which so far have not given them any results. However, in this case, the assistance expected by the community is still classified at the "help the people to stand" level. This can be interpreted that the external stimuli referred to above still make the community dependent on outside parties, namely the government and the forestry service. This then makes the community powerless when the assistance does not continue. So at this time, it seems that the community participating in HKm is so "powerless" in managing HKm and looks less enthusiastic.

The findings in this identification which are also supported by the results of interviews with several key informants above, show facts that do not meet the construction of Solomon's opinion (2011) about community capacity, which is characterized by an increase in community independence, where the attitude of the community participating in HKm in Banggai Regency seems unable to manage HKm. with their resources, lack of initiative, and so powerless in managing HKM, so far it can be concluded that the community participating in HKm is less empowered and tends to still depend on outside parties. In other words, in the case of HKm management in Banggai Regency, Soetomo's (2011) theory about community independence as a characteristic of empowered communities is not fulfilled.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion that has been described in the previous section, some conclusions can be drawn from the results of the study as follows:

1. There is no real empowerment through efforts to increase community capacity in the process of empowering communities around forests carried out by the state communities around forests through the Community Forest program in Banggai Regency.

2. Community capacity development did not succeed in growing community confidence in the results of HKm management, did not provide an increase in community cooperation, community institutions did not increase, and the community was unable to recognize their needs and problems. It did not grow self-reliance and community welfare in the program, even though, on the other hand, environmental conditions in production forest areas are improving.

3. There is a fragility in the social capacity of forest farming communities to manage HKm, marked by a decrease in community collective self-confidence, low intensity of collaboration, weak management institutions, and the inability to manage HKm independently.

REFERENCES

Adian, D. G. (2013). *Rasionalitas kerjasama: sebuah teori rekonsiliasi sosial*. Penerbit Koekoesan.

Agusta, I. (2014). *Indeks Kemandirian Desa: Metode, Hasil, dan Alokasi Program Pembangunan*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.

Awang, S. A. (2003). Politik kehutanan masyarakat. *Yogyakarta (ID): Center for Critical Social Studies & Kreasi Wacana Yogyakarta*, 1315–1755.

Awang, S. A. (2004). *Dekonstruksi sosial forestri: reposisi masyarakat dan keadilan lingkungan*. Bigraf Pub. & Program Pustaka.

Awang, S. A. (2006). *Sosiologi pengetahuan deforestasi: Konstruksi sosial dan perlawanan*. Debut Press.

Colbry, S., Hurwitz, M., & Adair, R. (2014). Collaboration Theory. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13(4).

Dewi, I. N. (2018). Kemiskinan masyarakat sekitar hutan dan program perhutanan sosial. *Buletin Eboni*, 15(2), 65–77.

Golar, G. (2019). *Adaptasi Masyarakat Tepian Hutan dalam Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Hutan*. Samudra Biru.

Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V. N., & Woolcock, M. (2003). Integrated questionnaire for the measurement of social capital. *The World Bank Social Capital Thematic Group*.

Habibatul, U. (2021). *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Berbasis Hutan Kemasyarakatan dalam Upaya Pelestarian Lingkungan di Desa Karang Jaya Kecamatan Merbau Mataram Kabupaten Lampung Selatan*. UIN Raden Intan Lampung.

Haryani, R., & Rijanta, R. (2019). Ketergantungan Masyarakat Terhadap Hutan Lindung dalam Program Hutan Kemasyarakatan. *Jurnal Litbang Sukowati: Media Penelitian Dan Pengembangan*, 2(2), 15.

Hidayat, K. (2012). Pengelolaan Program Hutan Kemasyarakatan Berbasis Kearifan Lokal: Studi Kasus di Kawasan Hutan Lindung Sesaot Lombok Barat. *Jurnal WACANA*, 13(1), 39954.

Kusumastuti, A. A., & Taufik, A. (2020). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Berbasis Budidaya dalam Mengembangkan Kampung Lele di Desa Tegalrejo Kecamatan Sawit Kabupaten Boyolali. *Journal of Politic and Government Studies*, 9(02), 71–80.

Lasker, R. D., & Weiss, E. S. (2003). Broadening participation in community problem solving: a multidisciplinary model to support collaborative practice and research. *Journal of Urban Health*, 80(1), 14–47.

Latang, L. (2012). Pelaksanaan Program Tanaman Padi oleh Kelompok Tani Bulu Cempa di Desa Nusa Kecamatan Kahu Kabupaten Bone. *JAPPA: Jurnal Andragogi Pedagogi Dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*, 1(1), 66–72.

Mansbridge, J. (2014). The role of the state in governing the commons. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 36, 8–10.

Melyana, M., Yoza, D., & Arlita, T. (2015). *Interaksi sosial ekonomi masyarakat terhadap kawasan taman nasional bukit tiga puluh (studi kasus desa Rantau Langsat kecamatan Batang Gansal kabupaten Indragiri Hulu provinsi Riau)*. Riau University.

Mukhtar, M., & Jannah, W. (2018). Program Hutan Kemasyarakatan Berbasis Kearifan Lokal; Studi Kasus Di Kawasan Hutan Lindung Sesaot Lombok Barat. *JISIP (Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Pendidikan)*, 2(1).

Mulyadin, R. M., Surati, S., & Ariawan, K. (2016). Kajian Hutan Kemasyarakatan sebagai Sumber Pendapatan: Kasus di Kab. Gunung Kidul. *Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Dan Ekonomi Kehutanan*, 13(1), 13–23.

Murti, H. A. (2018). Social Forestry for Community Justice Access and Poverty Reduction. *Jurnal Analis Kebijakan |*, 2(2), 1–14.

Nurasa, H. (2016). Analisis Program Pengembangan Kapasitas Kelembagaan Masyarakat Desa: Suatu Studi Pada Program Pengembangan Masyarakat Miskin di Perdesaan. *CosmoGov: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 2(1), 23–38.

Nuryanti, S., & Swastika, D. K. S. (2011). Peran kelompok tani dalam penerapan teknologi pertanian. *Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*, 29(2), 115–128.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge university press.

Reski, N. A., Yusran, Y., & Makkarennu, M. (2017). Rancangan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat pada Pengelolaan Hutan Kemasyarakatan (HKm) Desa Pacekke, Kecamatan Soppeng Riaja, Kabupaten Barru, Sulawesi Selatan. *Jurnal Hutan Dan Masyarakat*, 37–43.

Rizal, A. (2012). Sosiologi Kehutanan dalam Pengelolaan Hutan. *Buletin Eboni*, *9*(1), 1–15.

Safe'i, R., Febryano, I. G., & Aminah, L. N. (2018). Pengaruh keberadaan Gapoktan terhadap pendapatan petani dan perubahan tutupan lahan di Hutan Kemasyarakatan. *Sosiohumaniora*, *20*(2), 109–114.

Simangunsong, H., Perwira, Y., & Apriani, W. (2019). PKM: Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat dalam Mewujudkan Desa Mandiri di Desa Banjar Jaya: Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat dalam Mewujudkan Desa Mandiri di Desa Banjar Jaya. *TRIDARMA: Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat (PkM)*, *2*(1, Mei), 8–11.

Soetomo, 2011. Pemberdayan Masyarakat. Mungkinkah Muncul Antitesisnya?. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.