Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal – Vol.5, No.7 Publication Date: July. 25, 2018 DoI:10.14738/assrj.57.4829.

Dwijanti, R., Sutrisno, J., Pujiasmanto, B., & Rahayu, E. S. (2018). Community-Based State Forest Management (*Social Forestry*) In Purworejo Regency Of Central Java Indonesia. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal*, 5(7) 290-300.

Community-Based State Forest Management (*Social Forestry*) In Purworejo Regency Of Central Java Indonesia

Ratna Dwijanti

Doctoral program student in Graduate School, Depatemen of Agricultural Science, University of Sebelas Maret Surakarta, Central Java 57126, Indonesia Department of Agriculture of Purworejo, Central Java 54114, Indonesia

Joko Sutrisno

Graduate School, Departement of Agriculture Science, University of Sebelas Maret Surakarta Central Java 57126, Indonesia

Bambang Pujiasmanto

Graduate School, Departement of Agriculture Science, University of Sebelas Maret Surakarta Central Java 57126, Indonesia

Endang Siti Rahayu

Graduate School, Departement of Agriculture Science, University of Sebelas Maret Surakarta Central Java 57126, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted in Purworejo Regency, Central Java Province, with the aim to know the factors influencing the state forest management by community approach. The analysis unit is the community that manages the forest together in the institution of Community Joint Forest Management (PHBM) which is determined as the research objective. Purworejo Regency is located in Purworejo Forest Management Unit (KPH). Repressive approach towards the society around the forest caused society's reaction to the area, disruption to the forestry crops are frequent, and deforestation becomes evidence of dissonance between society and the manager of forest area in Bogowonto River Flow Territory. In the region there are 261 villages in Purworejo Regency, 168 among them are located in Bogowonto DAS, and are managed by 269 forestry farmer groups. Participant farmers' participation with score of 70.33 (71.04%) and community's participation in PHBM of 0.831 are categorized in very strong closeness level. From the significance test (t-test) is obtained $t_{count} = 12.232$ is higher than $t_{0.05} =$ 2.000 at the significance level of 5% meaning the relationship between education and participation in forest management. The farmers' income from the PHBM activity earned from the output sharing of forestry products is ranging from Rp. 450,000 - Rp. 12,400,000, with the average is amounted to Rp. 6,370,290 per year. From the research result is found that the PHBM participant farmers have income amounted to Rp. 450,000 - Rp. 4,433,333 with total is 11 people (15.94%), the income Rp. 4,433,334 -Rp. 8,416,667 with total is 43 people (62.32%) and those who have income amounted to Rp. 8,416,668 - Rp. 12,400,000 with total is 15 people (21.74%).

Keywords: State Forest, Forestry Community, PHBM, Social Forestry, management

INTRODUCTION

Forest is not only a group of trees but also has ecological, economical and political meaning. During this time, forest is the arena where various importance scrapping. In this context, the state formulates various policies that sometimes be in contradiction in one forest area. It



reflects that the state is a dynamic entity that has various different interests, policies and control method of forest management. The difference in policies of the forest management is not only the policy inter-department but also inter-government and inter-society.

The conflict of natural resource management at the local level cannot be separated from the influence of bigger entity such as state policy, global market or colonial tradition influence in the natural resource management. To understand holistically the situation of forest management at local level, the framework of ecology political approach is used. This approach is used by analyzing the empirical case study in local context linked with the wider analysis of politic economy structure at the regional, national and global level. With this framework, the case of society-based forest management is understood by comprehending the interaction inter-stakeholder at local level and how the correlation with the wide politic economy context. The above problem is also reflected in the case of society joint forest management (PHBM), which has been appreciated by the forest management that becomes the authority of Bogowonto DAS manager in forest management. Since 1999, the PHBM program has been initiated collaboratively by various stakeholders that open wider chance for society's participation in forest management at the regency level. After the release of the decentralization policy by the publication of Decree No.22/1999 of the local government (revised by Decree 34/2004), this effort becomes important in encouraging the growth of good forest governance at the regency level.

Problem Identification

Participative approach in forest management is articulated differently by various parties through various terms such as community forestry, social forestry and society-based forest management. Community forestry was widely known after the World Forestry Congress in Jakarta in 1978 that brought central theme that was "Forest for People'.

Some drawbacks are found in society forestry program: First, the implementation needs data collection and registration requirement that can intensify the government control upon the society's activity in the forest (Raharjo, 1999, pp. 78-95). Second, the zone determination for community forestry depends on the Forestry Department's decision and involves the complex regulation of bureaucracy. Third, this policy makes society form uniform local organization through farmer cooperation with particular structure.

The government, in 2007, released new policies that is Governmental Regulation No. 6/2007 of Forestry System and Planning Arrangement of Forest Management, and the Forest Utilization. According to Kartodihardjo (2007, pp. 126-135), the regulation revision is fostered to increase the investment (pro investment) and overcome the poverty (pro poor).

Research Objective and Usefulness

The objective of this research is to know the relationship between farmers' internal and external factors and the society's participation level in the activity of society joint forest management. The result of this research is expected to give contribution in form of information and recommendation for the wisdom in the development of forestry resources management, whether for the farmers, society and all related instances.

Thinking Renewal

The government policy in community forest management (forest for people) brings the mission of eternal, fair and democratic forest management. In the fair and democratic forest management, there is implied a new fostered paradigm that is community forestry paradigm or social forestry. Widely, the paradigm is also known as Community Based Natural Resources

Management. So that the rural society's poverty around the forest can be handled since they afford the access into the forest and new income by the pattern of outcome sharing. Outcome sharing is in form of wood sale result or the income from non-wood product.

Forest Resources Management

LITERATURE REVIEW

Community-based forest management has been done by State Forestry General Company by doing several community involvement experimentation in the state forest management. In the form of *Mantri Lurah (MALU)* program and the Forestry Rural Community Development (PMDH). In the early of 1970's, the State Forestry General Company initiated the social forestry program and in 1980 this state enterprise had commitment to allocate 5 percent of clean area of the enterprise per year to support the social forestry program (Peluso, 1992, pp. 79-112).

According to Santoso (2000, pp. 79-83) and Restiana (2003, pp. 123-136), Society Joint Forest Management is a system of forestry resources management carried out by State Forestry General Company together with the society or a group of society and other organization who have interest in the forestry resources by being supported by the principle of such a sharing so that each party's interest can be carried out optimally and proportionally. Furthermore, Santoso (2000, pp. 112-126) said that community-based forest management can be interpreted in the way of building some agreements democratically with the society, not about the done conception.

The basic principle that animates the system of community-based forest management is: the presence of participative planning, the presence of joint learning, the presence of General Company of facilitator DAS Manager, the presence of society's economic empowerment, the presence of institutional cooperation, the presence of professional justice through role division, the presence of production input-process-output in a way space-time-activity, the presence of clarity of right and duty, the presence of openness, and the presence of simple procedure and mechanism. The fundamental goal from the project is to control the society's access to the forest by reducing the local community's dependence towards the forest.

Community's Participation in Forestry Resource Management

Mardikanto (1988, pp. 176-187) proposed a definition of participation as one's or group's involvement in an activity. Bornby (1974, *in* Mardikanto, 1988, p. 158) defined participation as the act to "take a part" that is the activity or statement to take a part from an activity with the intention to get the benefit. Theodorson (1969, *in* Mardikanto, 1988, p. 169) also proposed that participation is one's involvement in a social group to take a part from the community's activity, outside of his own job or profession.

According to Tony (2004, pp. 136-148), he proposed that the level of society's participation in the program of Community-Based Forest Management is measured on each stage that is as follows:

- 1. The stage of planning is the stage of the activity arrangement of the employment contract, the crop species determination, the contribution land distribution, the determination of KTH (forestry farmers group) and the determination of output sharing.
- 2. The stage of program implementation consists of the activity of planting, cultivating and protecting the forest. The three activities are seen from the farmers' frequency to the land of Community-Based Forest Management.
- 3. The third stage is the stage of output utilization seen from the result/effect received by the participant of Community-Based Forest Management.

4. The last stage is the stage of evaluation consisting of the activity of monitoring and the activity evaluation held once in a year.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Location and Time

The research was conducted in Purworejo Regency located in the Forestry Management Unit (KPH) of West Purworejo, at the Bogowonto River Flow Territory (DAS). The primary data was the data obtained directly through the field survey with questionnaire, whether using the question list, interview and observation. The secondary data was obtained from the result of literature review and documentation review, included the performance reports of Regional Device Work Unit. The research location determination was done purposively with the consideration of the forestry farmers group and cooperating with the DAS manager.

Research Method

The kind of research used in this study is Explanatory Survey Method. The Explanatory Survey Method includes the theoretical research type for the non-exact science. It means the explanation or anything related to explaining, whether explaining the present event or situation, or explaining future event or situation (prediction). Therefore, such research method is also called the causality research (Rusidi, 1999: V-3).

The Explanatory Survey Method was used in this research cine the data to be collected was originated from the sample from the community around the forest and spread over the villages in the outskirts of forest in Purworejo Regency. While the research data resources were: 1). the distribution of questionnaire set to the managing farmers of community forest. 2). Interview with the related official in the governmental environment. 3). Focus Group Discussion (*FGD*), through interactive discussion that involved the stakeholders.

Population and Sample

Population in this research is all farmers who join in the forestry farmer group and come from 13 Subdistrict in Purworejo Regency. The sample collection technique used Stratified random Sampling where the community at rural level became the starting point taken from 3 villagers in each Subdistrict. From 168 villages in Bogowonto DAS managed by 269 forestry farmer groups, there was purposively determined 135 research sample villages. The total respondents were 449 people consisting of the manager of forestry farmer group, the apparatus of village and Subdistrict, community figure and all the stakeholders.

Analysis Method

The approach of the research was done descriptively through the case study in Kuningan Regency. The data and information collection technique was done by observation, interview, and questionnaire. The data analysis method used included Internal Factor Evaluation (IFE) analysis, External Factor Evaluation (EFE) analysis, Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats (SWOT) analysis, and strategy selection using Quantitative Strategic Planning Matrix (QSPM) analysis (David FR, 2012).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Participation of Participant Farmers in PHBM Activity

The participation of participant farmers in PHBM activity is the farmers' involvement in the planning, implementation, output utilization and the evaluation and monitoring activity in the Community Joint Forestry Resources Management activity. The participation in PHBM activity in Purworejo Regency in Bogowonto DAS was categorized high enough with the average score

of participant farmers' participation amounted to 70.33 (71.04%). The analysis result is as follows:

Table 1. Farticipation of Farticipant Farmers in Firdm					
No.	Component of	Score		Percentage	Category
	PHBM Participation	Expectation	Reality	(%)	
1.	Planning	21	15.12	7198	High Enough
2.	Implementation	33	26.07	79.01	High
3.	Output Utilization	33	22.06	66.84	High Enough
4.	Evaluation	12	7.09	59.06	High Enough
	Total	99	70.33	71.04	High Enough

 Table 1. Participation of Participant Farmers in PHBM

The Table 1 above shows that the farmer's participation in PHBM planning is in high enough category with participation score of 15.12 (71.98%). Farmer's participation in PHBM management implementation is in high category with score of 26.07 (79.01%). Farmer's participation in PHBM management is in high enough category with score of 22.06 (66.84%). Farmer's participation in PHBM evaluation is in high enough category with score of 7.09 (59.00%). The classification of participation can be seen as follows:

Table	Table 2. Classification of rarticipant rarmer s rarticipation Lever in r fibm Activity			
No.	Participation Level	Total (people)	Percentage (%)	
1.	Low (33.33% - 55.56%)	6	8.70	
2.	High Enough (55.57% – 77.78%)	47	68.11	
3.	High (77.79% – 100%)	16	23.19	
	Total	69	100.00	

Table 2. Cla	ssification of Participant Fa	rmer's Participation Lev	el in PHBM Activity

From the Table 2 above is seen that participant farmer's participation in PHBM activity is categorized low that is only 6 people (8.70%), the high enough participant farmers are 47 people (68.11%), and the remains of participant farmers categorized high are 6 people (23.19%).

Internal and External Factor of Participation in PHBM

Participative approach in forest management is articulated differently with various terms such as community forestry and (social forestry). Community forestry is widely known after the World Forestry Congress in Jakarta in 1978 which brought the central theme that was Forest for People. Based on the Decree of Forestry Minister number 677/kpts-l1/1998, then revised with 867/Kpts-11/1999 and last revised with 31/Kpts-ll/2001, it specifically regulates the community forestry and permission giving of forest management to the community group. Until 2001, there were about 252,410.55 ha of state forest spread over 18 provinces in Indonesia became the area of community forestry implementation. In the following is explained the closeness of relationship between community's participation in PHBM with the farmers' internal factor.

From the calculation of statistical test is obtained the value of r = 0.831. It means that the relationship between education and community participation in PHBM is 0.831, categorized as very strong closeness level. From the significance test (t-test) is obtained $t_{count} = 12.232$ is higher than $t_{0.05} = 2.000$ at the significance level of 5% meaning the relationship between education and participation.

The farmers' income from the output of forest management based on the result of Spearman statistical test is obtained the value of r = 0.352. It means that the relationship between the

income and the community's participation in PHBM is 0.352 and categorized in weak (low) closeness level. From the result of significance test (t-test) is obtained $t_{count} = 3.078$ higher than $t_{0.05} = 2.000$ at the significance level of 5%, it means that there is real relationship between farmers' income and participant farmers' participation in PHBM.

The width of forestry land managed by community, based on the result of statistical test, is obtained the value of r = 0.559. It means that the relationship between land width and community participation in PHBM is 0.559 and categorized in medium closeness level. From the result of significance test (t-test) is obtained $t_{count} = 5.518$ higher than $t_{0.05} = 2.000$ at significance level of 5%, it means that there is real relationship between land width and participant farmers' participation in PHBM.

The same comprehension of employment contract between community and Bogowonto DAS manager shows that from the result of statistical test calculation is obtained the value of r = 0.679. It means that the relationship between the comprehension of cooperation contract and participation in PHBM is 0.679 and categorized in strong closeness level. From the result of significance test (t-test) is obtained $t_{count} = 7.568$ higher than $t_{0.05} = 2.000$ at significance level of 5%, it means that there is real relationship between the comprehension of employment contract and the participant farmers' participation in PHBM.

Evaluation Result of Internal and External Strategic Factor

The calculation result of IFAS matrix (internal strategic factors analysis summary) by the weighting using paired comparison method to the strength, weakness, opportunity and threat factors. So there is categorization of three levels based on the interval gained by reducing the highest weight value with the lowest weight value, further is divided three to get interest level interval.

Strategic factor of the strength has value that is important enough starts from the weight of 0.040 to the weight of 0.082, important starts from the weight of 0.083 to the weight of 0.125, and very important starts from the weight of 0.126 to the weight of 0.168. Meanwhile, for the strategic factor of weakness, the value that is important enough starts from the weight of 0.043 to the weight of 0.077, important starts from the weight of 0.078 to the weight of 0.113, and very important starts from the weight of 0.114 to the weight of 0.148. In the value of influence level to the internal strategic factor, the rating level is valued 1 to 4. The value 1 represents the major weakness, value 2 represents the minor weakness, value 3 represents the minor strength and value 4 represents the major strength.

According to Bungin (2010, p. 243), the result of SWOT analysis can be used to give an alternative that can be done in the implementation of community forestry policy. The previous alternative becomes new suggestion for some alternatives that have been done previously. The SWOT analysis is also used to analyze the condition of policy prevailing to get a picture of whether the policy is proper to be implemented or not. However, SWOT can also be done when the policy can be continued, changed its strategy, or even stopped at all. The result of SWOT analysis can be made as matrix as follows:

of PHBM Management in Bogowonto DAS				
\backslash	STRENGHTS-S	WEAKNESSES-W		
INTERNAL	1. Government policy in	1. Development of		
FACTOR	supporting the PHBM	cooperation in forestry		
	program	crops marketing		
	2. Solidarity of apparatus and stakeholders	2. Monitoring and		
		evaluation		
EXTERNAL	3. Quality and quantity of	3. Fund allocation for		
FACTOR	resources	activity		
	4. medium and	4. Performance of		
\backslash	infrastructure in DAS area	apparatus' service to the society		
	5. Lack of fund for	5. Delay of cashing down		
	organization activity of	the activity fund		
	forestry farmer groups			
OPPORTUNITIES-0	STRATEGY SO	STRATEGY WO		
1. Congruence of	1. Optimization of land	1. Cooperation		
land and climate	and empowerment of	development of forestry		
	forestry farmer group	crops		
		marketing with partner		
2. Organization of	2. Betterment of	2. Development effort of		
forestry farmer	cultivation	financial cooperation		
group	quality in forestry land	with		
		financial institution		
3. Business partner	3. Simplifying the access	3. Making MOU about		
with financial	requirement to banking	credit with bank		
institution that	world			
provides credit				
4. Demand of	4. Restraining excessive	4. Monitoring and		
forestry and agro-	deforestation and doing	controlling and the		
forestry crops	selective logging	discipline of wood		
		logging		
5. Central	5. Creating cooperation	5. Treaty letter of		
governmental	agreement and	cooperation and joint		
policy to social	comprehension and	agreement about		
forestry	management of social	management and output		
	forestry	sharing		
THREATS-T	STRATEGY ST	STRATEGY WT		
1. Farmers' education	1. Consistency and	1. The increase of product		
level and young	interest	selling price and		
generation's interest	0 0 0	guarantee of forestry		
in forestry sector	generation in forestry	product price		
2 Authoritz	sector increase	2 MOU of the man and		
2. Authority granting	2. Increasing the ability of	2. MOU of the management		
of	forestry and agro-	and output sharing		

Tabel 3. SWOT Matrix of Identification of Alternative Strategyof PHBM Management in Bogowonto DAS

Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal (ASSRJ)

forest management forestry manageme		system
3. System of raw product sale	 Program of pick- process and sell 	3. Opportunity granting of processed product
4. Attack of plant- disturbing organism	4. Holding pest controlling movement especially wild boar and ape	4. Holding cooperation of pest controlling especially wild boar and ape

The result of weighting value of forestry development program is shown by the weight values both are 0.168 and 0.163. The rating score gained by the two factors is 4, it means very strong. So that the regency government policy in supporting the community forestry program has score 0.670 and 0.650. It means that the two factors are very important and have very strong influence in increasing community forestry. Meanwhile the internal strategic factor for weakness that needs to get regency government's attention is the cooperation development in marketing the product at field level, monitoring and evaluation, and fund allocation for counseling activity which are shown by the weight value of 0.148, 0.143 and 0.115. The three factors gain rating score 3, which means strong enough.

Cooperation development in marketing the product at the field level, monitoring and evaluation, and fund allocation for counseling activity each has score of 0.443, 0.428 and 0.345. It means that the three factors are very important and parts whose weaknesses are rather strong in the effort of maintaining the community forestry in Purworejo Regency.

Yet the total score of internal strategic factor based on the calculation result of IFAS matrix is 2.883 and indicates that the internal strategic factor is categorized "strong" (David, 2000). It shows that the internal position of district government in the community forestry program is able to exploit the available strength factors to overcome the weakness factors. The calculation result of EFAS matrix (external strategic factors analysis summary) after the weighting is done and the rating score is gained.

Strategic factor of the opportunity has value that is important enough starts from the weight of 0.036 to the weight of 0.059, important starts from the weight of 0.060 to the weight of 0.083, and very important starts from the weight of 0.084 to the weight of 0.108. Meanwhile, for the strategic factor of threat, the value that is important enough starts from the weight of 0.030 to the weight of 0.062, important starts from the weight of 0.078 to the weight of 0.113, and very important starts from the weight of 0.114 to the weight of 0.148.

In the value of influence level to the internal strategic factor, the rating level is valued 1 to 4. The value 1 means that the regency government's ability to respond the available opportunity is bad, value 2 means that the ability to respond is good enough, value 3 means that the ability to respond is good and value 4 means that the ability to respond is very good. For the external strategic factor of threat, the value 1 represents the major weakness, value 2 represents the minor weakness, value 3 represents the minor strength and value 4 represents the major strength.

The weighting result of opportunity factor shows that the main opportunity owned by the government in Purworejo regency in increasing the community forestry program is the land and climate congruence, and the presence of forestry farmer group organization which is shown by the weight value each of 0.108 and 0.105. The rating value gained by the two factors is 3, it means that the ability to respond is good. It shows that the opportunity factor is very

important and the district government is able to respond the opportunity is good. Meanwhile the external strategic factor of threat that needs to be anticipated by the district government is the farmers' education level and the young generation's interest in the forestry farm sector, and the land width that is managed with the weight value of 0.115 and 0.130. The two factors gained rating value of 3 meaning rather strong. Thus, the farmer's education level and young generation's interest in forestry farm sector and the land width have score 0.345 and 0.390. It means that the two factors are very important in the effort of increasing the community forestry program.

The next threatening factor is the slashing system that causes the grain at the farmers' level to be low with the weight value is 0.100. The rating value of this factor is 2 meaning rather weak. So that the slashing system that causes the forestry product price at the farmers' level to be low has score of 0.200. It means that the slashing system factor that causes the forestry product price at the farmers' level to be low is very important and threatening but with the rather weak level in maintaining the community forestry program.

The total score of external strategic factor based on the calculation result of EFAS matrix is 2.359. According to David (2000), the value is under the average number (2.5), which means that the external strategic factor is categorized "weak". It shows that the external position of government of Purworejo Regency in increasing the community forestry program is not able to exploit the opportunity and overcome the available threat.

Conclusion

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

1. The collaboration process in community joint forestry management is not a process that can produce an impact wanted in short time so that it needs long term commitment and various stakeholders involved in the initiative. One of the fundamental elements and collaborative process is belief (trust) among the parties to support the community joint forestry management program.

2. Although the community has gotten the acknowledgment upon the accessing right and also the participation in the policy making related to the forestry management poured in the Regent Decree or by the understanding memorandum between Regent and State Forestry General Company through the PHBM program. The participant farmers' participation in Community Joint Forestry Resource Management is good enough, with the participation score is 71.01%. Yet the minimum space for the local community's participation in the policy making at the national level makes the community's accessing right to the forest unsafe.

3. There is real relationship between the farmer's internal factors (education, farmers' income, land width and understanding of employment contract) with the community's participation in the activity of community joint forestry resources management, but the strength/closeness of the influence is different for each factor. Education level has very strong relationship, land width has medium relationship, farmers' income level has weak relationship, and understanding of employment contract strong relationship.

Recommendation

1. Formulating various policies in the forest management cannot be separated from the context of politic and economy situation and the discourse change of forest management at the national and global level. Therefore, the community empowerment in the activity of forestry resources management needs to be followed by the comprehension of the same interest. The dynamic alliance, policy and the forest

management controlling method need to be continuously increased by sitting down together through the non-formal education, such as PHBM technical training.

2. The status change of forest area to be joint management area influences much on the community's accessing level to the forest and all kind of forestry product they can exploit so that the understanding of all interest manager in PHBM activity that impinges the cooperation aspect under an obvious legal protection. Therefore, the community has continuous certainty and is continuously increased through development and empowerment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aliadi, Ant (2006). Encountering Uncertainty of Law and Policy in Participatory Forest Management Lessons Learned From Dompu and Kuningan Cases. Paper presented in Research Forum on Resiliency and Sustainability in Resources Management. June 27, 2006, Bali, Indonesia

Anwar Wahyudi. 2002. Desentralisasi Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Hutan. BP. Arupa, Yogyakarta.

Bungin, Burhan. (2010) *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosia lainnya.* Jakarta, Kencana Prenama Media Group.

David FR. 2012. Manajemen Strategis. edisi ke-12. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

David, Fred R. 2006. Manajemen Strategis Edisi 10. Penerbit Salemba Empat, Jakarta.

Departemen Kehutanan. 2001. Surat Keputusan Menteri Kehutanan RI No. 31 Tahun 2001 Tentang Penyelenggaraan Hutan Kemasyarakatan. Departemen Kehutanan, Jakarta.

Departemen Kehutanan. 1999. Renstra Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Hutan. Departemen Kehutanan, Jakarta.

Daldjoeni. 1977. Penduduk, Lingkungan dan Masa Depan. Alumni. Bandung.

Geertz, Clifford. (1966). Agricultural Involution. Berkeley: University of California Press. p.50

Faisal Kasryno, 1984. Prospek Pembangunan Ekonomi Pedesaan Indonesia. Yayasan Obor Indonesia Jakarta.

Husein, U. 1999. Riset Strategi Perusahaan. Gramedia Pustaka Umum, Jakarta.

Bungin, Burhan. (2010) *Penelitian Kualitatif: Komunikasi, Ekonomi, Kebijakan Publik dan Ilmu Sosia lainnya.* Jakarta, Kencana Prenama Media Group.

David FR. 2012. Manajemen Strategis. edisi ke-12. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

David, Fred R. 2006. Manajemen Strategis Edisi 10. Penerbit Salemba Empat, Jakarta.

Hermanto, F. 1993. Ilmu Usahatani. Penebar Swadaya, Jakarta.

Kadarman dan Ysusuf Udaya. 1997. Pengantar Ilmu Manajemen. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.

Mardikanto 1988. Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan. Dalam Komunikasi Pembangunan. Sebelas Maret University Press, Semarang.

Moh. Nazir. 1998. Metode Penelitian. Ghalia Indonesia. Jakarta.

Ndraha, Ta;iziduhu. 1997. Hubungan antara Partisipasi Masyarakat dan Tanggungjawab Masyarakat terhadap Hasil-hasil Pembangunan. Yayasan Karya Dharma, Jakarta.

Peluso, Nancy L. (1992). Rich Forest Poor People. Berkeley and Los Angeles, California. University of California Press.

Pramudji, Otok S. 1997. Menuju Pendekatan Pembangunan yang Partisipasif. Buletin Bina Swadaya Mandiri, Jakarta.

Perhutani KPH Pekalongan Barat dan KPH Balapulang. 2006. Rencana Lima Tahunan ke III. Kesatuan Pemangkuan Hutan Pekalongan Barat dan Balapulang, Jawa Tengah, Semarang.

Pujo (2003). Hutan milik siapa? Upaya-upaya mewujudkan forestry land reform di Kabupaten Wonosobo. Jawa Tengah. In Lounela, A & Zakaria,Y.R. (eds). Berebut Tanah. Yogyakarta: Insist Press

Pujo. 2003. Partisipasi Masyarakat Pada Program Kehutanan Sosial Di State Forestry General Company Unit III Jawa Barat. Tesis Program Pascasarjana Institut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor.

Restiana. 2003. Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Hutan Berorientasi Pola Kooperatif. Aditya Media, Yogyakarta.

Sayogyo dan Pujiwati Sayogyo. 1984. Sosiologi Pedesaan. Gadja Mada University Press. Yogyakarta.

Simanjuntak, J.P. 1985. Sosiologi Pembangunan. Transito. Bandung.

Soekanto. 1982 Sosiologi Suatu Pengantar. Raja Grafindo Persada, Jakarta.

Scott, James C. (1998). Seeing Like a State; How Certain Schemes to Improve Human Condition Have Failed New Haven: Yale University Press.

Santoso. 2000. Peran Serta Masyarakat dan Pemerintah Daerah Dalam Pengelolaan Hutan. Makalah disampaikan dalam Seminar Kehutanan. Institut Pertanian Bogor, Bogor.

Sugiyono. 2002. Statistika Untuk Penelitian. Alfabeta, Bandung.

Tim Bina Swadaya. 2001. Pengalaman Mendampingan Petani Hutan. Kasus Perhutanan Sosial di Pulau Jawa. Penebar Swadaya, Jakarta.