

# From Resistance to Co-Creation: Constructing Shared Values in Forest Governance

**Prudensius Maring**

Faculty of Communication and Creative Design  
Budi Luhur University.

## **Abstract:**

**This article analyzes the construction of shared values as the basis for collaborative governance between local communities and companies in forest resource management. Using a qualitative-participatory approach and a political-ecological anthropology framework, this study explores the dynamics of conflict, resistance, and the transformation of power relations toward value-based co-creation. The results show that the relationship between communities and companies is formed not only through formal schemes, but also through long-term, reflective social practices. Four core values, social contribution, self-help initiatives, open dialogue, and the desire for a peaceful life, serve as ethical meeting points that enable equal collaboration. Collaboration emerges from a process of negotiating interests and recognizing community values and experiences, not simply as a result of administrative consensus. Its mechanisms include alignment of goals, technical strategies, institutional strengthening, and dialogue-based conflict resolution. The resulting shared governance provides a social space for identity articulation, power distribution, and the construction of collective meaning. This study emphasizes that the success of collaboration is largely determined by the recognition of local values, reflective processes, and the adaptive capacity of the parties. The theoretical implication is the importance of enriching the governance approach with a contextual sociocultural perspective, while practically, the collaborative model of Prague Village can be a reference in building fair and sustainable forestry governance in areas with a similar history of agrarian conflict.**

**Keywords:** Collaboration, values, resistance, governance, participation.

---

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

Forest resource management in Indonesia has long been at the center of a tug-of-war between the interests of the state, corporations, and local communities. Forests are positioned not only as ecological resources but also as social spaces that become arenas of conflict, negotiation, and struggles for meaning between actors. Various government programs oriented toward environmental conservation and economic development through concession models such as industrial timber plantations (HTI), in reality, often trigger social tensions. These tensions are rooted in the practice of excluding local communities from access and decision-making, and they are still viewed as objects, not subjects, in forest governance (Wulan et al., 2004; Maring, 2010a).

Forest management conflicts reflect fundamental differences in perspectives and positions between the parties. The state and companies generally promote a legal-formal approach, based on permits and economic efficiency. Meanwhile, local communities view forests as an integral part of their daily lives, as a space for farming, cultivating, seeking water sources, and even as a symbolic space with cultural value. When these two perspectives meet within a non-inclusive governance framework, what occurs is resistance and clashes of interests that are difficult to reconcile unilaterally (Scott, 1993; Saifuddin, 2005).

Various attempts to resolve forest resource conflicts have been made, including legal approaches, participatory development programs, and corporate social responsibility (CSR) schemes. However, most of these approaches tend to be top-down and ignore local social dynamics, which occur informally and symbolically. As a result, conflict resolution programs often fail to create structural change in the patterns of relations between parties. Approaches that focus too much on technical solutions tend to produce short-term

solutions that fail to change the unequal access and power relations underlying the conflict (Manemba & Alamsyah, 2006; Elias, 2008).

In some cases, communities not only resist but also develop alternative systems through informal yet effectively functioning practices. Independent land clearing, integrated planting patterns, and family-based harvest distribution systems are examples of how communities develop adaptive strategies to survive amidst the pressures of unfair policies. This resistance is not always expressed through open confrontation, but can manifest in everyday practices that blur the lines between legal and illegal (Maring, 2010b; Santoso, 2004). Experiences from various regions demonstrate that ignoring local values, community social structures, and their historical experiences in dealing with natural resources is a major source of forestry policy failure. In this context, the formulation of forest resource governance cannot be separated from the need to develop a collaborative approach that recognizes the role of communities as key actors. Collaboration in this case means not only involvement in technical processes but also recognition of the values, knowledge, and social structures that already exist within the community (Suporahardjo, 2005; Maring, 2013b).

The study of forest management in Praha Village, Jambi, is crucial in this context. This village serves as a concrete example of how the relationship between local communities and forestry companies is shaped by a long history of conflict, resistance, and informal processes that ultimately lead to collaborative efforts. This collaboration did not emerge from a completely top-down project, but rather resulted from collective reflection on the failures of previous approaches. It was shaped through value negotiation, recognition of community contributions, and institutional design that involved local actors in formulating shared goals (Maring, 2009; 2010a).

As part of a constructive approach to natural resource management, shared governance built through social collaboration emphasizes the importance of constructing shared values as a moral and operational foundation. In this approach, success is measured not only by achieving production output or increasing community income, but also by building mutual trust, reducing latent conflicts, and establishing local institutions capable of sustainably managing the dynamics of interests (Maring, 2013c).

Therefore, the need to construct shared forest resource governance demands a paradigm shift: from management based on control and exclusion to management based on recognition and participation. Shared governance is not merely a managerial instrument but also a cultural space where stakeholders reshape their collective identities, meanings, and goals. Therefore, a qualitative-participatory approach is highly relevant to uncovering how this process occurs at the micro-level, through narratives, symbols, and practices that are not always captured in official documents but significantly influence policy direction at the grassroots level.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A theoretical approach to understanding collaborative forest resource governance requires a framework capable of explaining power relations, social dynamics, and the construction of values within the interaction between local communities and external actors such as companies or the state. In this regard, a political-ecological anthropology approach provides a solid foundation for analyzing how control and management of ecological resources are not solely determined by natural or technical factors, but are also heavily influenced by the structure of social relations, historical conflicts, and resistance to inequality (Scott, 1993; Saifuddin, 2005). This perspective opens up space to examine how local values and community resistance practices serve not only as forms of resistance but also as social capital in building participatory and equitable shared governance.

The concept of governance is a key framework for discussing resource management, but in the local context, the term needs to be reconceptualized as good forest governance, which is rooted in social experiences, community values, and local dynamics. Good forest governance is not solely about transparency, accountability, or administrative effectiveness, but rather how local actors are positioned as active subjects in decision-making, management access, and benefit distribution (Wulan et al., 2004). In this approach, the success of collaboration is determined not by formal structures alone, but by social legitimacy, mutual trust, and acceptance of shared values that serve as the moral and cultural foundation of collaboration (Suporahardjo, 2005).

The theoretical framework is also strengthened by the constructivist governance approach, where governance is understood as a social process continuously shaped through interaction, negotiation, and collective reflection. Governance is not a fixed framework imported from abroad, but rather a social product constructed from the ground up based on the experiences, aspirations, and interests of stakeholders (Maring, 2010a). In the context of Praha Village, the construction of shared governance reflects a governance model born from the reality of conflict and resistance, not from formal agreements formed technocratically. Therefore, this approach emphasizes the importance of epistemic dialogue, namely the intersection of local knowledge and technocratic rationality as the basis for establishing inclusive and contextual governance.

The concept of collaborative management or co-management serves as the theoretical foundation for building shared governance. Collaboration in the context of natural resource management requires the active involvement of all parties, equitable distribution of authority, and recognition of the claims and contributions of local communities (Manembu & Alamsyah, 2006; Santoso, 2004). However, collaboration is not the result of one-sided good intentions, but rather a long process of transformation from unequal power relations to equitable, participatory structures. Experience in many locations in Indonesia, including Jambi, has shown that collaboration often fails because it is not accompanied by fundamental changes in power relations and does not address the roots of the community's socio-cultural values (Elias, 2008; Maring, 2009).

In practice, collaboration requires essential prerequisites: recognition of local values, open articulation of interests, and a shared willingness to build collective goals. This process can theoretically be traced through the Appreciative Inquiry (AI) framework, which emphasizes the search for internal strengths and positive past experiences as the basis for shaping a shared future (Covey, 1997; Bukik's Ideas, n.d.). The AI approach offers reflective stages ranging from definition, discovery, dream, design, to destiny, allowing each party to avoid being trapped in a narrative of blame, but instead focus on their strengths to build shared solutions. In the context of this research, AI helps bridge the gap between companies and communities by building awareness that shared goals can be achieved if both parties strengthen each other, not exclude each other.

Furthermore, a stakeholder analysis framework is also crucial in clarifying the roles and positions of the actors involved. Stakeholders in forest management include primary actors (local communities and companies), key actors (government), and secondary actors (NGOs, academics), each with varying interests, capacities, and influence (Maring, 2013a). This analysis emphasizes that successful collaboration is not determined by homogeneity of interests, but rather by the parties' ability to formulate agreements based on mutual understanding and proportional role accommodation. In the context of Praha Village, the presence of a third party as a facilitator is crucial for reducing power asymmetries and building productive communication bridges.

The final relevant theoretical framework is the concept of shared value construction in resource management. This concept emphasizes that the success of collaborative governance is determined not solely by economic or technical interests, but by the normative values that emerge from interactions between stakeholders. Values such as ownership, trust, justice, and social responsibility are prerequisites for sustainable governance (Maring, 2013c). In forest management, these values enable the transformation from exploitative to mutualistic relationships between humans and nature, as well as between communities and formal institutions. Therefore, the theoretical framework in this study does not rely on a single approach, but rather represents a synthesis of several perspectives: political-ecological anthropology, constructivist governance, collaborative management, appreciative inquiry, and shared value construction. This synthesis enables an analysis that not only describes the structure of the relationship between communities and companies but also explores the social processes that shape it in a reflective, dynamic, and local context-based manner. This approach is believed to enrich the study of forest resource governance in Indonesia, which has been dominated by solely technocratic and legal-formal approaches.

### 3. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a qualitative approach inspired by the paradigms of social constructivism and interpretive anthropology. Its primary focus is to deeply understand the dynamics of the relationship between communities

and companies in forest resource management, as well as to explore the social processes behind the construction of shared governance that has developed in Praha Village, Jambi. This research does not pretend to find universal generalizations, but rather emphasizes a contextual understanding of local experiences and the perspectives of actors in shaping meanings, strategies, and social institutions that exist around state forest areas. Therefore, this research is emic in nature, starting from the perspective of local actors in explaining their social realities (Saifuddin, 2005).

The research model used resembles participatory action research, where researchers do not act as passive observers but rather engage reflectively in the process of social interactions, community discussions, and joint strategy design between the community and the company. The primary data collection methods consisted of in-depth interviews and participant observation. These two methods enabled researchers to capture the dynamics of actions, narratives, and social symbols that accompany the processes of resistance, negotiation, and collaboration in forest resource governance. As Creswell (2013) states, a qualitative approach opens up opportunities for researchers to explore social complexity without being trapped by rigid categorical structures.

The types of data collected in this study included descriptive data, narratives, and contextual documents. Descriptive data were obtained through observations of the daily activities of communities surrounding forest areas, their interactions with company officials, and participation in discussion forums and collaborative negotiations. Narrative data were collected through in-depth interviews, which recorded informants' experiences, perceptions, and expectations regarding forest management and the dynamics of the conflicts that accompany it. In addition, document data such as concession maps, village meeting minutes, cooperation agreement archives, and records of company CSR activities are also used to understand the formal and informal processes that shape governance.

The key informants in this study consisted of actors directly involved in and impacted by forest management practices. They included residents of Praha Village from various ethnic backgrounds and age groups, farmers cultivating land in state forest areas, community leaders, village officials, and members of farmer groups who initiated dialogue with the company. From the company's perspective, interviews were conducted with field staff, CSR managers, and security officers who interact with residents on a daily basis. In addition, this study also involved key informants from supporting NGOs, local government officials, and representatives from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry who had facilitated multi-stakeholder meetings. Thus, this research's data sources reflect a diversity of perspectives relevant to reconstructing the social processes involved in building shared governance.

The fieldwork took place in three phases: the first phase was conducted in 2009–2010, the second phase in 2013, and was renewed through field visits and data reflection in 2022. Each phase involved direct involvement of researchers in community activities and dialogue with companies, including supervision of ongoing collaborative programs. Within this framework, the research process simultaneously served as a learning space and value negotiation between the involved actors, where data was collected not simply to gain knowledge but also to understand and respond to social situations in a contextual and participatory manner (López et al., 2023; Maring, 2022a). The results of this approach are not only descriptive findings but also theoretical insights into the social construction of collaborative resource governance.

## **4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Sources of shared values from the community and the company**

The construction of values in collaborative forest resource management is inseparable from the social experiences of the community and the company in managing conflicts and shaping dynamic power relations. The Praha Village community has a strong geographic and functional connection to the state forest area. This closeness fosters a sense of belonging rooted in their collective consciousness. The cultural values that emerge from this relationship are not only materially meaningful as a source of livelihood, but also a symbol of social existence that is continuously championed through various initiatives, including resistance to marginalizing policies.



Meanwhile, the concession company develops managerial values oriented toward efficiency, productivity, and legal compliance as the basis for legitimizing its control of space. Although structurally and legally, the company holds a dominant position, in practice, these corporate values face negotiation on the ground. When communities demonstrate patterns of resistance through land acquisition, planting, or informal communication with company officials, they are actually practicing local values as a response to situations of inequitable resource access.

However, despite these tensions, this research identified common ground in values that could serve as a foundation for collaboration. One important value is recognition of social contributions. The company once ran a community development (CD) program that, despite its problems, was still remembered by the community as a form of concern. The social benefit inherent in the CD program demonstrates that, despite its economic motives, the company harbors potential social values that can be mobilized through collaborative schemes.

A second value emerging from the community is the self-help initiative of clearing land, planting, and maintaining the sustainability of the land informally. Although lacking legal basis, this initiative reflects the values of hard work, family responsibility, and the courage to fight for land rights as a source of livelihood. For the company, this demonstrates that the community is not merely a passive subject or a nuisance, but rather a rational actor with adaptive values and strategies.

The third value is openness to dialogue. Both communities and companies demonstrate a tendency to maintain communication—albeit informal and not always equal. Communities, for example, communicate their intentions when clearing land to village heads or company officials. Similarly, companies do not immediately take legal action, opting instead for a persuasive approach. The values of openness, informal respect, and seeking local solutions are essential foundations for building trust.

The fourth value is the desire to live in peace and harmony. In various discussions, company officials expressed that security and peace are basic needs. Statements such as "we want to sleep soundly at night and not have people banging on our doors" demonstrate that harmonious social relations are also an important value for the company. This value aligns with the community's aspiration for a secure life, free from conflict or pressure from the company.

Based on these four values—social contribution, self-help initiative, open dialogue, and the desire for peace—it can be concluded that behind the ongoing conflict lies a foundation of shared values that can be developed into an ethic of collaboration. These values are contextual, growing out of long-standing social experiences, and possess social legitimacy in the eyes of the parties involved. By consciously exploring and articulating these values, the construction of shared governance will have a strong moral and cultural foundation.

### **Patterns of relationships between communities and companies**

The patterns of relationships between communities and companies in Praha Village can be understood as the result of a dialectic between resistance and adaptation. In the study of political-ecological anthropology, this kind of relationship reflects a field of power that is not static but is constantly negotiated through everyday practices and symbolic strategies (Scott, 1993; Maring, 2010a). Communities are not completely subordinate, and companies are not completely hegemonic. What emerges is an ambivalent relationship, full of strategy and improvisation.

In the initial stages, the relationship between communities and companies was characterized by a unilateral domination structure from the company. Through formal legal authority in the form of state-issued concession permits, the company defined forest areas as exclusive spaces for industrial crop production. Any community activity within or around these areas was considered a violation. In this regard, the company upheld the value of "legal authority" as both legitimacy and a mechanism of social control.

However, in practice, communities developed complex informal relationships that the company could not fully control. They gradually cleared land, planted commodity crops such as oil palm, areca nut, and pineapple, and asserted ownership claims through a form of involvement known as "real authority." Communities did not directly reject the company, but instead used subtle methods, such as communicating information to village officials and the company, maintaining local ethics, and not disturbing the company's core area.

This relationship pattern creates a latent space for negotiation, where the boundaries between legal and illegal become blurred. The company allows some concession areas to remain under community management, as long as they do not disrupt crop rotation schedules or strategic production areas. Meanwhile, the community understands that their activities fall within a gray area, but they nonetheless operate within local social and moral considerations. This relationship is not simply passive coexistence, but rather a hybrid practice that allows for multiple claims to space.

In the context of resistance, the community builds informal networks, whether through farmer groups, personal communication, or limited collective action such as demonstrations. This resistance strategy does not aim to overthrow the company, but rather to demand a fair redistribution of access and management space. Meanwhile, the company implements CSR programs, builds separation trenches, and employs local residents as security personnel. All of this is not intended to build equal relations, but rather to control the escalation of conflict while creating the illusion of harmony.

This pseudo-relationship persisted for years, creating ambiguity in the relationship. The presence of company officials who were also members of the local community reinforced this dynamic. They stood between two poles: as representatives of the company and as members of the community. This situation created a flexible and complex relationship, where conflict and collaboration could coexist.

However, at a certain stage, this relationship evolved into a collaborative one. Through third-party facilitation, the community and the company began a formal process of building understanding. The previously informal and resistive relationship began to be formalized into a partnership. In this phase, the relationship shifted from one of dominance and resistance to one of negotiation and cooperation.

The pattern of relationships between communities and companies in Praha Village demonstrates that collaboration does not begin in a vacuum, but rather results from the transformation of complex power relations. It is not the product of unilateral good intentions, but the result of a multi-layered struggle for values, claims to space, and everyday practices. Understanding this pattern anthropologically allows us to view collaboration not as the end of conflict, but as a new form of interest articulation in forest resource governance.

### **Mechanisms for implementing collaboration**

The mechanisms for collaboration in forest resource management in Praha Village did not emerge instantly, but rather through a long process involving the articulation of interests, the formulation of shared goals, the development of technical strategies, and the creation of collective control systems. Each stage of this process reflects a reflective and participatory social construction. From an anthropological perspective, collaboration is not simply a technical agreement, but rather the creation of shared meaning through repeated social practices and equal dialogue.

The initial stage of the collaboration mechanism begins with explicit recognition of the existence and interests of the parties. The company, which previously positioned the community as a threat, began to acknowledge, through third-party mediation, that the community's presence could not be ignored. Conversely, the community began to realize that resistance efforts without formal dialogue only created prolonged tension without concrete results. This process created a meeting forum that opened up a space for articulation for both parties to openly express their aspirations and concerns.

The first mechanism established was a shared understanding of shared goals. In discussions between the community and the company, it was agreed that the goal of collaboration was not simply to preserve the forest

or increase economic profits, but rather to create social peace and mutually beneficial relationships. This goal was explicitly formulated as "harmonious coexistence," which in practice includes maintaining the ecological function of forest areas, guaranteeing management access for the community, and operational stability for the company.

The second mechanism is the formulation of technical strategies and the division of roles. This technical agreement covers the allocation of jointly managed space, the division of planting areas, the types of commodities that can be cultivated by the community, and planting and harvesting schedules that do not conflict with the company's production cycle. In this context, it is important to note that the success of technical strategy formulation depends heavily on participatory discussion processes and data transparency. For example, the community must know the company's concession map, while the company needs to understand the community's de facto land tenure structure. Local knowledge and technocratic information are essential raw materials for developing collaborative spatial planning.

The third mechanism is the strengthening of local institutions and the arrangement of representation. In the collaboration agreement, a joint team is formed consisting of community and company representatives, with an independent facilitator. This team is tasked with monitoring the implementation of the agreement, resolving disputes, and evaluating the progress of the collaboration. In practice, this process does not always run smoothly. One of the main challenges is maintaining consistent community representation to prevent it from being infiltrated by individual interests. Therefore, strengthening local institutions such as farmer groups, cooperatives, or village forums is crucial to ensure that community voices remain authentic and collective.

The fourth mechanism is the establishment of a conflict control and resolution system. The collaboration agreement includes a tiered dispute resolution mechanism, starting with internal mediation within the collaborative team and ending with the involvement of village institutions or local government, if necessary. This process marks a shift from a repressive approach to a dialogical one, where conflict is no longer seen as a threat but as part of a dynamic that needs to be addressed openly and with dignity. In many cases, minor conflicts can be resolved at the community level without involving state officials, which previously only led to escalation.

The final, equally important mechanism is strengthening joint reflection and dynamic adjustment. The collaboration established in Praha Village is not static, but continuously adapts to evolving conditions and aspirations. At the end of each planting or harvest season, the collaboration team holds a reflection forum to evaluate achievements, challenges, and opportunities for improvement. This practice provides an important space for maintaining transparency, strengthening trust, and renewing both parties' commitment to shared goals.

From this entire process, it can be concluded that the collaborative mechanisms implemented in Praha Village reflect good forest governance practices based on local values. It is not a top-down system, but rather the result of social interactions rich in values, compromise, and institutional innovation. This approach provides an important lesson: the success of collaboration is determined not only by legal or technical frameworks, but also by the social capacity to listen, share power, and collectively shape the future.

Thus, collaboration is not merely a tool for resolving conflict, but a social learning space that enables the transformation of relational structures, from domination and resistance to co-creation and shared responsibility in forest resource governance.

### **Discussion: Construction of shared governance**

The construction of co-governance in the context of forest resource management in Praha Village represents a complex social dynamic between local communities and companies. The relationship between the parties does not begin with equality, but is shaped by a long history of unequal access, latent conflict, and ongoing resistance. However, as demonstrated in the fieldwork, the active involvement of both parties in building co-governance indicates the potential for social transformation toward cooperative relationships based on shared values. This perspective aligns with the political-ecological anthropology approach, which emphasizes the

importance of understanding power relations, local values, and socio-economic structures in designing resource governance schemes (Scott, 1993; Maring, 2010a).

One crucial aspect of constructing shared governance is the intersection of values between communities and companies. Despite differing orientations—communities with values of survival and kinship over land, while companies with economic calculations and productivity—both parties demonstrate the capacity to find shared normative foundations. Values such as openness to dialogue, recognition of social contributions, and a collective desire to live in peace become the seeds of collaboration that do not come from outside sources but rather grow from their own historical experiences (Maring, 2013b; Covey, 1997). This distinguishes the Prague collaboration model from technocratic approaches that often fail because they fail to address the community's core values.

The transformation of relationships from resistance to collaboration, demonstrated in the patterns of community-company relations, is also the result of mutual recognition of each other's existence. Communities are no longer positioned solely as disruptors, while companies are no longer viewed as absolute oppressors. Each party employs social strategies to safeguard its interests, while taking into account local social and ethical boundaries. When community resistance is articulated through informal communication regarding land clearing, and when companies choose to tolerate it as long as there is no direct disruption to operations, a hybrid pattern of social relations is formed that opens up space for negotiation and adaptation (Maring, 2010b; Saifuddin, 2005).

In this context, the mechanism for implementing collaboration becomes an important marker of the construction of adaptive and contextual shared governance. This process does not begin with legal documents or formal instruments, but with a reflective process that allows for the articulation of interests, the formulation of shared goals, and inclusive technical design. The presence of participatory forums where communities and companies openly express their aspirations and concerns is a form of democratized forest management practice (Suporahardjo, 2005). Here, collaboration does not stop at the symbolic stage, but is manifested in the arrangement of management space, determination of plant types, and crop rotation systems that take into account ecological balance and distribution of economic benefits.

Interestingly, the construction of shared governance in Prague also underscores the importance of mental construction as a prerequisite for technical construction. As Maring (2010) points out, the three initial stages—interest articulation, shared goals, and collaborative strategy—form mental construction that determines the direction and quality of collaboration. Without maturity at these stages, the collaboration being built is vulnerable to failure when it enters technical stages such as land allocation or institutional arrangements. Therefore, discussions about collaboration cannot be separated from dialogical processes that touch on the values, emotions, and collective narratives that exist within the community.

More broadly, the experience in Prague Village demonstrates that collaborative schemes are not simply about designing efficient cooperation systems, but also about creating social arenas that enable the transformation of power relations, open negotiation of interests, and the formation of contextually shared value systems. This approach fundamentally differs from project-based management models, which tend to be technocratic and often fail to adapt to local socio-cultural dynamics (Wulan et al., 2004; Manembu & Alamsyah, 2006).

Thus, co-governance in Prague is not a top-down construct, but rather the result of a long, reflective, and participatory sociocultural process. This process also provides a space for the articulation of identity, spatial claims, and the formation of collective practices in sustainably managing forest resources. Beneath the formal agreements, rich social dynamics lurk, which serve as essential raw materials for developing community-based governance models and local values.

The theoretical implication of these findings is the importance of enriching theories of collaboration in resource management with sociocultural perspectives and local practices. Collaboration cannot be reduced to a rational consensus between formal actors, but must be seen as a process of negotiating values and social relations that occurs within the context of history and structural inequalities. Practically, the experience in Prague Village offers an alternative model for authentic, participatory forest resource management that can



be replicated in other contexts, provided there is recognition of local values, a shared reflective space, and an equally agreed-upon control mechanism.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The collaborative process in forest resource governance in Praha Village demonstrates that the transformation of relations between the community and the company did not occur instantly, but rather through long and complex social dynamics. The initial relationship, fraught with conflict and resistance, gradually found common ground through daily practices, informal communication, and the articulation of local values embedded within the community. This approach emphasizes that inclusive forest management cannot be built solely on a formal-legal foundation but must begin with a recognition of social history, the existence of local actors, and the symbolic meanings attached to forest spaces by the community.

Shared values such as social contribution, self-help initiatives, open dialogue, and aspirations for peace serve as the social capital that enables collaboration. These values were not imposed from the outside but grew from the direct experiences of conflict and injustice experienced by the parties. The company, which previously held a dominant position, began to open up space to recognize the existence and interests of the community, while the community demonstrated its adaptive capacity to bridge resistance into negotiation. These findings demonstrate that successful collaboration is not simply the result of technical facilitation, but rather the construction of shared values reinforced through reflective social interaction.

The established collaborative mechanisms involved aligning goals, designing technical strategies, strengthening local institutions, and establishing a participatory conflict resolution system. This reflects a paradigm shift from a repressive to a deliberative approach, where conflict is viewed not as a threat but as an opportunity to create more equitable relations. The role of a third party as a facilitator also proved crucial in bridging power imbalances and building communication bridges between actors. As a result, collaboration not only produced technical agreements but also fostered mutual trust and a collective commitment to sustainable forest resource management.

Theoretically, this study confirms that collaboration in resource governance must be understood as a contextual and non-linear social process, shaped by power relations, local values, and historical experiences. The frameworks of political-ecological anthropology, constructivist governance, and appreciative inquiry proved effective in uncovering hidden dimensions of the collaborative process. The practical implications of these findings are the importance of establishing reflective forums and institutional structures that enable the articulation of values and the equitable distribution of roles. The Praha Village model can be replicated in other contexts as long as there is recognition of local complexity and a willingness to build governance that is not only legal, but also socially legitimate.

## Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Budi Luhur University and the Budi Luhur Cakti Education Foundation for their support of this research and publication.

## REFERENCES:

1. Arifin, H. (2009). Report on Environmental Surveys Around Industrial Plantation Areas to Find Suitable Locations for Demonstration Plots in South Kalimantan and Jambi Provinces, Indonesia (*Laporan Survei Lingkungan Sekitar Areal HTI guna mencari lokasi yang sesuai untuk Demplot di Provinsi Kalimantan Selatan dan Provinsi Jambi Indonesia*). Jakarta: ITTO PD 396/06 Rev.2 (F).
2. Bukik's Ideas. (t.t.). Driving Appreciative Inquiry: Imagine Indonesia (*Berkendara Appreciative Inquiry: Imagine Indonesia*). Bukik's Ideas.
3. Covey, S. R. (1997). *The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People* (Indonesia Edition). Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.
4. Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

5. Elias. (2008). The Development of a Strategy for the Collaborative Forest Plantation Management in Jambi Province and South Kalimantan Province. Jakarta: ITTO PD 396/06 Rev.2 (F).
6. López, et al. (2023). Participatory Action Research: Theory and Practice in Community-Driven Social Change.
7. Manembu, A., & Alamsyah, S. (2006). Impact Assessment of the DFID Multistakeholder Forestry Program on Natural Resource Conflicts (*Kajian Dampak Program Kehutanan Multipihak-DFID terhadap Konflik Sumber Daya Alam*). Jakarta: Program Kehutanan Multipihak.
8. Maring, P. (2009). Participatory Rural Appraisal for Collaborative Plantation Forest Development (Case Study of Jambi and South Kalimantan Provinces) (*PRA untuk Pembangunan Hutan Tanaman Kolaboratif (Kasus Provinsi Jambi dan Kalimantan Selatan)*). Jakarta: ITTO PD 396/06 Rev.2(F).
9. Maring, P. (2010a). How Does Power Work Behind Conflict, Resistance, and Collaboration? An Anthropological Perspective on the Struggle for Ecological Resources (*Bagaimana Kekuasaan Bekerja di Balik Konflik, Perlawanan, dan Kolaborasi? Sebuah Sudut Pandang Antropologi tentang Perebutan Sumberdaya Ekologi*). Jakarta: Lembaga Pengkajian Antropologi Kekuasaan Indonesia.
10. Maring, P. (2010b). Resistance Strategies Under the Guise of Collaboration: An Anthropological Review of Forest Control Cases (*Strategi Perlawanan Berkedok Kolaborasi: Sebuah Tinjauan Antropologi Kasus Penguasaan Hutan*). *Buletin PARTNER*, Kupang, ISSN: 0852-6877.
11. Maring, P. (2013a). Analysis and Mapping of Stakeholders in Forest Control. Training Materials for Forest Control Conflict Resolution (*Analisis dan Pemetaan Stakeholders dalam Penguasaan Hutan*. Materi Pelatihan Resolusi Konflik Penguasaan Hutan). Jakarta: Lembaga Wana Aksara.
12. Maring, P. (2013b). Transforming Conflict into Collaboration: The Case of Forest Control Conflict Resolution. (*Transformasi Konflik Menuju Kolaborasi: Kasus Resolusi Konflik Penguasaan Hutan*). *Jurnal INSANI*, Edisi Desember, STISIP Widuri.
13. Maring, P. (2013c). Power Working Through Resistance: The Case of Forest Control by Communities and Companies (*Kekuasaan yang Bekerja Melalui Perlawanan: Kasus Penguasaan Hutan oleh Masyarakat dan Perusahaan*). *Antropologi Indonesia*, 34(2), Artikel 7. <https://doi.org/10.7454/ai.v34i2.3971>
14. Maring, P., Vera, N., Wicaksono, B., & Reza, Y. C. (2024). Sociocultural Change, Communication, and Learning in Central Java, Indonesia. *Journal of Population and Social Studies (JPSS)*, 32, 794–812. <https://so03.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/jpss/article/view/274404>
15. Saifuddin, A. F. (2005). Contemporary Anthropology: A Critical Introduction to Paradigms (*Antropologi Kontemporer: Suatu Pengantar Kritis Mengenai Paradigma*). Jakarta: Prenada Media.
16. Santoso, H. (2004). Resistance at the Crossroads: Daily Contests in Forest Villages in Java. (*Perlawanan di Persimpangan Jalan: Kontes Harian di Desa-desa Sekitar Hutan di Jawa*). Yogyakarta: Yayasan Damar.
17. Scott, J. C. (1993). Peasant Resistance (*Perlawanan Kaum Tani*). Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
18. Suporahardjo. (2005). Collaborative Strategy and Practice: A Review. In Collaborative Management. (*Strategi dan Praktek Kolaborasi: Sebuah Tinjauan. Dalam Manajemen Kolaborasi*) (Editor: Suporahardjo). Bogor: Pustaka Latin.
19. Utama, S. (2009). Socioeconomic Survey Report for Collaborative Forest Plantation Development between Companies and Communities (*Laporan Survei Sosial Ekonomi dalam rangka Kolaborasi Pembangunan Hutan Tanaman antara Perusahaan dan Masyarakat*). Jakarta: MOF & ITTO PD 396/06 Rev.2(F).
20. Widyantoro, B. (2008). *Drafting of the Legal Framework for the Conflict Resolution Approach in Jambi Province and South Kalimantan Province*. Jakarta: ITTO PD 396/06 Rev.2 (F).
21. Wulan, Y. C., Yasmi, Y., Purba, C., & Wollenberg, E. (2004). Analysis of Forestry Sector Conflicts in Indonesia 1997–2003 (*Analisa Konflik Sektor Kehutanan di Indonesia 1997–2003*). Bogor: CIFOR dan Forest Watch Indonesia.