DIVERSITY
SYNTIFIC Publisher
LOGIC JOURNAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY
E-ISSN 2988-571X
Vol. 4 Issue 3, 2026 Page.301-315

Original Article

COMMUNITY ORGANIZING IN LAND CONSERVATION FOR FOREST AND LAND FIRE MITIGATION IN MENANG RAYA VILLAGE, OGAN KOMERING ILIR

Dimas Reza Kurnia[1)]*, Yunindyawati[2)], Rudy Kurniawan[3)]
[1), 2), 3)] Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sriwijaya, Indonesia
*Corresponding Author, E-mail: dimas@gmail.com

Submitted: 31 October 2026, Revised: 17 November 2026, Accepted: 19 November 2026.

ABSTRACT

Background. Forest and land fires on peatlands are generally handled through technical and structural responses, yet they recur in Ogan Komering Ilir (OKI) Regency despite the many programs in place.
Research Purpose. This study examines the village government organizes the community in land conservation to mitigate fires in Menang Raya Village, Pedamaran District, covering it develops participation, plans programs, and mobilizes residents.
Research Method. This qualitative single-case study used Rothman's three models of community intervention (locality development, social planning, and social action) as the main theory, adapted to the context of village government and peatland. Data were collected using semi-structured interview guide used in in-depth interviews with 12 informants from the village government, the community, and relevant agencies; structured observation checklist; and document review sheet. All three were built on the practice variables of the Rothman models. Data were analyzed with the Miles and Huberman interactive model.
Findings. Participation is representative-informative: strong at implementation but consultative at decision-making. Planning is consultative-adaptive and relies on external data, with targets that are not yet measurable. Mobilization is operational-partnership in character, with the fire-care community group (Masyarakat Peduli Api, MPA) as the main vehicle, but it depends on equipment, funds, and volunteers. The three models blend and alternate following the seasonal cycle.
Conclusion. Community organizing in Menang Raya is strongest as mobilization and awareness-raising based on mutual cooperation, and weakest in documented planning, inclusion of residents' voices, and structural land conservation. The article offers four conceptual propositions for community-based fire prevention.

Keywords: Community Organizing, Fire Mitigation, Forest and Land Fires, Land Conservation, Rothman Model, Village Government.

BACKGROUND

Forest and land fires are an environmental threat that affects ecosystems, public health, and climate stability. Their smoke often crosses national borders, which makes fire mitigation part of the collective commitment to address climate change. In Indonesia, the triggers combine biophysical, socio-economic, and governance factors. Drained peatlands

burn easily, while livelihood pressures push residents to clear land by burning because it is cheap and fast.

South Sumatra, especially Ogan Komering Ilir (OKI) Regency, is among the fire-prone regions, and fires recur there almost every year. The regional government, together with private parties and the community, has run fire-handling task forces, canal blocking, revitalization of peat-care villages, satellite-based early detection, corporate social responsibility (CSR) programs, and the formation of the fire-care community group (Masyarakat Peduli Api, MPA). Even so, fires on OKI peatlands keep recurring. Kospa and Praja found that the main triggers remain land-use conversion, environmentally unfriendly land-clearing techniques, and prolonged drought[1], while Nurhayati et al. showed that community behavior and perception also shape the occurrence of peat fires in OKI[2].

Earlier studies tend to position the community as an object: a subject whose behavior and perceptions are measured, the locus of technical-spatial analysis, or the target of incidental, short-term programs. The organizing process itself, namely how villagers are brought together, how their programs are planned, and how they are mobilized for land conservation, has received little in-depth study at the village level in OKI. Yet the village government holds formal authority over deliberation, planning, and budgeting under Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages[3].

Three research gaps follow from this review. First, an empirical gap: studies in OKI explain why fires occur (land-use change, burning practices, drought, perception) or evaluate prevention programs, but they do not describe how a village government builds participation, plans, and mobilizes residents on an ongoing basis. Second, a theoretical gap: Rothman's three models of community intervention[4] were developed for practitioners working from outside a community. To the authors' knowledge, they have not been used to read a village government, which holds formal authority, as the organizing actor, nor to read a recurrent, seasonal hazard rather than a one-off intervention. Third, a conceptual gap: a typology explains the pattern of organizing but not its quality, so it needs to be linked with concepts of participation, social capital, and common-pool resource governance.

This article fills these gaps by positioning the village government as the driver of community organizing. The research questions are: (1) how does the village government develop community participation, (2) how does it plan programs, and (3) how does it mobilize the community in land conservation for fire mitigation in Menang Raya Village?

The novelty lies in reading the role of the village government through the three models of Rothman[4] in a peatland context, so that the community is positioned as a subject of conservation rather than merely an object of evaluation, education, or advocacy. The theoretical framework and its adaptation are set out in the Research Method.

The purpose of this study is to describe and explain how the Menang Raya Village Government develops participation, plans programs, and mobilizes residents for land conservation and fire mitigation, and how these three activities combine across the seasonal cycle. The study makes three contributions. Theoretically, it adapts Rothman's models to a village government as change agent and to a seasonal, recurrent hazard, and it formulates four conceptual propositions. Empirically, it gives the first village-level account, from the three informant groups, of how organizing for peatland fire prevention works in OKI. Practically, it identifies where organizing is weak (documented planning, residents' voices, structural conservation) so that village governments and agencies can target support.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research design and site

This study used a descriptive qualitative design with a single-case study strategy[5]. Menang Raya Village, Pedamaran District, OKI Regency, was selected purposively. The village borders a peat swamp of 171.24 hectares (about 9.1 percent of its 1,872.48-hectare area), has a history of recurring fires, and has local institutions such as the village government, the MPA, and traditional leaders. Its population was recorded at 13,856 in 2022 in the population table of the Village Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJM-Desa), with livelihoods based on agriculture, plantations, inland fisheries, and purun handicrafts.

Theoretical framework and its adaptation

Rothman distinguishes three models of community intervention[4]. Locality development sees change as the result of broad resident participation in determining and solving their own problems, with the practitioner acting as enabler, coordinator, and teacher of skills. Social planning emphasizes solving substantive problems through fact gathering and rational decisions, with consultative resident involvement. Social action aims to change power relations and resource distribution by organizing residents to strengthen their bargaining position. Rothman stresses that the three models rarely appear in pure form; they are combined simultaneously (mixing) or sequentially (phasing)[4].

This study adapts the models in three ways. First, the change agent is the village government, which holds formal authority, not a practitioner from outside the community. Second, fires are seasonal and recurrent, so the three models are read across the seasonal cycle rather than as a one-off intervention, in line with the recursive nature of community organizing described by Twelvetrees[6]. Third, social action is understood as mobilizing collective action and strengthening bargaining position toward parties outside the village, not as confrontation between residents and the village government.

Because Rothman's model is typological and explains the pattern, not the quality, of organizing, it is complemented with other concepts: the participation typology of Cohen and Uphoff[7] and the ladder of participation of Arnstein[8]; social capital as described by Putnam[9,10]; the principles of common-pool resource management of Ostrom[11]; collaborative governance of Ansell and Gash[12]; the Pressure and Release vulnerability framework of Blaikie et al.[13]; and the disaster management cycle of Carter[14].

Informants and sampling

Primary data were obtained through semi-structured in-depth interviews with 12 informants, who were selected purposively and expanded by snowball sampling[15,16]. They consisted of four village government officials (codes P1–P4: the village head, the village secretary, the head of the people's welfare and services section, and a hamlet head), four community members (M1–M4: a community figure and three MPA members), and four officers from related agencies (I1–I4: the OKI Regency Regional Disaster Management Agency [BPBD] and Manggala Agni). The codes are used in quotations to protect the informants' identities.

Research instruments

Three instruments were used. Each was organized around the same two sets of categories, the three research focuses (participation, planning, mobilization) and the practice variables of the Rothman models, so that the data from the three instruments could be compared in the analysis.

Interview guide. The semi-structured guide had four blocks: (A) the history, causes, and impacts of fires in the village; (B) participation, covering forums, who speaks and who decides, how proposals are made, and how violations are handled; (C) planning, covering data sources, budget, targets, division of responsibility, programs, and evaluation; and (D) mobilization, covering the MPA, patrols, resources, cooperation with agencies, requests to parties outside the village, and sustainability. Blocks B to D were derived from the practice variables of Rothman[4] (goals of action, basic strategy, tactics, practitioner role, medium

of change, orientation toward power structures, conception of the public interest, and role of residents). Three versions were used, for village officials, community members, and agency officers. They shared a core set of questions so that accounts on the same issue could be compared in the triangulation. Interviews were conducted face to face in Indonesian. Each interview was audio-recorded with the informant's consent and transcribed verbatim.

Observation checklist. Observation used a structured checklist with four groups of items: (a) conduct of hamlet or village deliberations and residents' meetings, namely who speaks, whether residents speak directly or through spokespersons, and who sets the direction; (b) MPA activities, namely patrols, use of the mini fire truck, and use of borehole water on small hotspots; (c) physical facilities, namely borehole wells, retention ponds (embung), and equipment; and (d) information media, namely information boards, banners, and the fire map displayed in the village hall and at hamlet heads' houses. Observations were recorded in field notes and photographs. The researcher took the role of participant as observer, with passive to moderate participation: present at the research site and openly known to those observed, but not fully involved in their activities. The field notes recorded the time, place, actors, events, and the researcher's initial interpretation.

Document review sheet. The sheet recorded, for each document, whether it contained fire-related content, budget lines and values, targets and indicators, persons in charge, document numbers, fire event records, and participatory maps. The documents reviewed were the Village Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJM-Desa) 2023–2028, land-use maps, and agency data on hotspots and fire history.

Research ethics

The study involved human informants and was conducted under research permit No. 3A/S2/2026. The research began on 4 April 2026: observation was carried out on 6 April 2026, document review from 6 April to 12 November 2026, and interviews from 10 April to 12 November 2026. All informants were told the purpose of the study and gave their consent before the interviews were recorded. Informants are identified by codes in the quotations, and the recordings and transcripts were stored separately from their identities to protect confidentiality, particularly on rule violations and land-clearing practices that could carry legal or social consequences for them.

Data analysis

The analysis used the interactive model of Miles and Huberman[17]: data were reduced and coded according to the three research focuses, presented in narratives and

matrices, and then concluded through source triangulation, that is, by comparing the accounts of the village government, the community, and the agencies on the same issue. Interview, observation, and document data were also compared with each other. Data trustworthiness followed the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of Lincoln and Guba[18]. The findings were compared with the practice variables of each Rothman model[4], namely goals of action, basic strategy, tactics, practitioner role, medium of change, orientation toward power structures, conception of the public interest, and role of residents.

FINDINGS

All informants stated that fires in Menang Raya Village occur almost every year, with the worst events in 2019 and 2026. The triggers vary: cigarette butts, burning of waste, scorching sun that dries out the peat, and deliberate burning by some residents. The village government and the community understand residents' reasons for burning in a similar way: it is cheap, fast, and requires no transport to dispose of leftover vegetation. The impacts are felt in health and education; an elementary school principal (M1) reported that many students suffered acute respiratory infections in 2026, so that learning was conducted remotely for almost a month.

The village government has no special forum for fires. Discussion takes place through hamlet and village deliberations, residents' meetings, WhatsApp groups, information boards, and banners. Awareness is raised through weekly outreach, counseling at community events, and training together with BPBD, Manggala Agni, and the village military guidance officer (Babinsa); outreach even reaches schools and parents (M1). Mutual cooperation (gotong royong) and the role of community figures form the basis of mobilization, and violations are handled in tiers: a warning, deliberation, customary sanction, and then formal regulation (P1, M1, M2).

In implementation, about 80 residents have joined the MPA and residents provide logistics. Residents' self-help, in the form of monitoring, reminding one another, providing logistics, and reporting hotspots, is valuable, but it takes the form of support for activities designed and led by the village and the agencies. No informant described a resident group that had independently designed ways to clear land without burning or drafted land-use rules on its own initiative. In decision-making, residents attend and are heard, and a proposal for borehole wells was accepted, but the direction of discussion is led by village

officials and community figures, and residents' voices are generally conveyed by spokespersons (P2, P3, P4, M1, M2).

Accounts differed between informant groups. The village head stated that all stages involve residents (P1), whereas the school principal said that residents speak the least because they are represented by community figures (M1), and an MPA member said that not all residents dare to speak in forums (M2). The data contain no mention of assistance with equipment, costs, or schemes that would make non-burning alternatives affordable.

The facts used by the village government are largely provided by outside parties: maps from the regency, and hotspot data and fire history from BPBD and Manggala Agni (P1, I1, I2), complemented by reports from residents and hamlet heads. BPBD enlarged the map and displayed it in the village hall and at the hamlet heads' houses (I1). However, the village's own role as a collector and analyst of data remains limited. The RPJM-Desa contains no village-level record of fire events, and no informant mentioned a participatory map produced in cooperation with the Participatory Mapping Network (JKPP) and the Indonesian Forum for the Environment (WALHI) as a basis for fire planning.

The fire budget is designed through reallocation from other programs, and the rules are revised every year (P1). No informant mentioned a document number, an article, or a budget value for fire prevention. Targets are clear at the level of goals (fires under control, preparedness improved) but are not formulated in verifiable measures, such as the number of hotspots or the burned area to be reduced. Responsibility is divided through one coordinator per hamlet, following the administrative boundaries of hamlets rather than the ecological boundary of the peat swamp.

The programs that are planned and funded are borehole wells, retention ponds (embung), mini fire trucks, MPA equipment and training, and incentives. Canal blocking, peat restoration, and a structured no-burn land-clearing program do not appear as planned activities. CSR in the form of seedling planting stopped after the company moved its operations to other land (P1, I1). Residents act as proposers and beneficiaries; final decisions follow budget capacity, and budget disclosure depends on residents asking for it (M1, M2, M4).

Mobilization is structured and recurring. Weekly patrols with a mini fire truck, about 80 MPA members, the use of borehole water to extinguish small hotspots, and logistics from residents show real collective action (P1). BPBD officers observed that village youth move quickly when invited to the field (I4). Recruitment, training by BPBD, the National Search and Rescue Agency (Basarnas), the fire brigade (Damkar), and

Manggala Agni, and endorsement under the village government show that mobilization is organized through institutions, not merely spontaneous.

The MPA is nurtured but fragile. All informant groups cited the same constraints: limited equipment and logistics, irregular operational costs and incentives, rapidly changing weather, and knowledge and safety that need strengthening. The village head stated that MPA members go to the field risking their lives without commensurate reward (P1).

To strengthen its position toward outside parties, the village government conveys its needs through letters, coordination meetings, and direct communication, and the results depend on the availability of programs, personnel, and budget at the agencies. For land and concession issues, the village pursues dialogue and official channels and tries to bring the relevant parties together so that the matter does not become a conflict.

On sustainability, the village head stated that activities continue because the village does not need much outside help, but in the same interview he said that equipment is supported by the agencies and that MPA incentives are minimal (P1). Mobilization also follows the season; in the dry season many residents work away from their land, leaving dry land unguarded (P1), a gap that residents say should be closed with a patrol schedule and monitoring posts (M1, M2).

The three models blend and alternate following the seasonal cycle (Table 1). The transitions between models are triggered by environmental cues and residents' reports, such as hotspots that shift, not by scheduled evaluation; evaluation takes place orally and in conversation.

Table 1. Phasing of the Rothman models by seasonal cycle in Menang Raya Village

Phase	Activities mentioned by informants	Dominant model
Rainy season and pre-dry season	Planning, budget reallocation, maintenance of borehole wells and water facilities, training, residents planting	Social planning, followed by locality development
Early dry season	Outreach and appeals intensify, coordination strengthened, update of data on vulnerable locations	Locality development
Peak dry season and emergence of hotspots	Patrols, initial extinguishing with borehole water, cross-agency coordination, logistics from residents	Social action
Post-event	Oral evaluation, adjustment of plans and needs, requests for support to the regency	Social planning and locality development

Source: processed primary data, 2026.

The characteristics of each model in Menang Raya Village, including the role of the village government, the pattern that emerged, and its strengths and weaknesses, are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary of the patterns of the Rothman models in Menang Raya Village

Model	Role of the village government	Pattern	Strengths	Weaknesses
Locality development	Forum coordinator and teacher	Representative-informative	Social capital, mutual cooperation, authority of community figures	Residents' voices through representatives; limited independent self-help; inclusion not yet even
Social planning	Planner dependent on external data and support	Consultative-adaptive	Alignment with regency programs, annual adjustment, one coordinator per hamlet	No village-level data and indicators; weak institutionalization; structural conservation not planned
Social action	Mobilizer and partnership broker	Operational-partnership	MPA mobilization, rapid response, network with agencies	MPA incentives and safety; dependence on equipment and funds; bargaining position not yet data-based

Source: processed primary data, 2026.

DISCUSSIONS

Compared with the practice variables of Rothman[4], the village government performs the roles of coordinator and teacher well, but it is weak as an enabler of residents' initiative. Residents' self-help is valuable, but it supports activities designed and led by the village and the agencies, so the goal of building self-help capacity, which is the core of locality development, has been only partly achieved. The quality of participation differs by stage. In implementation, residents are at the level of partnership. In decision-making, participation lies between consultation and placation on Arnstein's ladder[8]: residents are present and heard, but the direction is set by officials and community figures. The differing accounts of the informant groups can be read as differences in vantage point: the village government judges by the availability of opportunity, whereas residents judge by their experience of speaking up.

The greatest strength of participation lies in social capital. Bonding social capital[9,10] appears in mutual cooperation, obedience to respected figures, and the habit of reminding one another, while bridging social capital appears in the role of community figures as links to the village government and in the presence of agencies in forums. The chain from warning to formal regulation is consistent with Ostrom's principle of graduated sanctions[11]. However, the village government's responses, namely outreach and

warnings, target the behavioral level. In the framework of Blaikie et al.[13], burning is an unsafe condition rooted in dynamic pressures, such as the cost of clearing land without burning and limited knowledge. The data contain no assistance that makes non-burning alternatives affordable. This pattern resembles the finding of Purnomo and Puspitaloka in Jambi that developing fire-care communities is hindered by economic incentives and limited equipment[19]. Participation therefore still rests on awareness-raising and implementation, not yet on changing how residents make a living from their land.

In answer to the first research question, the village government develops participation by using deliberation forums, awareness-raising, mutual cooperation, and community figures as channels, so that the locality development pattern is representative-informative: high at implementation and consultative at decision-making.

The social planning model requires rational decisions based on facts that can be verified. Priority setting that rests on memory and oral reports is valuable but hard to retest, and the data assets the village does hold are not yet connected to planning. The annual reallocation of the budget and revision of rules can be read in two ways. On the one hand, planning is responsive to rapidly changing field conditions and is consistent with Ostrom's principle of fit between rules and local conditions[11]. On the other hand, fire prevention has not yet been recorded as a fixed budget item with a value, a person in charge, and indicators, and targets are not stated in measurable terms. Responsibility that follows hamlet boundaries rather than the boundary of the peat swamp also weakens the ecological fit of the plan.

The content of the planned and funded programs functions more as preparedness and initial suppression than as land conservation. Kospa and Praja affirmed that in OKI community-based peat restoration is more fundamental for long-term mitigation than responsive approaches[1], while Herawati et al. examined peat rewetting through boreholes built participatively[20]. In the cycle of Carter[14], the programs are stated to focus on the pre-disaster phase, but their intensity rises when drought and hotspots appear. From the perspective of collaborative governance[12], the village government positions regency programs as a complement to village plans, but resource asymmetry persists. The end of CSR support left one source of assistance without a replacement, and residents remain proposers and beneficiaries rather than co-decision makers.

In answer to the second research question, the village government plans programs through deliberation and annual adjustment based on external data and field reports. The pattern is consultative-adaptive: strong in alignment with regency programs and annual

adjustment, but weak in the village's own data base, measurable targets, and institutionalization.

Mobilization shows real collective action built on the same social capital that shapes participation. Yet the MPA is nurtured but fragile, because the risk is borne by volunteers who work without commensurate incentives. This pattern is almost identical to the findings of Purnomo and Puspitaloka[19]. Regarding the strengthening of position toward outside parties, in the roles described by Rothman[4] the village government is better described as a broker and negotiator than as an activist and advocate. This pattern is plausible in context: the parties it faces are government agencies positioned as partners, and the confrontational element typical of Rothman's social action is not assumed in the contextual adaptation used in this study. The two seemingly contradictory statements of the village head on sustainability can be reconciled: the village is independent in labor, awareness, and basic activities, but depends on outside parties for equipment, training, data, and the handling of large cases.

In answer to the third research question, the village government mobilizes the community by forming and nurturing the MPA, mobilizing mutual cooperation and community figures, and acting as an intermediary with the agencies. The pattern is operational-partnership: collective action runs actively but depends on external resource support and the willingness of volunteers.

The pattern of mixing and phasing shows that the greatest intensity lies in the phases approaching and during fire events, whereas the genuine pre-disaster phase, namely structural mitigation and long-term preparedness, has not been filled as strongly as the response phase[14]. This reactive trigger is consistent with weak institutionalization. The three models also support one another. Locality development provides legitimacy and social capital: without forums, community figures, and mutual cooperation, the MPA could not be formed and mobilized. Social planning provides technical direction: without data on vulnerable locations and budget allocation, patrols and borehole wells would have no target. Social action realizes both in the field. The weakness of one model presses on the others: weak data makes the bargaining position toward the regency depend on the goodwill of annual programs, and weak residents' voices in forums risk leaving planning blind to urgent needs such as volunteer incentives and access to no-burn land clearing.

Similarities and differences with previous studies

The findings agree with earlier work on OKI and on peatland fire prevention in some respects and differ from it in others.

Kospa and Praja[1]. Their evaluation of prevention in OKI points to land-use conversion, environmentally unfriendly land clearing, and drought as the main triggers, and to community-based peat restoration as more fundamental than responsive measures. This study is consistent with that emphasis: the programs planned and funded in Menang Raya are preparedness and initial suppression, while canal blocking and peat restoration are not planned. The difference is one of focus. Where an evaluation of prevention describes what is and is not delivered, this study shows how the organizing process produces that result: planning relies on external data, targets are not measurable, and responsibility follows hamlet rather than peat swamp boundaries.

Nurhayati et al.[2]. They showed that community behavior and perception shape peat fires in OKI. Informants in Menang Raya describe the same behaviors (burning waste, cigarette butts, deliberate burning because it is cheap and fast). The difference is the position given to residents. In the earlier study, residents' behavior is the object being measured. Here the behavior is read as the outcome of livelihood pressure that the village response, mostly outreach and warnings, does not yet address, and residents are also treated as participants in organizing, through the MPA and mutual cooperation.

Purnomo and Puspitaloka[19]. The finding that fire-care communities are hindered by economic incentives and limited equipment in Jambi is almost identical to what Menang Raya informants from all three groups reported about the MPA. What this study adds is the link between that fragility and the organizing pattern: the MPA is strong because it rests on bonding social capital and the village's institutional endorsement, and fragile because the village has no budget line or incentive scheme of its own for it.

Herawati et al.[20]. They describe peat rewetting through boreholes built participatively, as a community service activity. In Menang Raya the borehole wells are also central, and a resident proposal for them was accepted. They differ in role: the data here record their use for initial suppression of small hotspots, and no informant described residents designing or building them independently, or using them to rewet peat. The wells therefore appear as a village and agency program that residents support, not as resident-led rewetting.

Conceptual propositions

Because the Rothman model is typological, the results are formulated as conceptual propositions rather than causal relationships.

Proposition 1. For seasonal environmental problems such as forest and land fires, organizing by the village government moves with the climate cycle: planning and

awareness-raising dominate in the rainy season and early dry season, while operational mobilization dominates when the risk peaks.

Proposition 2. Strong bonding social capital eases the mobilization of residents, but without mechanisms to include residents' voices and initiative, participation tends to remain at the level of implementation and consultation.

Proposition 3. When data and technical resources come from outside the village, village planning tends to be adaptive and responsive, and the sustainability of programs depends on the availability of external support each year.

Proposition 4. In the village context, social action tends to take the form of partnership and administrative intermediation, so that the strength of the bargaining position depends on the quality of documentation of needs and the clarity of roles among actors, not on confrontation.

These findings show that the Rothman model[4] can be used to read the village government as an organizing actor, with the three adjustments described above. This typological model is more useful when combined with concepts of participation, social capital, and common-pool resource governance, because Rothman's variables explain the pattern whereas the supporting concepts explain its quality.

Limitations and recommendations for future research

This study has limitations. The data rest on 12 informants and the RPJM-Desa document, so the voices of traditional leaders, the MPA head, tenant farmers, women, and day laborers are not directly represented. Informants did not mention document numbers or fire-related budget values, and village-level records of fire events are not available, so changes in outcomes cannot be assessed quantitatively. In line with the character of a single-case study and a typological model, the conclusions are not intended to be generalized. Future research could conduct comparative studies across villages to test the propositions, longitudinal studies across seasons, and studies of the household economics of farmers regarding the choice to burn.

CONCLUSION

The Menang Raya Village Government organizes the community for land conservation and fire mitigation through a combination of three Rothman models that alternate with the seasons. Participation is developed through forums, awareness-raising, mutual cooperation, and community figures, with results that are strong at implementation but consultative at decision-making. Planning runs adaptively and consultatively but

depends on external data and does not yet have measurable targets or strong institutionalization. Mobilization through the MPA is active but depends on equipment, funds, and the willingness of volunteers. Community organizing in Menang Raya is therefore strongest as mobilization and awareness-raising based on mutual cooperation, and weakest as documented planning, inclusion of residents' voices, and structural land conservation.

Several suggestions can be made. The village government needs to set out fire prevention in writing in the RPJM-Desa, the annual Village Work Plan (RKP-Desa), and the Village Budget (APBDes), with targets, indicators, persons in charge, and budget; build a fire database per hamlet connected to the village participatory map; ensure the inclusion of women, tenant farmers, and day laborers in forums; designate a steward for the peat swamp; and develop incentive and protection schemes for MPA members. The regency government, BPBD, and Manggala Agni need to update vulnerability data regularly, provide equipment and training support across years, and establish a clear coordination mechanism.

Acknowledgement. The authors thank the Menang Raya Village Government, the community figures, residents, and MPA members of Menang Raya Village, and the officers of BPBD OKI Regency and Manggala Agni for their time and openness as informants and for access to documents.

Conflict of Interest. The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

[1] Kospa HSD, Praja AA. Evaluasi pencegahan kebakaran hutan dan lahan gambut di Kabupaten Ogan Komering Ilir, Sumatera Selatan. Jurnal Rekayasa. 2023;13(1):1–9. doi:10.37037/jrftsp.v13i1.165

[2] Nurhayati AD, Saharjo BH, Sundawati L, Syartinilia, Vetrita Y. Perilaku dan persepsi masyarakat terhadap terjadinya kebakaran gambut di Ogan Komering Ilir Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. J Pengelolaan Sumberd Alam Lingkung. 2020;10(4):568–83. doi:10.29244/jpsl.10.4.568-583

[3] Republik Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa. 2014.

[4] Rothman J. Approaches to community intervention. In: Rothman J, Erlich JL, Tropman JE, editors. Strategies of community intervention. 5th ed. Itasca (IL): F.E. Peacock Publishers; 1995.

[5] Yin RK. Case study research and applications: design and methods. 6th ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 2018.

[6] Twelvetrees A. Community work. 4th ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan; 2008.

[7] Cohen JM, Uphoff NT. Participation's place in rural development: seeking clarity through specificity. World Dev. 1980;8(3):213–35. doi:10.1016/0305-750X(80)90011-X

[8] Arnstein SR. A ladder of citizen participation. J Am Inst Plann. 1969;35(4):216–24. doi:10.1080/01944366908977225

[9] Putnam RD. Making democracy work: civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press; 1993.

[10] Putnam RD. Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster; 2000.

[11] Ostrom E. Governing the commons: the evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.

[12] Ansell C, Gash A. Collaborative governance in theory and practice. J Public Adm Res Theory. 2008;18(4):543–71. doi:10.1093/jopart/mum032

[13] Blaikie P, Cannon T, Davis I, Wisner B. At risk: natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters. 2nd ed. London: Routledge; 2004.

[14] Carter WN. Disaster management: a disaster manager's handbook. Mandaluyong City: Asian Development Bank; 2008.

[15] Patton MQ. Qualitative research and evaluation methods. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 2002.

[16] Sugiyono. Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung: Alfabeta; 2019.

[17] Miles MB, Huberman AM. Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks (CA): Sage Publications; 1994.

[18] Lincoln YS, Guba EG. Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills (CA): Sage Publications; 1985.

[19] Purnomo H, Puspitaloka D. Pembelajaran dari pencegahan kebakaran dan restorasi gambut berbasis masyarakat. Bogor: CIFOR-ICRAF; 2020. doi:10.17528/cifor/007500

[20] Herawati H, Kartini K, Akbar AA, Abdurrahman T. Sosialisasi upaya pembasahan lahan gambut dengan pembangunan sumur bor secara partisipatif. SELAPARANG J Pengabdi Masy Berkemajuan. 2020;4(1). doi:10.31764/jpmb.v4i1.3252

Copyright and Grant the Journal Right under Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Copyright @ 2022 SYNTIFIC PUBLISHER