

Community Perception of the Impact of the Social Forestry Program in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency

¹Nabila Zannuba Rahman, ¹Slamet Widodo, ¹Amanatuz Zuhriyah,
²Yuhanin Zamrodah, ³Purbowo

¹ Agribusiness Study Program of Trunojoyo Madura University, Indonesia

² Agribusiness Study Program of Islamic Balitar University Blitar, Indonesia

³ Agribusiness Study Program of K.H. Wahab Hasbullah University, Jombang, Indonesia

Abstract

Social forestry is a government program designed to grant communities residing around forest areas legal access to and management rights over the forests. Given the significant attention paid by the government to social forestry policies and the substantial number of people reliant on forests, this study aims to assess the implementation and community perceptions of the social forestry program in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency. The study employed a consecutive sampling method, with 25 respondents participating. Descriptive qualitative analysis was used to analyze the implementation process, while the assessment of community perception utilized a descriptive quantitative method employing a Likert scale. Findings indicate that social forestry in Barurejo Village operates under the IPHPS scheme, following the guidelines outlined in Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation Number 39 of 2017. Community perceptions regarding the program's impact are notably positive, with economic aspects scoring 266, conservation aspects 251, and social aspects 261. The overall level of community perception falls within the 'very high' category, with 64% (16 people) in the very high category and 36% (9 people) in the high category.

Keywords: Perception, Impact, Likert Scale, Social Forestry.

How to Cite:

Rahman, N., Z., Widodo, S., Zuhriyah, A., Zamrodah, Y., Purbowo (2024). Community Perception of the Impact of the Social Forestry Program in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency. *International Conference on Sustainable Agribusiness, Community, Economic, and Rural Agriculture (ICo-SACERA) 2023*. Universitas Trunojoyo Madura.



Email: slametwidodo@trunojoyo.ac.id



Content from this work may be used under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

Forests play a vital role in sustaining life, serving as the Earth's lungs and maintaining ecological, social, cultural, and economic balance globally. Over the past decade, the forested area in Indonesia has diminished due to annual deforestation rates. According to data from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, the average deforestation rate from 2009 to 2011 was 0.45 million hectares per year. However, this figure has decreased compared to the period from 2019 to 2020, which recorded a rate of 0.11 million hectares per year (MoEF, 2022). Despite the reduction in deforestation within Indonesia, according to data reported by Global Forest Watch, the country still ranks among the top 10 nations with the highest forest loss globally (Weisse & Goldman, 2022).

The significance of forests in Indonesia is underscored by the substantial number of people reliant on forest resources. Approximately 25,800 villages in Indonesia are situated within or near forested areas, constituting around 34 percent of all villages nationwide (MoEF, 2020). In terms of population, these 25,800 villages are home to approximately 30 million people, which accounts for 70 percent of Indonesia's total population (Wisnubro, 2018). Numerous studies have highlighted the reliance of communities on forest resources (Fahrirurrahman & Ratnaningsih, 2020; Haryani & Rijanta, 2019; Nay et al., 2023). This dependency phenomenon is not unique to Indonesia and is observed in various other countries as well. For instance, research conducted by Hussain et al. (2019) illustrates the significant reliance of forest communities in Pakistan. Similarly, studies by Mahmoudi et al. (2023); Nasar et al. (2016); and Ofoegbu et al. (2017) have also identified similar patterns of community dependence on forest resources.

There has been a notable shift in conservation paradigms within environmental management, particularly in forestry. Consequently, there is a growing recognition of the importance of community-based forest management, which prioritizes human-focused and community-centered conservation approaches. This approach, commonly known as community-based conservation (CBC), has been adopted by communities worldwide (Alexander & Campbell, 2018; Fariss et al., 2023). The primary goal of community-based empowerment is to enhance community capacity and autonomy, foster sustainable environmental and socio-economic benefits through capacity-building initiatives, and ensure equitable access for communities to utilize conservation area resources optimally and fairly (Ekarini & Koestoer, 2022; Wijayanto et al., 2014).

The community empowerment-based conservation initiative outlined in Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation No.83/2016 is commonly referred to as social forestry (Sami, 2020). Social forestry is a government-led program designed to enable communities residing in forested areas to legally access and manage forest resources. The program encompasses various forms, including community forest (HKm), community plantation forest (HTR), village forest (HD), customary forest (HA), and partnership forests. As of May 2020, the implementation of social forestry schemes has provided forest access to local communities over a total area of 4,147,875.30 hectares.

However, the realization of the Social Forestry program has reached only 1.7 million hectares out of the targeted 12.7 million hectares (MoEF, 2020).

The success of the Social Forestry Program is determined by whether it achieves its objectives as outlined in Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia Number 83 of 2016. These objectives include reducing poverty and unemployment, resolving tenure issues to ensure justice for communities residing in or around forest areas, and promoting community welfare while preserving forest functions. In essence, the program is considered successful if it leads to improvements in both the condition of the forest and the well-being of the communities involved.

As of 2022, the implementation of social forestry in East Java has been successful, with a total area of 176.15 thousand hectares distributed across 18 districts and 1 city. This achievement represents a significant portion of social forestry on Java Island, accounting for 53% of the total area. Additionally, there are 765 Social Forestry Business Groups (KUPS) in East Java that have been granted forest management rights, benefiting a total of 120,990 individuals (Newsroom, 2023). The largest forest area in East Java is located in Banyuwangi Regency, spanning 177,084 hectares (BPS East Java, 2020), with 40 social forestry decrees and 90 KUPS.

Banyuwangi Regency comprises 24 sub-districts, including Siliragung District, situated in the southwestern part of Banyuwangi. Within Siliragung District lies Barurejo Village (Ekaningsih et al., 2018). The predominant economic activities in Banyuwangi district include agriculture, forestry, hunting, and fisheries. As of 2021, the number of individuals employed in these sectors totaled 315,607 (BPS Banyuwangi, 2022). Similarly, in Barurejo Village, these occupations prevail, employing 3,926 individuals, which accounts for 31.48% of the village's total population of 12,472 (Barurejo Village Official Website, 2023).

In several regions of Indonesia, the social forestry programs have yielded diverse outcomes. While, in general, social forestry demonstrates positive impacts and successes, the implementation of this program has encountered challenges and obstacles that hinder its optimal operation (Sahide et al., 2018; Supriyanto et al., 2018; Agusti, Nurjaya, & Koeswahyono, 2018; Latifah et al., 2022; Fakhruddin et al., 2022).

Several prior studies have investigated community perceptions of forest management across various schemes. Lestari et al. (2019); Purnomo et al. (2017); and Pratiwi and Nitibaskara (2018) discovered that communities generally hold a positive perception of social forestry initiatives. Furthermore, in terms of the impact of social forestry, communities tend to perceive it positively, particularly regarding its economic implications (Aziz et al., 2022; Andini & Masrilurrahman, 2023).

Given the significant attention from the government to social forestry policy and the substantial number of forest-dependent communities, this study aims to achieve two main objectives: (i) to assess the implementation of social forestry programs by communities residing in the vicinity of forests in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency, (ii) to evaluate the perceptions of communities regarding the

impact of forests on social forestry programs in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency.

2. Research Method

This research was conducted in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency, from August to December 2023. The research location was purposively selected due to its status as the site of social forestry implementation. The sampling method employed in this study was consecutive sampling, involving a total of 25 respondents who met the criteria of being registered forest farmers in forest farmer group (KTH) or members of the community residing around the social forestry management forest. Primary data for this research were collected through interviews and observations. Interviews were conducted using a questionnaire format, wherein respondents were asked a series of questions to gather relevant for the first objective, the analysis will involve describing the implementation of the social forestry program by communities around the forest in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency using a descriptive qualitative approach. This method will focus on providing a detailed narrative of the various aspects of the program's implementation based on the data collected from interviews and observations. For the second objective, assessing community perceptions will be analyzed using a descriptive quantitative method with a Likert scale. The Likert scale assessment utilized to measure perceptions will consist of the following options:

- 1 = Strongly Disagree/Very Low (SD)
- 2 = Disagree/Low (D)
- 3 = Agree/High (A)
- 4 = Strongly Agree/Very High (SA)

Respondents will be asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements related to the impact of forests on social forestry programs, and the responses will be quantitatively analyzed to gauge the overall perceptions of the community. To determine the category boundaries using the interval formula, the following steps can be taken:

1. Calculate the maximum score:

Maximum score = highest score x number of samples x number of questions

2. Calculate the minimum score:

Minimum score = lowest score x number of samples x number of questions

Once the maximum and minimum scores are calculated, they can be used to establish the category boundaries for analyzing the Likert scale responses.

$$\text{Interval} = \frac{\text{Maximum value} - \text{Minimum value}}{\text{Number of categories}}$$
$$I = \frac{300 - 75}{4} = 56,25$$

Tabel 1. Assessment Criteria

Variable	Category	Score Interval
	Strongly disagree/low	75-131,25
Community Perception	Disagree/very low	131,26-187,51
	Agree/high	187,52-243,77
	Strongly agree/very high	243,78-300,3

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2023

Table 1 above presents the criteria used to assess the public perception categories for each indicator. The indicators examined in this study include (i) economic aspects, namely income improvement, income alternatives, and assistance programs; (ii) conservation aspects, such as actions that harm the forest, participation in conservation activities, and protective efforts; and (iii) social aspects, encompassing social ties, conflict reduction, and collaboration through KUPS. Subsequently, the weighted value or score for each response was determined based on the answer category to gauge the community's perception of social forestry. This involved calculating the final score value, which is obtained by multiplying the number of scores by the number of samples. Following this, the percentage of community perception frequency was calculated and interpreted across four categories

3. Results and Discussion

Implementation of Social Forestry in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency

The implementation of the Social Forestry program in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency adheres to the regulations stipulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia Number 39 of 2017. According to Article 4 Paragraph (1) of this regulation, the Social Forestry Forest Utilization Permit (IPHPS) is granted for forest areas with a land cover below or equal to 10% over five consecutive years. Conversely, forest areas with a land cover above 10% over the same period are subject to recognition under the Forestry Partnership Protection (Kulin KK) scheme.

In Barurejo Village, the implementation of the Social Forestry program operates under the IPHPS scheme, as indicated by Decree No. SK.1732 MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/3/2019 issued by the Minister of Environment and Forestry of the Republic of Indonesia on March 12, 2019. This decree granted the Barurejo Makmur Sejahtera Forest Farmer Group permission to utilize approximately 363 hectares of production forest land within the jurisdiction of the State Forestry General Company (Perum Perhutani) RPH Tegalsari BKPH Curahjati KPH Banyuwangi Selatan. The implementation process of IPHPS in Barurejo Village follows the guidelines outlined in Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation No.39 of 2017.

The majority of members of the Forest Farmers Group in Barurejo Village originate from the local community, although there are individuals from outside the village involved in land activities within Barurejo Village's forest area. It is essential to

note that the granting of permits does not confer ownership of the forest area but merely permits its management based on agreed-upon terms. The cultivated area for each group member is determined on-site, considering topographical and land conditions at the IPHPS site level through consensus. The Barurejo Makmur Sejahtera Forest Farmers group is tasked with addressing violations by group members concerning IPHPS rights and obligations.

The rights of the Barurejo Makmur Sejahtera Forest Farmer Group, as IPHPS permit holders, include the entitlement to conduct forest utilization activities within the allocated area, protection against environmental harm and unilateral takeovers, access to assistance in permit area utilization, counseling, technological business development, financing, and marketing support, as well as the receipt of business utilization results. Conversely, the group is obligated to develop a 10-year Forest Utilization Plan (RPH) and a 1-year Annual Work Plan (RKT), mark area boundaries, plant woody trees, protect the environment, maintain forest functions, pay stipulated fees, and establish institutional arrangements.

Under Article 19 of Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation No. 39/2017, IPHPS holders have the authority to appoint mentors. These facilitators, appointed by a local NGO or facilitated by the Pokja PPS, play a vital role in providing guidance and technical assistance. The facilitators listed in the SK 1732 MENLHK-PSKL/PKPS/PSL.0/3/2019 decree received coaching and technical assistance from various governmental and non-governmental entities. However, discrepancies exist concerning field assistance compared to those listed in the decree.

Furthermore, the Social Forestry area in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, offers opportunities for diverse business activities, including land utilization for agroforestry and silvopasture, timber and non-timber forest product utilization, nature tourism services, facilities provision, and carbon sequestration and storage. However, the development of forest area utilization businesses in Barurejo Village has not entirely aligned with the intended objectives, as evidenced by limited success in implementing social forestry-related activities among KUPS groups. Only a single KUPS group has achieved notable welfare improvement through the social forestry program, with the remaining groups encountering challenges related to age, traditional agricultural practices, operational costs, and other factors.

In conclusion, while the implementation of the Social Forestry program in Barurejo Village largely conforms to regulatory standards, it falls short of fully achieving its objectives due to management inefficiencies and conflicts within the community. The delayed delivery of the Kulin KK decree and the presence of external conflicts further hinder the effective operation of the program. These challenges underscore the need for enhanced coordination and cooperation among stakeholders to overcome existing barriers and realize the full potential of social forestry in promoting sustainable forest management and community welfare.

Community Perception of Social Forestry

Community perception of social forestry is crucial in assessing its impact and benefits for forest-dependent communities. Evaluating various aspects, including economic, conservation, and social factors, provides insights into the extent to which social forestry management benefits forest farmer group members (Sahide et al., 2018). Adinda et al. (2021), elucidated that higher scores correlate with increased variable significance, indicating stronger effects of social forestry.

Community Perception of Economic Aspects of Social Forestry

Enhancing the living standards of rural communities near forests stands as a primary objective of the social forestry program. According to research by Kastanya et al. (2019), the economic impact of social forestry manifests in income augmentation, employment opportunities, and business collaborations. As illustrated in Table 2, the community's perception of income improvement scored 93. The majority, comprising 72% or 18 individuals, strongly agreed, while 28% or 7 individuals agreed on household income enhancement. Preceding social forestry, limited forest access restricted community engagement to teak tree planting within forest areas. However, post-social forestry implementation, legal forest access empowered communities to participate in forest management, including farming and livestock rearing, thereby improving community income.

The community's perception of the alternative income indicator scored 92. Of the 25 respondents, a majority, consisting of 68% or 17 individuals, strongly agreed, while 32% or 8 individuals agreed on the emergence of new income sources. Despite recognizing the forest's economic potential, limited resource access impedes utilization. Consequently, community members express hope for training to enhance forest management proficiency for sustainable practices. While social forestry has bolstered community income, diversifying income streams remains a challenge. Presently, agricultural ventures, including food crops, fruits, horticulture, and timber, alongside goat farming initiatives, supplement community income.

Perceptions of assistance programs from an economic aspect scored 81. While 44% or 11 individuals agreed and 40% or 10 individuals strongly agreed with the abundance of government and institutional aid programs, 16% or 4 individuals dissented due to perceived lack of government assistance. According to the head of the KTH Barurejo Makmur Sejahtera, government and institutional assistance, including seeds and goats, channeled through KUPS, are commonplace. However, inadequate knowledge and accountability diminish assistance efficacy, prompting KTH Barurejo Makmur Sejahtera to proactively utilize Ministry of Environment and Forestry assistance to develop KUPS through communal goat rearing initiatives.

Table 2. Assessment of Community Perceptions of Economic Aspects

No	Indicator	KJ	NS	Frequency	Total	Percentage (%)
1.	Social forestry has an impact in the form of improving household income.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	7	21	28
		SA	4	18	72	72
	Total			25	93	100
2.	Through social forestry, new sources of income for households become possible.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	8	24	32
		SA	4	17	68	68
	Total			25	92	100
3.	After the implementation of social forestry, numerous assistance and training programs are offered by both the government and other institutions.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	4	8	16
		A	3	11	33	44
		SA	4	10	40	40
	Total			25	81	100
Total					266	Very High

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2023

The total score of community perceptions regarding the economic aspect of social forestry reached 266, placing it in the very high category. This indicates that the community collectively perceives a positive impact following the introduction of social forestry, particularly evident in the increase in community income. Although the program has not fully succeeded in generating new alternative income sources, the rise in income is attributed to the assurance of management rights granted to the community. Consequently, community members can utilize their land effectively without apprehension, provided they adhere to legal guidelines. The augmentation in income stems from three primary sources: main crops, supplementary crops, and livestock. This finding aligns with the research conducted by Susilo and Nairobi (2019), highlighting that heightened agricultural production correlates with increased income.

Community perception of conservation aspects of social forestry

Based on research by Kastanya et al. (2019), environmental (ecological) impacts can be observed in three aspects: sustainability, threats or acts of destroying forests, and participation in sustainability. Community perceptions of the conservation aspect indicators, particularly actions to prevent forest damage as shown in Table 3, indicate that the majority of respondents provided favorable responses. Specifically, 72% or 18 individuals agreed, and 28% or 7 individuals strongly agreed that there were no actions that could potentially damage the forest by the local community. Prior to the introduction of social forestry, forest damage primarily occurred through unauthorized logging of teak trees by community members, reflecting a sense of legal injustice stemming from the state-centric forest management ideology, enforced by repressive

laws and criminal penalties for those infringing upon forest regulations. However, the implementation of the social forestry program has contributed to a positive shift in the behavior of village communities residing in forest areas.

Furthermore, Table 3 illustrates that out of 25 respondents, 16 individuals or 64% agreed, and 9 individuals or 36% strongly agreed with the community's perception of their involvement in forest conservation activities facilitated by the social forestry program. Similarly, the indicator assessing community perceptions of protection measures revealed that 60% or 15 individuals agreed, while 40% or 10 individuals strongly agreed. Community engagement in conservation endeavors and protective measures entails active participation in forest management activities, notably through agricultural practices. Members registered with the KTH Barurejo Makmur Sejahtera are mandated to partake in agricultural undertakings, such as cultivating corn on a minimum area of 0.25 hectares. During the maize planting season, community members frequently collaborate in tending to the crop on their respective plots of land. Additionally, the community underscores the significance of forest conservation by refraining from reckless burning or engaging in activities that could compromise the forest ecosystem. The ethos of returning the forest to its natural state appears deeply ingrained and pivotal in the collective consciousness of the community.

Table 3. Perceptual Assessment of Conservation Aspects

No.	Indicator	KJ	NS	Frequency	Total	Percentage (%)
1.	Social forestry has led to a decrease in actions that could damage the forest by the community.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	18	54	72
		SA	4	7	28	28
	Total			25	82	100
2.	Through social forestry, communities are now actively engaged in forest conservation activities.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	16	48	64
		SA	4	9	36	36
	Total			25	84	100
3.	Community-driven forest protection efforts are underway.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	15	45	60
		SA	4	10	40	40
	Total			25	85	100
Total					251	Very High

Source: Primary Data Processed (2023)

The total score of community perception regarding the conservation aspect is 251, indicating a category of very high. This implies that the community perceives a positive impact on conservation through social forestry. The decrease in forest damage experienced by the community reflects an increasing awareness and recognition of the crucial role forests play in their lives. Consequently, detrimental practices like illegal logging and forest burning have ceased. Forests are vital components of the ecosystem, enhancing soil fertility and promoting optimal plant growth through effective land management practices.

Moreover, community involvement in forest management nurtures a sense of ownership among its members. This sentiment is reinforced by the provision outlined in the IPHPS Decree, which grants beneficiaries the authority to manage the forest for up to 35 years. These findings align with research conducted by Adinda et al. (2021) on forest utilization in the Mire Village Forest Area, Ulubongka District. The study revealed that the community utilizes forest resources, environmental services, and forest products equitably and efficiently to enhance community welfare while ensuring the sustainability of the forest ecosystem.

Community Perceptions of Social Aspects of Social Forestry

According to research conducted by Kastanya et al. (2019), social impacts can be observed in three different ways: public views, behavioral changes, and institutions. In this study, community perceptions of the social aspects of social forestry include social ties, reduced conflict, and cooperation through KUPS. Regarding the economic aspect of the social relationship indicator, data in Table 4 shows that 44% or 11 people agreed, and 56% or 14 people strongly agreed that there was a better relationship with the community through social forestry. Before social forestry, community relations were limited to the surrounding community. However, with social forestry, the scope of community interaction has expanded through the formation of KTH. Additionally, organizing frequent meetings by forest farmer groups can foster a sense of unity and improve social ties among communities.

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the community's perception of social aspects is an indicator of reduced conflict. Of the 25 respondents interviewed, 68%, or 17 people, gave answers agreeing, while 32% or 8 people, gave answers strongly agreeing. The reduction in conflict is because the community now understands the boundaries of the forest area between the boundaries of the forest managed by KTH and the state-owned forest under Perum Perhutani, so that debates that can trigger conflict can be avoided. Additionally, the community now has legal rights to manage the forest. This gives the community the courage to exercise their rights and authority, supported by the Minister of Environment and Forestry Regulation No. 39 of 2017, which gives legal rights to the community through the IPHPS scheme.

Community perception of the social aspect of the cooperation variable through KUPS can be seen in Table 4, where 56% or 33 people, gave an agreed assessment, and 44% or 14 people, gave a strongly agreed assessment. The assessment has a significant difference between agree and strongly agree because there are ± 15 KUPS in Barurejo

with the IPHPS scheme determined based on the social forestry area. There is a difference in the routine meeting time conducted by each KUPS, which is on average about once every 1-2 months. Additionally, the business activities undertaken by each group are different. Therefore, the assessment depends on the activeness and cooperation of each KUPS in the activities initiated by the social forestry program.

Based on Table 4, the overall score of community perception on the social aspects of social forestry is 261, which falls into the very high category. This indicates that overall, the community holds a very high perception of the positive impacts of social aspects following the implementation of social forestry. Social forestry has expanded the range of community interactions through routine activities conducted by KTH. Additionally, the occurrence of conflicts between the community and Perhutani, or state forest managers, has decreased because the community now has legal rights to manage forest areas. Similarly, the presence of KUPS has increased community cooperation. However, it should be noted that not all KUPS in Barurejo are running optimally, especially concerning their capacity to support the growth of the businesses they run.

Overall Community Perception on the Impact of the Social Forestry Program

Table 5 illustrates that the community's perception of the impact of social forestry is predominantly in the very high category, with a percentage of 64% for 16 respondents, falling within an interval of greater than or equal to 36.03. Meanwhile, the high category, encompassing an interval of 22.52-29.27, represents 36% of respondents, totaling 9 individuals.

Table 4. Assessment of Perceptions of Social Aspects

No.	Indicator	KJ	NS	Frequency	Total	Percentage (%)
1.	Through social forestry, social bonds among residents are strengthened.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	11	33	44
		SA	4	14	56	56
	Total			25	89	100
2.	Social forestry results in reduced conflict between residents and Perhutani or state forest managers.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	17	51	68
		SA	4	8	32	32
	Total			25	83	100
3.	Cooperation has been enhanced through KUPS, which was initiated by the social forestry program.	SD	1	0	0	0
		D	2	0	0	0
		A	3	11	33	56
		SA	4	14	56	44
	Total			25	89	100
Total					261	Very High

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2023

Table 5. Total Community Perception of The Impact of Social Forestry

Variable	Perception Category	Number of respondents	Percentage (%)
Community perception	Very Low ($\leq 15,75$)	0	0
	Low (15,76-22,51)	0	0
	High (22,52-29,27)	9	36
	Very High ($\geq 36,03$)	16	64
Total		25	100

Source: Primary Data Processed, 2023

In conclusion, it is evident that the community around the forest in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, Banyuwangi Regency, holds a very high perception of the impact of social forestry, encompassing economic, conservation, and social aspects. This is evidenced by the preservation of the forest, the utilization of forest resources for community income generation, and the improvement of social relations between the community and Perhutani. These findings align with research conducted by Aziz et al. (2022), which suggests that social forestry enhances community security in land management, leading to increased income and greater awareness of forest protection. Similarly, research by Latifah et al. (2022) highlights the opportunities provided by social forestry for economic improvement, behavior change towards forest preservation, and the strengthening of social ties within the community.

4. Conclusion and Recommendation

The implementation of social forestry in Barurejo Village, Siliragung District, and Banyuwangi Regency operates under the IPHPS scheme. However, internal and external disagreements between management and other groups have hindered the smooth execution of the Kulin KK scheme, despite the community's understanding and efforts towards implementation. Consequently, the decree of Kulin KK has yet to be handed over to the management. Community perceptions of the impact of social forestry on economic, conservation, and social aspects are categorized as very high, with assessments of 266 for economic impact, 251 for conservation impact, and 261 for social impact. This high level of recognition underscores the positive influence of social forestry on various aspects of community life. Currently, communities are focusing on optimizing resources due to limited capacity to effectively manage forests through KUPS. Therefore, government involvement is crucial to address internal disputes among administrators and external conflicts with other groups, ensuring the optimal implementation of social forestry management. Building commitment and integrity within institutions is essential for success, while strong synergy among stakeholders is needed to support the program's success. This includes establishing businesses based on community superior commodities to improve income, strengthen social capital, and ensure sustainability.

References

- Adinda, S. R., Umar, S., & Maiwa, A. (2021). Persepsi Masyarakat terhadap Pengelolaan Hutan Desa Mire Kecamatan Ulubongka, Kabupaten Tojo Una-Una. *Warta Rimba*, 9(1), 9–16.
- Agusti, T. M., Nurjaya, I. N., & Koeswahyono, I. (2018). *Implementasi Regulasi Perhutanan Sosial yang Bermanfaat Bagi Masyarakat Sekitar Hutan*. 4, 300–309.
- Alexander, S. M., & Campbell, D. (2018). Participation in Planning and Social Networks Increase Social Monitoring in Community-Based Conservation. *Conservation Letters*, (January), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12562>.
- Andini, R. A., & Masrilurrahman, L. S. (2023). Persepsi Masyarakat terhadap Pengelolaan Hutan Kemasyarakatan Lembah Sempager pada Blok 3 Desa Gunungmalang Kecamatan Pringgabaya Kabupaten Lombok Timur. *Jurnal Silva Samalas: Journal of Forestry and Plant Science*, 6(1), 28–36.
- Aziz, I. U. I., Purnama, M. M., & Rammang, N. (2022). Dampak Program Perhutanan Sosial terhadap Konflik Tenurial di Kawasan Hutan Lindung Wukoh Lewoloro, Desa Boru Kedang, Kecamatan Wulanggitang, Kabupaten Flores Timur. *Jurnal Wana Lestari*, 7(2), 335–341.
- BPS. (2020). Luas Kawasan Hutan Menurut Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Jawa Timur, 2019. Badan Pusat Statistik Provinsi Jawa Timur.
- BPS. (2022). *Penduduk 15 Tahun Ke Atas yang Bekerja Selama Seminggu yang Lalu Menurut Lapangan Pekerjaan Utama, 2018-2021*. Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Banyuwangi.
- Barurejo, Website Resmi Pemerinta Desa Barurejo, Kecamatan Siliragung, K. Banyuwangi. (2023). Demografi Berdasar Pekerjaan.
- Ekaningsih, L. A. F., Aini, A. I., & Mutiah, I. (2018). Analisis Praktik Jual Beli Produk Pertanian Bayar Panen dalam Perspektif Hukum Ekonomi Islam di Desa Barurejo Kecamatan Siliragung Kabupaten Banyuwangi. *Jurnal Darussalam: Jurnal Pendidikan, Komunikasi dan Pemikiran Hukum Islam*, 10(1), 180. <https://doi.org/10.30739/darussalam.v10i1.278>.
- Ekarini, D. F., & Koestoer, R. H. (2022). *Policy in Community-Based Environmental Conservation and Protection: A Comparative Study Between Brazil and Indonesia*. (November). <https://doi.org/10.14710/jwl.10.1.1-14>.
- Fahrirurrahman, & Ratnaningsih, Y. (2020). Analisis Ketergantungan Masyarakat Terhadap Hasil Hutan di Dalam Kawasan Hutan Lindung di Desa Daha Kecamatan Hu'u Kabupaten Dompu Propinsi Nusa Tenggara Barat. *Jurnal Silva Samalas*, 3(2), 86–89. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jss.v3i2.3695>.

- Fakhruddin, Putra, D. E., & Iskandar, R. (2022). Kesejahteraan Petani sebagai Dampak dari Program Perhutanan Sosial di Banyuwangi. *Agrinika : Jurnal Agroteknologi Dan Agribisnis*, 6(2), 208–216.
- Fariss, B., Demello, N., Powlen, K. A., Kennedy, C. M., Masuda, Y., & Latimer, C. E. (2023). Catalyzing success in community-based conservation. *Conservation Biology*, 37, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cobi.13973>.
- Haryani, R., & Rijanta, R. (2019). Ketergantungan Masyarakat terhadap Hutan Lindung dalam Program Hutan Kemasyarakatan. *Jurnal Litbang Sukowati*, 2(2), 72–86.
- Hussain, J., Zhou, K., Akbar, M., Zafar khan, M., Raza, G., Ali, S., ... Ghulam, A. (2019). Dependence of Rural Livelihoods on Forest Resources in Naltar Valley, A Dry Temperate Mountainous Region, Pakistan. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 20, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2019.e00765>.
- Indonesia, M. L. H. dan K. *Peraturan Menteri Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan Nomor 39 Tahun 2017*. Pub. L. No. NOMOR P.39/MENLHK/SETJEN/KUM.1/6/2017, 1. Jakarta.
- Kastanya, A., Tjoa, M., Mardiatmoko, G., Latumahina, F., Bon, I., & Aponno, H. E. S. (2019). Kajian Dampak Perhutanan Sosial Wilayah Maluku-Papua. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Perhutanan Sosial dan Rempah-Rempah Provinsi Maluku*. Program Studi Manajemen Hutan PPs UNPATTI.
- Kementerian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan Republik Indonesia. (2022). *Status Lingkungan Hidup Indonesia 2022*.
- Kementrian Lingkungan Hidup dan Kehutanan Republik Indonesia. (2020). *Status Hutan & Kehutanan Indonesia 2020*.
- Khusniatin, D., Taufiq, A., & Kasiami, S. (2023). Implementasi Program Perhutanan Sosial di Kabupaten Bojonegoro Tahun 2020 (Studi Kasus Di LMDH Jati Makmur Desa Jono Kecamatan Temayang Kabupaten Bojonegoro). *JIAN - Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Negara*, 7(1), 1–10.
- Latifah, S., Yonariza, & Purwanto. (2022). Study of Community Forest Management (HKm) on Socio-Economic Sustainability in Several Regions of Indonesia Study of Community Forest Management (HKm) on Socio- Economic Sustainability in Several Regions of Indonesia. *IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 1188, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1188/1/012026>
- Lestari, S., Premono, B. T., & Winarno, B. (2019). Local People Awareness Towards Social Forestry Program: A Case Study of Ogan Komering Ulu District, South Sumatra Province, Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 308, 1–10. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1088/1755-1315/308/1/012075>.

- Lingkungan, M., Dan, H., & Republik, K. *Peraturan Menteri Lingkungan Hidup Dan Kehutanan Republik Indonesia Nomor P.83/Menlhk/Setjen/Kum.1/10/2016*. (2016).
- Mahmoudi, B., Ng, E., Mafi-gholami, D., & Eshaghi, F. (2023). Forest Dwellers ' Dependence on Forest Resources in Semi-Arid Environments. *Sustainability Article*, 15, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15032689>.
- Naftali. (2019). *Program PS di Barurejo, Ketua LMDH Menolak Keras Warga dari Luar Wilayah*. pp. 1–2.
- Nasar, A., Abdullah, M., Stacey, N., Garnett, S. T., & Myers, B. (2016). Economic Dependence on Mangrove Forest Resources for Livelihoods in the Sundarbans, Bangladesh. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 64, 15–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2015.12.009>.
- Nay, A. C. J. W., Pellondo, M. E., & Rammang, N. (2023). Tingkat Ketergantungan Masyarakat Terhadap Hutan (Studi Kasus : Kawasan Hutan Koa Besipae , Desa Mio, Kecamatan Amanuban Selatan, Kabupaten Timor Tengah Selatan). *Jurnal Wana Lestari*, 5(1), 051–056.
- Newsroom, J. (2023). *Hingga 2022, Capaian Hutan Sosial di Jawa Timur Tembus 176.149,68 Hektar*.
- Ofoegbu, C., Chirwa, P. W., Francis, J., & Folarannmi, D. (2017). Socio-economic Factors Influencing Household Dependence on Forests and Its Implication for Forest-Based Climate Change Interventions. *Southern Forests: A Journal of Forest Science*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.2989/20702620.2016.1255420>.
- Pratiwi R, Unu Nitibaskara, and M. S. (2018). Persepsi dan Sikap Masyarakat terhadap Pengelolaan Hutan Adat (Studi Kasus di Kasepuhan Pasir Eurih, Desa Sindanglaya, Kecamatan Sobang, Kabupaten Lebak, Provinsi Banten. *Jurnal Nusa Sylva*, 18(1), 31–37.
- Purnomo, B., Anggoro, S., & Izzati, M. (2017). Analysis of Perception and Community Participation in Forest Management at KPHP Model Unit VII-Hulu Sarolangun, Jambi Province. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 70(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/70/1/012034>.
- Sahide, M. A. K., Jusuf, Y., Alam, S., Supratman, Millang, S., Mahbub, A. S., ... Penulis. (2018). *Kajian Dampak Perhutanan Sosial Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan* (Muhammad Alif K. Sahide, Ed.). Fakultas Kehutanan Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Sami, R. G. (2020). Implikasi Peraturan Menteri Lingkungan Hidup Nomor 83 Tahun 2016 Tentang Perhutanan Sosial Terhadap Swadaya Ekonomi Masyarakat Dalam Program Perhutanan Sosial (Studi Pada Kelompok Tani Nagari Latang Kab . Sijunjung). *Unes Journal Of Swara Justisia*, 4(2), 121–138.

- Supriyanto, B., Karyana, A., Rosdiana, E., Tjiptono, B. H., Dwijayati, N., Presetiani, C. E., Haryanto, G. (2018). *Dampak Perhutanan Sosial Perspektif Ekonomi, Sosial, dan Lingkungan*.
- Susilo, S. Y., & Nairobi. (2019). Dampak Perhutanan Sosial terhadap Pendapatan Masyarakat. *ISEI Economic Review*, 3(1), 16–27.
- Weisse, B. M., & Goldman, L. (2022). Kehilangan Hutan Tetap Tinggi di Tahun 2021. *Globaal Forest Watch*, 1–22.
- Wijayanto, H., Suryono, A., & Domai, T. (2014). Perencanaan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Sekitar Hutan Melalui Aneka Usaha Kehutanan (Studi di Dinas Kehutanan Kabupaten Malang). *Jurnal Hutan Tropis*, 2(1), 1–13.
- Wisnubro. (2018). Refleksi Hutan Sosial KLHK 2018 : Hutan untuk Kesejahteraan Rakyat. *Portal Berita Info Publik*, pp. 22–24.