

# Group activity on Forest and land protection efforts in Bila Walanae Catchments (Case Study at Enrekang, Province of South Celebes)

Muh. Agung

Lecturer Staff of Forestry Faculty of Hasanuddin University

\* Email for corresponding author : [agung.muhammad15@gmail.com](mailto:agung.muhammad15@gmail.com)

## Abstract

This study aimed to Farmers Group activities, relationships elements Farmers Group RHL and a comparison of the dynamics (activity) between groups using indicators of the eight elements of group dynamics. The research was conducted for approximately three months, the month from March to June 2009. The research was conducted in the District of Baraka, Enrekang, South Sulawesi Province. Elements of dynamics (activity) group significantly affect farmers' groups RHL is the destination group and group structure. For elements of the group's goals, better than forestry agriculture, whereas for the element of group structure, forestry has a better structure than agriculture.

**Keywords** : *Activity, Farmer group*

## INTRODUCTION

### Background

Dynamics of farmer group affect the role of farmer groups. If the farmer groups can play its role, farmer groups will appear forces that can bring changes towards the development of a more dynamic group that always raises the motivation to work. In order for farmer groups can play an active role, then the farmer groups to be compact and powerful that it will grow responsibilities in RHL activities. Need to build a harmonious relationship between the members of both groups in terms of right or authority, in terms of interest or benefit by taking into account the competence / knowledge of each member of the group. Harmonious relationship created not only among members of the group, but also between groups of farmers and between farmers' groups and the government. With these facts it is necessary to study what factors are causing farmers, as individuals and as members of farmers willing and able to act dynamically improve their welfare through farmer groups, otherwise obstacles faced by the group so that the members are not active anymore.

If this issue is more developed the elements of group dynamics as proposed by Slamet (1978) which includes: 1) the purpose of the group, 2) the structure of the group, 3) the functions and duties of the group, 4) development group, 5) the cohesiveness of the group, 6 ) group atmosphere, 7) pressure group and 8) the effectiveness of the group. So we arrive at the question of the extent to which the relationship dynamics of farmer groups on forest and land rehabilitation activities.

Based on the above description of the underlying research based on the Farmers Group dynamics in forest and land rehabilitation activities DAS When Walanae in District Baraka, Enrekang, South Sulawesi Province.

### Research Purposes

This research aims to: 1) Knowing the dynamics of RHL in the District Farmers Group Baraka, Enrekang, South Sulawesi Province, 2) Knowing the relationship elements of group dynamics by Farmers Group RHL and see the dynamics of inter-group comparison using indicators of eight elements of group dynamics.

### Research Method

#### Materials and Methods

The research was conducted for approximately three months, ie March to June 2009. The research was conducted in the District of Baraka, Enrekang, South Sulawesi Province.

### Population and Sample Research

The population in this study were all farmer groups contained in District Baraka conducting forest and land rehabilitation and farming. Determination of the sample was done by using stratified random sampling Cluster. The population is grouped into dalani sub-sub-populations based on the type of activities. Each of these

sub-populations will be selected at random some farmer groups, the number of farmer groups selected in each sub-population is determined based on the same average allocation. And each farmer group again randomly selected sample with three members of farmer groups. In this empirically, the number of farmer groups selected sample is 24 farmer groups. Each farmer groups will be chosen three farmers the sample, so that the total respondents were 72 people.

## **Collection Techniques and Data Types**

### **1. Data Collection Techniques**

Collecting data in this study is done by: a) In-depth interviews, b) interview by quisioner.

### **2. Data Types**

The data used in this study consists of two types, namely primary data and secondary data.

#### **a. Primary Data**

Primary data that includes: a) the purpose of the group, b) structure of the group, c) functions and tasks of the group (with indicators: the implementation of the task function), d) coaching group, d) cohesiveness of the group, e) group atmosphere, f) pressure groups, g) the effectiveness of the group.

#### **b. Secondary Data**

## **Processing and Data Analysis**

The data obtained and the field firstly be typing with the intent to make adjustments to the conditions then data entry field. Data that has been processed to meet the statistical test hypotheses ata doing the analysis of qualitative and quantitative analysis.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Farmers Group Dynamics**

#### **Group purposes**

Based on the calculation of descriptive show that FG(farmers groups)-Forestry persentas that have high value criteria only 16.67% while the FG-Agriculture reached 83.33%. This is because generally the formulation and preparation of the FG-forestry purposes, done by outsiders (Operator program or project) and farmer groups, although it is only according to these objectives there is no or less according to their wishes, because they are important to them earned and other advantages and activities. In contrast to the FG-Agriculture, preparation and formulation of group goals made by the groups themselves or together with the government (PPL and village heads).

Objectives are based on the needs of farmers so that the objectives of the group with the aim of members are generally identical or unidirectional although there are also some conflicting. The activities carried out by members of the group either forestry or agriculture are all above 50%, but the implementation is different motives. FG-Forestry carry out activities for the encouragement of incentives (rewards) while the FG-Agriculture carry out such activities as are their basic needs (routine every day).

#### **Group structure**

Based on the calculations can be seen that the structure of FG-forestry is much better than FG-Agriculture. This can be seen in the value of FG-Forestry 100% higher criteria while agricultural farmer groups only 50% who achieve these criteria. This is due, the role of government / organizer of the FG-forestry project further into the group so that a clear organizational structure, consisting of a chairman, bendahana, secretary or sections implementing activities and administratively registered member or official, although it reflects that No power in the government and administrators.

In FG-Agriculture, the group structure is less clear because generally the head of the group may serve as treasurer or secretary. In general, only the group members know the chairman alone and group structure as if only the chairman and members only. Similarly, recorded in Agricultural Extension Center was limited to the chairman and members. Agriculture FG- power in there on the board in this case the chairman of the group. The role of the group as a vehicle for interaction is generally the same, namely to increase the good cooperation and collaboration between members of the group of farmers.

#### **Function and Group Task**

Based on the calculations can be seen that the implementation of the functions and duties of the FG-Forestry (66.67%) is better than FG-Farming (58.33%). This is because the FG-Forestry, clear group structure so that each committee and members understand their respective duties. Generally, members of the group are

satisfied with the achievement of group goals because they have carried out the functions and duties of each. If there are several groups of farmers who are not satisfied, it is more due to their soil fertility conditions are unfavorable which resulted in many dead plants drought atupun for pest / disease.

Functions and duties of the FG-Agriculture also performed well because all of these activities is a routine that they did before the formation of the group. So it can be said that whether or not the farmers formed into groups, they still carry out farming activities. Only if in the form of a group, more regular and organized activities. Functions of satisfaction with the achievement of the goals are generally the same, they are mostly satisfied and if there are some who are less satisfied it is also because their yields are not as expected, usually because of drought or pests / diseases.

The spread of ideas or ideas on FG-Forestry generally members of the group did not dare to spend his or less. This is due to the difference in social status between the government / management with group members. The differences both in terms of education and degrees and social. Usually the head of the group are those who have the highest level of education or those who respected or influential in the region, so that the group members are reluctant to pull out his ideas. In addition, most members of the group have a level of awareness of the objectives of the group are very low because they assume the goal is not to them but to the government / project organizers (they do not feel the direct benefits and activities other than wages).

In contrast to the FG-Agriculture, group members generally have the courage to express his ideas, although there are also some who are still less daring. Courage members convey his ideas is because they are well aware that the purpose of the group for their good so if there are ideas concerning the good of the group, they immediately expressed and discussed. Regarding the function of farmer groups to seek and provide information to members, the FG-FG-Agriculture and Forestry are generally the same, namely the delivery of information clearly and evenly. This is because in general rural communities still have a high degree of kinship, so that if there is information from the board or other parties, will quickly come to the meeting of the group members especially their intensity is high enough so that the information is quickly up.

### **Coaching and Development Group**

Based on the calculations can be seen that 75% and FG-Forestry has high value criteria, whereas for FG-Agriculture which has a value of 33.33% with these criteria. It is due to the FG-Forestry, during the activity, group coaching facilities available while the FG-Agriculture not. Regarding communication within the group, for all groups generally good and smooth. This is again related to the sense of family that rural communities are still high danjuga most of them still have a relationship darahlkeluarga. Rules in the group to FG-FG-Agriculture Forestry and generally written and unwritten. Written rules usually a matter of wages, and the loan repayment schedule for the implementation of activities, whereas for the unwritten rules concerning the implementation of activities in the field as well as other rules that still has something to do with customs.

Although these rules are not written, the level of adherence to an agreement group members group was very high. This is because in general, rural communities still adhere to the principle of "the secret", so an agreement if it has been agreed that abstinence / taboo to be broken because if violated tantamount embarrassed the family and descendants. One example of such a rule, among others, the farmer groups in the hamlet Coppobulu HKM, apply the rules for members of farmers who have land borders with "Karama Forest", before the process of land required to carry out the ritual of "prayer". This is so that the occupants "Karama forest" and the blessing of their activities so that activities can be run as expected.

FG-Forestry participation largely due to have a particular interest in this regard relates to the acquisition of an incentive / reward. In contrast to the FG-Agriculture which group members participate voluntarily because he felt that he was part and groups. This is because the FG-Forestry generally they work not dilahan them (for reforestation) and also they feel do not benefit directly and these activities, however their participation remains high because of the wages given by the organizers of the project / activity.

In FG-Agriculture, they feel part and groups and they benefit directly and activities for example in terms of improved drainage. Generally they will directly participate without dimintapun fix it because it is related to irrigation interests in the field / land they respectively. But again, these activities even though they are not actually members of the group, would still be together because they have the interests of each of the water channels.

Efforts to FG-forestry regeneration exist at the time of the project / program has been running, the members are given training by the organizers of the project prior to or during the activity is still running, but after the intervention ended, the effort is lost by itself, so it is not sustainable. For FG-Agriculture, mostly no effort at all, just given penyuluhan-counseling by PPL, but usually only once a month and even visited PPL 6 months and even then only to the extent silaturalimi. If there is a group of farmers who follow the training, was on his own initiative and personal.

The number of members of the group for FG-Forestry usually fixed with no additional members of the group until the end of the activity, the addition typically occurs when the group gets a new project again or

extension project, in addition to the group receiving new members if there are members who came out. For FG-Agriculture, the number of members of the group between 25 to 30 people, it relates to the provisions of the Department of Agriculture which sets a limit on members of the group is 30 people. In addition, the group generally accept members with the requirement to have land / field is adjacent to land one of their members and also when members of the group has not reached the number of 30 people.

### **Group cohesiveness**

Based on the calculations can be seen that FG-forestry which has a high value criteria as much as 66.67%, while the FG-Agriculture as much as 50%. Generally together members of both groups of Forestry and Agriculture are good although decisions made by the board or the board and members. Keloinpok farmer decision making usually determined by the board because the board has a strong influence on the group as well as education or social status.

Leadership in groups usually depends on the nature / character and masing each group leader. There is a group leader who was very attentive to its members, but some are indifferent to the group. The attitude of the head of the group that pays little attention to the unity of the group is caused by several things, among others, as the chairman of the group possess other activities outside the group is quite time consuming and concentration, as well as chairman of the group could be disappointed with its members so that was concerned with the members turn into indifferent.

The attitude of members of the leadership in the group, both forestry and agriculture mostly pleased with the chairman of the group, but there are also some groups that do not like the chairman, this is usually due to a lack of trust members to its chairman, especially on matters relating to the funding of the group. One example is the FG-Agriculture "Kaja Manu" in the village several times Samaenre where there is a conflict between a member and chairman of the group. Some members of the group did not want to pay installments installments group because they assume they are used by the head of the group for their own interests. Another group also had conflicts with its chairman, among others FG-Sipatokkong FG, FG-When Walanae, and FG-Ellue.

Ability to work in groups, to FG-Forestry mostly have good cooperation skills, as well as the FG-Agriculture, although there are some groups whose cooperation is lacking, but this is more due to busy farmers in land / each of their fields, especially just before harvest .

### **Group Atmosphere**

Based on the calculations can be seen that the two groups, both of Forestry and Agriculture has a high percentage of the value of the criteria that is large enough for FG-forestry as much as 83.33% compared to FG-Agriculture as much as 75%. It mi reflect that in a group, the members have high morale and the relationship between members and between groups is quite good.

In terms of perceived freedom in the group, for FG-Forestry most members feel less democratic and there is even a group that considers the group a completely undemocratic, this is due to the centralized power held by the project organizers and administrators, even the head of the group were subject to rules and decisions of the project organizers, so that the freedom of the group is not created. In FG-Agriculture, although most feel less democratic, but there are also some groups who feel the freedom in the group, it is created as between members of the group and chairman of the group have the same needs and interests of the group is to improve and memngkatkan rice production, so between members need each other and exchange information about cultivation techniques or other information that is considered to be beneficial for both groups it disarnpaikan by members or by the chairman, generally group will accept.

### **Pressure on Group**

Based on the calculations can be seen that FG-Forest has a high value to the criteria as much as 58.33%, while the FG-Agriculture as much as 41.67%. This is because the agricultural farmer groups tend to be a conflict between members or between members of the chairman is primarily concerned with financial issues. Each farmer group recorded his name in the Department of Agriculture, get help and good government funds as well as seed and fertilizer. The grant is a revolving fund loans, after harvest or seed money received by members must be returned in the form of dollars to the chairman of the group, after the money has been raised by the chairman of the group will be used again for the purchase of equipment or material that is needed by farmers, so these loans are not returned to the government but rotates in the group. This eventually lead to conflict because unsuspecting group members with the chairman of the group, especially if the head of the group is not transparent in the fund. In addition, there are also members from the beginning did not intend to return the loan, which is often a conflict either with the chairman of the group and the other group members. This conflict usually affect the performance of the group and even led to the disintegration of the group, although there is also a group that brings together because of introspection and masing respective parties.

In contrast to the FG-Forestry, the members know how wages should they receive based on their working day. Conflicts generally between farmers' groups or between groups of farmers with the surrounding community. One example is the conflict between farmers' groups in Hamlet Hamlet Coppobulu with farmer groups Taka in 2002. This was triggered by two border problem areas with no certainty. Groups of farmers who own land in the border areas are often intentionally burned by a group of people who feel more entitled to the land. (5 April 2007)

This conflict also occurs because of jealousy and people who are not included in government activities. This conflict is enough to affect the performance of this group work but also strengthen the relationship between the members in the group. The conflict ended after an agreement spearheaded by community leaders and the two hamlets and was attended by the head of the village and the local community.

In contrast to the FG-Forestry, the group was formed based on the presence or activity of government project with the aim of mobilizing farmers to activities run smoothly. So, a group formed by outsiders so that the formulation and preparation of purpose is also largely determined by outsiders. The second element is the structural dynamics of the group. In contrast to the element where the FG-purpose better than FG Agriculture-Forestry, the group structure is the opposite. This is because the structure of FG-Forestry organization specified by the project so obviously a good division chairman, secretary, treasurer, and members of the group. In FG-Agriculture, the structure is determined by the groups themselves so that the shape is very simple, namely the head of the group (which doubles as a treasurer or secretary) and members of the group. Although the structure of FG-farm is very simple, but the survival of the group can survive Iebih longer than FG-Forestry.

Other elements of group dynamics, namely the functions and duties of the group, group coaching, group atmosphere, the pressure group path, and the effectiveness of the group, all show the value of  $\chi^2$  count smaller than  $\chi^2$  table. This indicates that there is no influence or relationship between the sixth element with farmer groups RHL.

Based on calculations it is known that the average value of the overall factors of a good group dynamics and FG FG-Forestry-Agriculture is a dynamic category (score > 62.5 to 94). However, the background of the dynamic between the two groups differ. FG-Forestry is due to the encouragement of wages (participation for material incentives), while the FG-Agriculture participated voluntarily because he felt that he was part and group (voluntary participation). (Tajuddin, 2000).

In FG-Forestry, the role of outsider (outsiders) are dominant in everything, and the beginning of the formation of the group, the determination of the structure, functions and duties of the group, coaching and development, up to the implementation of activities in the field. All of these are within the control of government or organizing activities. The role of the group as a container aspirations of members is not created on the FG-Forestry. Members of the group working on the instructions of the center. This resulted in the group are not independent so that at any time, if the activity is over, and the role of government be interrupted, then the farmer groups will disappear by itself.

In contrast to the FG-Agriculture, Outsider role in this case the government was limited to the facilitator. Other matters relating to groups such as the formulation of objectives, structure, functions and tasks, development and coaching groups, and the activities are determined and regulated by the group itself. This creates independence, group cohesiveness and social capital with institutional revitalizing FG-Agriculture (Nurrochmat, 2005).

In FG-Agriculture, the role of the group as a forum for the aspirations of its members actually materialized. Members feel the freedom of ideas, opinions, and suggestions in the group, but it is also often lead to conflict between members of the group as well as between members of the group leader. Social processes such as conflict, accommodation finally an agreement among the members of farmer groups in the activities achieve group goals can be achieved even in the long term (at least one to three years)

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

### Conclusions

Based on the results of research that transactions are carried out in the District of Baraka, Enrekang, it can be concluded as follows:

1. Elements of group dynamics significantly affect farmers' groups RHE is the destination group and group structure. For elements of the group's goals, better than forestry agriculture, whereas for the element of group structure, forestry has a better structure than agriculture. In FG-Forestry, the government's role or project organizers further into the group so that the organizational structure more clearly both the chairman, secretary and treasurer, while the FG-Agriculture organizational structure is less clear because the general chairman of the group concurrently as treasurer or secretary. Formulation and preparation of group goals in forestry conducted by the organizers of the project / government, whereas in agriculture conducted by the groups accompanied by local government.

2. Elements of the functions and duties of the group, coaching and group development, group cohesiveness, group atmosphere, the pressure on the group, and the effectiveness of the group did not show any significant effect on the dynamic farmer groups RHL.

### **Suggestion**

The dominance of the government in all aspects of the life of the farmer groups should be slowly removed so that the independence of the group can be created and also participation and groups that have been at the instigation incentive or reward that is converted into self-help.

### **Reference**

- Adjid, D. A. 1985. Patterns of Rural Community Participation in Development plans. Orba Sakti, Bandung.
- Arif, Mirriam Sofyan. 1986. Organization and management. Open University, Karunia, Jakarta.
- Beddu, Dahlan. 2003. [Thesis]. Farmers Group Dynamics in Improving Rice Production. PPS, Makassar.
- Gautama, I. 2007. The dynamics of community participation in RHL activities in the upstream Bila Walanae watershed, in order to rescue the Lake Tempe. Hasanuddin University. Makassar.
- Golterman, H. L. 1975. Physiological Limnology. Elsevier SPC, Amsterdam.
- Haeruman, H. 1975. Possible study Business Village Afforestation and Reforestation watershed Citanduy Pelita II. Faculty of Forestry, Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor.
- Hafsah, M. Djafar. 1988. Guidelines for Development of Farmers Group Managing intensification. Guidance Control Board Secretariat. Department of Agriculture, Jakarta.
- Ibrahim, Jabal Tank. 2003. Sociology The Countryside. University of Muhammadiyah Malang, Malang.
- Irwan. 2007. [www.menlh.go.id/lnrhlhtml/kesra-l8-2003jim](http://www.menlh.go.id/lnrhlhtml/kesra-l8-2003jim)(Accesse 27 Januari 2007)

The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open-Access hosting service and academic event management. The aim of the firm is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the firm can be found on the homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

### CALL FOR JOURNAL PAPERS

There are more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals hosted under the hosting platform.

**Prospective authors of journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:** <http://www.iiste.org/journals/> All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Paper version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

### MORE RESOURCES

Book publication information: <http://www.iiste.org/book/>

Academic conference: <http://www.iiste.org/conference/upcoming-conferences-call-for-paper/>

### IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library , NewJour, Google Scholar

