



## Social Capital in Empowering Forest Communities Through Livelihood Plants Program in Pelalawan Regency, Riau Province

Yolanda Velinsca<sup>1</sup>, Herman<sup>2</sup>, Humaira Inara Izzati Putri<sup>3</sup>, Waddha<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup>Public Administration Study Program, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science,  
Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Indonesia.

Correspondent Author Email1\*: [herman@uir.ac.id](mailto:herman@uir.ac.id)

### **Abstract**

*This study aims to analyze and explain social capital in community empowerment through Livelihood plants program in Pelalawan Regency, Riau Province. This research uses qualitative methods and triangulation data collection techniques, informants consist of village communities, cooperatives and negotiating teams, village governments, local governments, Riau Province Environment and Forestry Service, and companies. Data collection was conducted through observation, interviews, and documentation. Data analysis was conducted through a narrative approach. The results showed that the village community did not trust the people working to encourage the community through livelihood plants program. There is no partnership involving the community in forest management, and rules are not followed. weak social capital relationships between the community and business, government, cooperatives, and negotiating groups. Bonding and bridging relationships, however, have positive impacts. Village communities around forests should be empowered through livelihood plants program crops using social capital. The government, companies, cooperatives and communities should all be actively involved.*

*Keywords: Social Capital; Empowering; Industrial Forest Plantation; Livelihood Plants Program*

### **1. Introduction**

Forests benefit the general public as they are a refuge for flora and fauna as well as humans, so we must work together to protect forests from destruction. Since forests are a component of natural resources and play an essential role in communities' social and economic well-being, humans still depend on forest products to meet their financial needs and for their own well-being. As a result, rural communities living around forests continue to rely on forest products (Kanowski et al., 2020; Arowolo et al., 2014; Harbi et al., 2018).

The government is actively regulating forests for the benefit of many people, and as a source of Indonesia's natural wealth, forests must be used for the prosperity of the people. Therefore, the government has established various regulations to regulate forestry policies (Agusti et al., 2020). One of these policies is based on the regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia Number P.12/Menlhk-II/2015 concerning the Development of Industrial Plantation Forests (Latif et al., 2022), by the text of Article 10 of the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry, namely: Timber forest products, non-timber forest products, or other plant products from the community-managed livelihood plants program area in the context of community empowerment as referred to in paragraph (2), to increase local community income proportionally (Menlhk Nomor: P1.12 / Menlhk-II / 2015 Tentang Pembangunan Hutan Tanaman Industri, 2015).

With the above regulations, companies in the village area must empower the community and have the right to use 20% of the company's main crop area as livelihood plants program (Herman, Susilowati, & Astuti, Retno Sunu; Warsono, 2023). Livelihood plants program are plants to improve community welfare, which can be in the form of staple plants that produce wood forest products and plants that produce non-wood forest products, and plants that are beneficial to the community (food security) which are managed through a partnership pattern between the community and the holder of the Katu Forest Product Utilization Business Permit in the relevant Industrial Plantation Forest (Herman et al., 2022).

One of the problems that emerged in Pelalawan Regency, precisely in Pelalawan and Teluk Meranti Districts, is the Livelihood plants program between the company and the local community. 6 villages have not been empowered by the regulations, including Kuala Tolam Village, Rangsang Village and Sungai Ara Village, Petodaan Village, Kuala Panduk Village, and Pangkalan Terap Village. The problem faced by these six villages is that the Company has not fully realized the plans of life for the village community. The Companies in the six villages are: PT. RAPP, PT. Selaras Abadi Utam, PT. Yos Raya Timber, PT. Madukuro, CV. Alam Lestari dan CV. Bhakti Praja Mulia.

Community Empowerment is closely related to social capital because without the capital owned, empowerment will not run well. The same thing is by what was conveyed by Gold, that etymologically

social capital has the meaning of capital owned by the community in community empowerment (Andreas & Savitri, 2016). The success of natural resource management is closely related to the social capital possessed by the community (Nurrochmat et al., 2016). According to Ostrom, in sustainable natural resource management, social capital is considered to be able to encourage collective action. Then, according to Lesser, social capital can help community groups get information (Amelia et al., 2019), and become a spread of power, building relationships with higher groups (Gorritz-Mifsud et al., 2017), stop and resolve group conflicts (Jennings, C., & Sanchez-Pages, 2017), and improve forest sustainability (Jennings, C., & Sanchez-Pages, 2017). Therefore, social capital, consisting of trust, norms, and networks, can enhance community relations by enabling planned actions (Putnam, 1993; Oktalina et al., 2022). Measuring empowerment can be done through the theory of social capital, which consists of Bonding (involving relationships between communities), Bridging (involving relationships with other different social groups), and linking (involving groups outside the community) (Woolcock, 1998; Ingrida et al., 2023; Prastyo et al., 2024).

The research conducted by the author is to see the social capital of the village community located on the edge of the forest, consisting of six villages in two sub-districts in Pelalawan Regency, where the forest management program is to implement the regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia Number P.12 / Menlhk-II / 2015 concerning the Development of Industrial Plantation Forests. The regulation explains that the community on the forest's edge must be empowered by companies that hold forest management business permits with a plant of life program. As is known, the program is implemented by providing cash with a very disproportionate calculation. From these symptoms, there is a lack of trust among village communities towards companies that have forestry business permits; many norms are violated by companies so that the relationship between village communities, local government, and companies does not run well.

Isi dari pendahuluan adalah jawaban atas pertanyaan [2,3]: (1). Latar belakang, (2). Tinjauan literatur singkat atas penelitian terkait (3). Alasan diadakan penelitian ini dan (4). Pertanyaan tujuan. *State of the art, gap analysys* dan *novelty* terlihat disini. Hindari membahas tinjauan pustaka dan defenisi yang bersifat umum.

## 2. Research Methods

The method used in this study is qualitative. According to Sugiyono, the qualitative research method is used to research natural object conditions,

where the researcher is the key instrument, data collection techniques are carried out by triangulation (combination), data analysis is inductive, and qualitative research results emphasize meaning rather than generalization (Hapsari & Rokhani, 2021). This study uses a qualitative approach because the research objectives are described in detail and interpreted by considering the social context (Creswell & Creswell, 2017). Selection of qualitative research methods to find research problems on Social Capital social capital in empowering communities around the forest through livelihood plants program in Pelalawan Regency, Riau Province. Informants in this study were employees of the Village Community, Cooperatives and Negotiation Teams, Village Government, Regional Government, the Riau Province Environment and Forestry Service, and companies. In this study, the informant search method used purposive sampling to dig up in-depth information according to the research situation. Data collection techniques used in this study were observation, interview, and documentation techniques. Data analysis techniques are based on presentation by applying a narrative approach to convey the results of the analysis of social capital in empowering communities around the forest through livelihood plants program.

## 3. Results and Discussions

### 3.1. Empowerment Through Livelihood Plants Program

Forestry policy in Indonesia, where one form of government concern is issuing regulations in the form of Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry Number P.12/Menlhk-II/2015 concerning the Development of Industrial Plantation Forests (Herman et al., 2023). With this regulation, the village community on the forest's edge is obliged and has the right to be empowered by the Company that holds the business license. The regulation also stipulates that the village community should be empowered by distributing land covering 20% of the Company's work area to be managed by the village community with a partnership pattern between the Company and the village community. The following is the area of the Industrial Plantation Forest concession:

Table 1. Area of Industrial Plantation Forest Concession

No	Village Name	Area (Hectares)	Company Name
1	Kuala Tolam	19.440,2525	PT. SAU dan PT. RAPP
2	Rangsang	7.235,8551	PT. SAU, PT. RAPP, CV. Alam Lestari, CV. Bakti Praja
3	Sungai Ara	6.195,5881	PT. SAU, PT. RAPP, PT. Yos Raya Timber, PT. Madukuro, CV. Alam Lestari dan CV. Bakti Praja.

4	Pangkalan Terp	2.493,3853	PT. SAU, PT. RAPP, PT. Yos Raya Timber, PT. Madukuro, dan CV. Bakti Praja.
5	Kuala Panduk	5.668,8902	PT. RAPP, PT. Yos Raya Timber, dan CV. Bakti Praja.
6	Petodaan	4.117,0610	PT. RAPP, PT. Yos Raya Timber, dan CV. Bakti Praja.

Source: Department of Environment and Forestry of Riau Province, 20024.

Based on the information obtained, the form of empowerment of village communities on the edge of the forest is by providing cash, which is a pattern that is very detrimental to the village community and is only consumptive. This pattern has long been carried out with a contract agreement starting in 1997 with a contract duration of 40 years. The Company has agreed upon this contract with representatives from each village initiated by the Cooperative and the Livelihood plants program Negotiator in each town. If seen from the literature review, this pattern is very detrimental to the community because the village community income cannot lift their economy. For example, a research study conducted by (Nur Aminah et al., 2014) which Community empowerment is carried out with a partnership pattern in a monocultural, polyculture, and agroforestry manner. With this pattern, the average farmer's income is Rp. 17,619,649 per year with a forest area of 137.5 hectares. Meanwhile, the village community in Pelalawan Regency only gets an average of Rp. 1,200,000-1,500,000 every five years, according to the contract agreement agreed upon at the beginning.

The crux of the problem is the inability of the cooperative and the negotiating team in each village to fight for the rights of the village community, coupled with the lack of community trust in the Cooperative and the Negotiating Team because at the time of disbursement of livelihood plants program funds in the form of cash, it is always non-transparent and non-accountable. The emergence of a sense of dissatisfaction, distrust, and the inability of the Regional Government and certain Agencies to fight for the rights of the village community resulted in an inharmonious relationship with the village community. Likewise, the community's trust and relationship with the Company holds the forestry business permit because it cannot empower the village community to escape poverty.

Based on the above, it is necessary to have social capital in the community in empowerment through livelihood plants program that Social Capital is something that the Community owns in carrying out empowerment. In this discussion, the indicators of Social Capital consist of 5 dimensions, namely Trust, Norms, and Social Capital Typology (bonding, bridging, linking), including the

following:

### 3.2 Trust

The study's findings on the dimensions of trust show that most of the community does not have trust in the government, companies, or cooperatives/teams that are representatives of the community as representatives in each village. The Pelalawan Regency government itself has no concern for the village community, either in the form of policies or regulations. Likewise, the Riau Provincial Environment and Forestry Service is authorized to supervise and regulate how ideally this plant of life is managed and run. Then, the company, as the party that has the obligation, has also not been able to maximize the empowerment of the community around the forest. What is even worse is the trust of the village community in the Cooperative and Team, which are expected to be able to be an extension of the community to manage the disbursement of Livelihood plants program funds. There have been many cases of misappropriation of plant of life funds carried out by certain individuals, which ended in court. The last Livelihood plants program fund for Sungai Ara Village itself was disbursed in 2019, but until now, there has been no clarity. Due to the case of the individual, the chairman of the cooperative was replaced by the villagers. However, until now, there has been no clarity regarding the disbursement of the Livelihood plants program funds.

### 3.3 Norm

Based on the information from the interview results above related to the norm dimension, the author can conclude that the norms associated with complying with the rules and improving the welfare of the Village Community around the forest have not been appropriately implemented. Regarding this rule, it is stated in the Regulation of the Minister of Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia Number: P.39 / Menhut-II / 2013 Concerning Empowerment of Local Communities Through Forestry Partnerships and the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia Number: P.12 / Menlhk-II / 2015 Concerning Development of Industrial Plantation Forests Where in both regulations it is stated that to empower the community, a partnership is needed between the Company and the local community whose aim is to improve the welfare of the Community. However, as is known, there is no partnership pattern, and the Community around the forest has not been prosperous with the empowerment that has been carried out.

So far, the community believes that the Company has not been able to implement the rules to empower the village community around the forest. It is clear that in the rules, there is a partnership pattern that is established between the village

community around the forest and the Company that holds the forest management rights, but in practice, the partnership does not work. Then, with the Company's presence, the village community's welfare around the forest will increase. In this case, the Company also does not want to be immediately blamed by the Village Community. The Company assumes that they have done everything based on existing rules so far. The issue of partnership and welfare is the choice of the Village Community when making the contract. The Company also argues that transparency and accountability are not the Company's business but are the business of the Village Community with the Cooperative or team in each village.

### **3.4 Bonding**

The above Social Capital Typology has three sub-indicators, namely bonding, bridging, and linking, where these three sub-indicators have their assessments. A bonding Network is a type of social capital that describes relationships within a group or community characterized by a high level of similarity in demographic characteristics, attitudes, and available information and resources. Bonding social capital occurs between people who are in it together and usually have close solid relationships. Examples include family members, close friends, and neighbors (Claridge, 2018). In addition, social bonding is a factor that can bind each person in a social system consisting of values, norms, traditions, and customs that can be the intended components. Social bonding capital is a type of social capital that works more internally, and solidarity is built by the local community.

According to the informant's answer, the sub-indicator of bonding means the relationship between the community and the community and the cooperative or team. The relationship between the community and other communities has been going well, and there have been no significant obstacles. Still, the relationship between the community and the cooperative or team has not been very harmonious because of the lack of community trust in the cooperative or team in each village. This is because in implementing the disbursement of the livelihood plants program fund it is not done openly, transparently and with accountability from the cooperative officers or team. This raises suspicion from the village community so that there is a lot of friction between the community and the cooperative or team, even between fellow cooperative administrators. There is also friction because the accountability of the cooperative chairman or team is not in line with what it should be.

### **3.5 Bridging**

According to Woolcock, Bridging social networks are relationships between people from different cultures, religions, or socio-economic backgrounds

(Yamin & Dartanto, 2016). Social bridging is a social bond that emerges in response to the various characteristics among group members. Social bridging emerges as a result of an awareness of weaknesses that exist in their community, leading to a decision to build on strengths by correcting these weaknesses (Nurohmah et al., 2021). Social ties that emerge in response to the characteristics of the group are called social bridging. Common involvement as citizens, associations, and networks is evidence of social bridging.

The relationship between the community of one village and another village regarding the livelihood plants program so far has been well established, as well as the relationship between cooperatives or teams with cooperatives or teams in other villages also has not experienced any obstacles. According to the author's information in the field, there were no significant obstacles in this bridging relationship. The relationship between the community of one village and another village seems good because they are both victims and have the same fate. For the cooperative or team of one village with another town, a good relationship is also established because they always communicate regarding when the disbursement time is, what the process is like, and so on.

### **3.6 Linking**

Social linking is a social capital bond that connects members from different backgrounds or classes (Maad & Anugrahini, 2022). This type of social linking in social capital shows networks or relationships established at various levels, such as social power, status, and roles in community groups. Social linking is social capital that describes norms of honor and networks of trust relationships between people who interact across formally institutionalized societies, authority, and power (Widhagtha, 2019).

Based on information the relationship between the Community and communities outside the village, such as the Riau Provincial DLHK, District Government, Companies, Academics and NGOs has not been going well so far. As is known, the Riau Provincial DLHK has not taken any action so far to contribute to the sustainability of the lives of village communities around the forest. Likewise, the Pelalawan Regency government, in this case, turned a blind eye to what happened in the sense that there was no form of supervision and evaluation that the Pelalawan Regency Government did to implement empowerment in livelihood plants program. Then the Company is also like that, where they carry out empowerment not by existing regulations and continue to carry out empowerment on the grounds of a long-term contract agreement of 40 years. As long as the contract has not been completed, empowerment with a partnership pattern

cannot be carried out because the initial contract carried out in the context of empowerment is by providing cash. Likewise, academics have not made any real contributions so far. Meanwhile, local NGOs have made several contributions, such as made by the Pelalawan Youth Care Movement (GP3) NGOs, which protested PT. RAPP is related to the livelihood plants program.



Figure 1. NGOs GP3 During Protest Against Embankment Construction By PT. RAPP With Livelihood plants program Funds

In social capital, there should be a good relationship between the actors in society. Putnam said that in social capital, trust, norms, and networks are very necessary based on actions carried out together with other actors, which are intended so that goals and hopes can be realized together, where this relationship or network is one of the requirements for creating good social capital (Cahyani, 2021). Davidson argues that the most resilient communities work together to achieve common goals (Islam & Walkerden, 2014). Therefore, without a good network, everything that is to be achieved in order to achieve the goal will not go well. In the future, the actors involved in the community will rearrange and repair if there is communication, coordination, and broken relationships. In response to the above, there needs to be a principle of openness and mutual trust between actors in the community, especially in managing these livelihood plants program.

#### 4. Conclusion

Social capital is owned by the community, especially for rural communities on the edge of the forest to participate in being empowered by the company so that they are free from depression and backwardness. As is known, the empowerment carried out by the company is not in the form of a partnership between the village community and the company holding the forestry business license. Still, empowerment is carried out by providing cash, which is disproportionate and detrimental to the

village community. The ideal empowerment is carried out with a partnership pattern in which the village community on the edge of the forest is maximally involved in managing the forest together. Forest management with this pattern will undoubtedly benefit the village community because the amount of income obtained is more significant when compared to providing cash which is far from sufficient. According to the author's information, the average village community only gets Rp. 1,200,000-1,500,000 (one million two hundred thousand-one million five hundred thousand) per five years from the harvest calculated according to the contract.

This study analyzes and explains the social capital owned by rural communities in Pelalawan Regency in community empowerment through livelihood plants program. The study results concluded that there was a sense of distrust in the community towards various institutions involved in implementing empowerment through livelihood plants program. The company violated Many norms or rules so that the expected empowerment did not run as it should. The Regional Government and the Environment and Forestry Service, which should protect the village community, did not play a role because they seemed to be neglecting it. The company, in this case, also did not carry out empowerment as empowerment carried out in other regions in Indonesia by fully involving the community, namely the partnership pattern. The Cooperative and the Negotiating Team were also unable to carry out their duties properly, so they were unable to accommodate the rights and desires of the village community. Other findings, such as bonding and bridging social capital, ran positively; the relationship between them went well because they felt they had the same fate and burden. The social capital of the environment had a negative effect because of the relationship between the community and the Regional Government, the Environment and Forestry Service of Riau Province, the Company, the Cooperative and the Negotiating Team, and academics. The reason is that the stakeholders cannot carry out their respective tasks and functions in empowering the village community. However, the relationship between the village community and NGOs is going well because NGOs come from the community.

#### Reference

- Agusti, T. M., Nurjaya, I. N., & Kuswahyono, I. (2020). Implementasi Regulasi Perhutanan Sosial yang Berkemampuan bagi Masyarakat Sekitar Hutan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 4(2), 300. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um019v4i2p300-309>
- Amelia, N. R., Kar todihardjo, H., & Sundawati, L. (2019). Peran Modal Sosial Masyarakat Penambang Emas Dalam Mempertahankan Tambang Ilegal Di Taman Hutan Raya Seulawesi Tengah. *Jurnal Sylva Lestari*, 7(3), 255.

- <https://sylvalestari.fp.unila.ac.id/index.php/JHT/article/view/370>
- Andreas, & Savitri, E. (2016). Peran Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Pesisir dan Modal Sosial Dalam Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan di Kabupaten Meranti dan Rokan Hilir. *Repositiry UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau*, 1998, 1–118.
- Anen, N. (2016). Peran Modal Sosial Masyarakat Dalam Pengelolaan Hutan Rakyat Di Kelurahan Selopuro Kecamatan Batuwarno Kabupaten Wonogiri. *Nusa Sylva*, 16(2), 72–81.
- Arowolo, A. O., Agbonlahor, M., Okuneye, P., & Soaga, J. (2014). Assessing the distributional impact of community forest income Evidence from south-western Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 41(11), 1101–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-07-2013-0156>
- Cahyani, R. A. (2021). Modal Sosial Penari jathil Obyog Di Kabupaten Ponorogo. *Paradigma*, 1–18. <https://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/paradigma/article/view/43144%0Ahttps://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/paradigma/article/download/43144/37014%0Ahttps://ejournal.unesa.ac.id/index.php/paradigma/article/view/43144>
- Claridge, T. (2018). Functions of social capital – bonding, bridging, linking. *Social Capital Research*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7993853>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.
- Darmawan, B., Zulkarnain, A. A., & Ansyari, I. (2023). Modal Sosial Masyarakat Dalam Pelestarian Hutan Mangrove Di Desa Kurau Barat, Kabupaten Bangka Tengah. *Neo Societal*, 8(4), 59–74.
- Dey, N. P. H., & Djumaty, B. L. (2019). Modal Sosial Dewan Adat Dayak (Dad) Kabupaten, Dalam Melestarikan Kearifan Lokal Di Kabupaten Lamandau, Provinsi Kalimantan Tengah. *Civic-Culture: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Pkn Dan Sosial Budaya*, 3(1), 1–11.
- Fathy, R. (2019). Modal Sosial: Konsep, Inklusifitas Dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat. *Sosioglobal: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Sosiologi*, 3(2), 35. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jsg.v3i2.21267>
- Ferdian, A., SM, S., & Darmawati, D. (2021). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Berbasis Modal Sosial Dalam Rangka Pelestarian Hutan Mangrove. *Societas: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Sosial*, 10(1), 54–66. <https://doi.org/10.35724/sjias.v10i1.3296>
- Gorri-Mifsud, E., Secco, L., Da Re, R., Pisani, E., & Bonet, J. A. (2017). Structural social capital and local-level forest governance: Do they inter-relate? A mushroom permit case in Catalonia. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 188, 364–378. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2016.11.072>
- Hapsari, N. T., & Rokhani, R. (2021). Modal Sosial Kelompok Tani Hutan Santoso li Dalam Pengembangan Kapulaga Di Desa Sumberpakem Kecamatan Sumberjambe Kabupaten Jember. *Jurnal KIRANA*, 1(2), 92. <https://doi.org/10.19184/jkm.v1i2.23668>
- Harbi, J., Erbaugh, J. T., Sidiq, M., Haasler, B., & Nurrochmat, D. R. (2018). Making a bridge between livelihoods and forest conservation: Lessons from non timber forest products' utilization in South Sumatera, Indonesia. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 94(February 2017), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2018.05.011>
- Herman, H., Susilowati, I., & Astuti, Retno Sunu; Warsono, H. (2023). Constraints to community empowerment: A study of communities around forests in Pelalawan Regency, Riau Province. *Publisia Unmer*, 8(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.26905/pjiap.v8i2.9560>
- Herman, Rifai, A., & Gesmi, Ir. (2022). Empowerment Of Communities Around The Forest In Sungai Ara Village, Pelalawan Regency. 2(1), 530–537.
- Herman, Susilowati, I., Astuti, R. S., & Warsono, H. (2023). Constraints to community empowerment: A study of communities around forests in Pelalawan Regency, Riau Province. *Publisia Unmer*, 8(2), 1–13. <https://www.jurnal.unmer.ac.id/index.php/jkpp/article/view/9560>
- Inggrida, J., Mulyadi, F., & Purnama, S. (2023). Rural Social Capital in Organic Farmer Institutions in Rice Organic Farming. *Habitat*, 34(2), 190–202. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.habitat.2023.034.2.17>
- Islam, R., & Walkerden, G. (2014). How bonding and bridging networks contribute to disaster resilience and recovery on the Bangladeshi coast. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 10(PA), 281–291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2014.09.016>
- Jennings, C., & Sanchez-Pages, S. (2017). Social capital, crime and welfare 124, 157-167. *Journal of Development Economics*, 124, 157–167. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203887837.ch3>
- Kanowski, P. J., McDermott, C. L., & Cashore, B. W. (2020). Implementing REDD+: Lessons from analysis of forest governance. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 14(2), 111–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2010.11.007>
- Menlhk Nomor:P1.12/Menlhk-II/2015 Tentang Pembangunan Hutan Tanaman Industri, 1 (2015).
- Latif, S. A., Herman, & Dewi, Y. Y. (2022). Analisis Faktor Penghambat Pengembangan Kapasitas Kelembagaan di Dinas P3APM Kota Pekanbaru pada Bidang Pengarusutamaan Gender ( PUG ) dan Pemberdayaan Perempuan. *Jurnal Publikauka*, 10(2), 171–180.
- Maad, H., & Anugrahini, T. (2022). Bentuk dan Peran Kapital Sosial dalam Percepatan Penurunan Stunting di Desa Pandawangi, Lombok Timur. *RESIPROKAL: Jurnal Riset Sosiologi Progressif Aktual*, 3(2), 230–251. <https://doi.org/10.29303/resiprokal.v3i2.45>
- Marfai, M. A., Rahayu, E., & Triyanti, A. (2015). Peran Karifan Lokal Dan Modal Sosial Dalam Pengurangan Resiko Bencana Dan Pembangunan Pesisir (Integrasi Kajian Lingkungan, Kebencanaan dan Sosial Budaya (Cetakan Pe). Gajah Mada University Press.
- Nur Aminah, L., Qurniati, R., & Hidayat, W. (2014). Kontribusi Hutan Rakyat Terhadap Pendapatan Petani Di Desa Buana Sakti Kecamatan Batanghari Kabupaten Lampung Timur. *Jurnal Sylva Lestari*, 1(1), 47. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jsl1147-54>
- Nurohmah, M., Subiyantoro, H., & Suja'i, I. S. (2021). Peran Modal Sosial dalam Pendidikan Pesantren di Era Society 5.0. *EQUILIBRIUM: Jurnal Ilmiah Ekonomi Dan Pembelajarannya*, 9(2), 133. <https://doi.org/10.25273/equilibrium.v9i2.10010>
- Nurrochmat, D. R., Darusman, D., & Ekayani, M. (2016). Kebijakan Pembangunan Kehutanan dan Lingkungan. Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- Oktalina, S., Wiyono, W., Suka, A., Bisjoe, A., Muin, N., & Race, D. (2022). Understanding Social Capital in Management of Community Forest in Indonesia. *Habitat*, 33(2), 153–165. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.habitat.2022.033.2.16>
- Prastyo, R. E., Wisadirana, D., Rozuli, A. I., & Hakim, M. L. (2024). Social Capital's Impact on Indonesia's Urban and Rural Areas. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 12(1), e2714. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i1.2714>
- Pribadi, M. A., Maharani, K. E., Gunung, J., No, B., & Barat, J. (2018). Modal Sosial Petani Penggarap Dalam Tata Kelola Hutan Penelitian Parungpanjang. *Balai Penelitian Dan Pengembangan Teknologi Perbenihan Tanaman Hutan*, 61–83.
- Puspita, N. T., Qurniati, R., & Febryano, I. G. (2020). Social Capital of Community Forest Management in Batutegei Forest Management Unit. *Jurnal Sylva Lestari*, 8(1), 54. <https://doi.org/10.23960/jsl1854-64>
- Putnam, R. D. (1993). Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy. *Political Science Quarterly*, 108(3), 549–550. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2151707>
- Romzy, N., Triwahyudianto, T., & Wardani, N. R. (2019). Modal Sosial Dalam Pengelolaan Hutan Produksi Pada Lembaga Masyarakat Desa Hutan (LMDH) Desa Pandantoyo Kabupaten Kediri. *JPIG (Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Geografi)*, 4(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.21067/jpig.v4i1.3103>

- Sabar, A., Dassir, M., & Ita, S. E. N. (2022). Modal Sosial Masyarakat Pengelolaan HutanKemasyarakatan (Hkm) Buhung Lali Kecamatan GantarangKabupaten Bulukumba. *Jurnal Kehutanan Papuaasia*, 8(1), 94–101.
- Suwarno, E., Ikhwan, M., & Ariyanto, A. (2023). Profil Modal Sosial Masyarakat Adat Kenegerian Kampa Dalam Pengelolaan Hutan. *Wahana Forestra: Jurnal Kehutanan*, 18(1), 72–92. <https://doi.org/10.31849/forestra.v18i1.12340>
- Syahli, R., & Sekarningrum, B. (2017). Pengelolaan Sampah Berbasis Modal Sosial Masyarakat. *Sosioglobal: Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Sosiologi Is*, 1(March), 143–151. <http://journal.unpad.ac.id/sosioglobal/article/view/13309>
- Widhagdha, M. F. (2019). Relasi Bonding Dalam Masyarakat Binaan CSR (Studi Deskriptif Interpretif Relasi Sosial Masyarakat Binaan CSR PT Pertamina RU II Sungai Pakning di Kabupaten Bengkalis). *Profetik: Jurnal Komunikasi*, 12(1), 108. <https://doi.org/10.14421/pjk.v12i1.1547>
- Woolcock, M. (1998). *Social Capital and Economic Development : Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework* Author ( s ): Michael Woolcock Published by : Springer Stable URL : <http://www.jstor.org/stable/657866> REFERENCES Linked references are available on JSTOR for th. *Theory and Society*, 27(2), 151–208.
- Yamin, S., & Dartanto, T. (2016). Pengentasan Orang Miskin di Indonesia: Peran Modal Sosial yang Terlupakan. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Pembangunan Indonesia*, 17(1), 88–102. <https://doi.org/10.21002/jepi.v17i1.07>