

Tokenism Analysis in Community Participation: A Case Study from Saung Pandu Program of Badak LNG Bontang

Restra Sewakotama¹, Arsy A. W. Hamdir², Alfah Putri³

¹*Karya Cita Konsultindo, Indonesia*

²*Resilient Indonesia, Indonesia*

³*Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Indonesia*

Email: restrasewakotama@gmail.com

Academic Editor: Nguyen Ngoc Anh

Copyright © 2023 Sewakotama et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract. Saung Pandu is an acronym for Usaha Unggulan Pertanian Terpadu, a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) program located in direct proximity to PT Badak NGL Bontang in East Kalimantan. Saung Pandu was initiated to mitigate land conflicts through community empowerment approaches. As a result, Saung Pandu has become a community development program that focuses on integrated agriculture by utilizing processed domestic wastewater from the company. This research examines the process of community empowerment and participation using the theories of empowerment and community participation. Given the intertwined nature of empowerment and participation, the empowerment process is seen as a sequence of awareness-raising, capacity building, and empowerment. Meanwhile, participation is observed through the stages of planning, implementation, benefit realization, and monitoring and evaluation. This research adopts a qualitative methodology. The findings of this study indicate that while there is an existing empowerment process, optimal participation has not been achieved. The participation that occurs is largely influenced by the historical background of conflicts between the company and the community. This is due to the segmentation of groups based on land ownership, leading to some degree of tokenism among certain parties, thereby resulting in suboptimal individual participation within the groups.

Keywords: *Corporate Social Responsibility, Empowerment Process, Participation Tokenism.*

A. INTRODUCTION

In his thesis, Sudiarmo (2017) stated that the existence of industries can have two main implications: positive externalities and negative externalities. On the positive side, the presence of industries can contribute to economic growth, welfare improvement, infrastructure development, scientific advancements, and technological progress. However, on the flip side, industries also contribute to social inequality, discrimination, marginalization of communities, and environmental pollution, including air, water, land, and noise pollution. The negative implications of industries emphasize the urgency of implementing corporate social responsibility. Social responsibility becomes a turning point for companies to reduce negative implications while promoting the realization of positive implications.

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) development began around the 1970s. The concept of CSR refers to the principle of a company's social responsibility as a form of policy that involves relationships among stakeholders, values, compliance with legal requirements, community appreciation, environmental concerns, and the business world's commitment to contributing to sustainable development (Kurniawati, 2017). The implementation of social responsibility or CSR by companies is one of the ways it is applied through a community empowerment approach. Community empowerment is the process of empowering marginalized communities by emphasizing principles of awareness, participation, community capacity building, and being locally oriented (Ife, 2018). In the process, communities and local aspects are the primary targets in the implementation of empowerment, thus active community participation is crucial. Local orientation becomes the focus of empowerment implementation

by emphasizing the urgency of empowering processes to preserve the existing values within the community. Local context also provides insights into relevant approaches in the empowerment process.

Although corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives in the form of community development have good intentions, they are not without challenges. Semantically, CSR is often seen as part of a company's business strategy to build its corporate image rather than a genuine commitment to the environment and society. This is related to one of the functions of social responsibility, which is to build a positive corporate image for investment purposes and to ensure the company's sustainability. Hofland (2012), in his research, emphasizes that the challenges faced by CSR in Indonesia are related to the perception that corporate social responsibility is seen as a charitable activity of the company, as well as the government. MVO Nederland (2012), in their research, further clarifies that the view of corporate charitable contributions to society tends to create dependence on companies, as the community sees the company as a source of funding for their needs.

The presence of companies in Indonesia is considered quite positive in their contribution to society through their social responsibilities. In 2019, there were 2,012 companies involved in social responsibility activities, and this number increased to 2,021 companies in 2020. PT Badak NGL, a nonprofit company engaged in natural gas processing and liquefaction, is one of the companies known for carrying out their social responsibilities effectively. The company was established in 1974 in Bontang City, East Kalimantan.

In 2020, one of the forms of social responsibility implemented by Badak LNG was through the Saung Pandu Program. This program was carried out through a community empowerment approach that embraced the concept of integrated farming, utilizing treated domestic wastewater from the company. The treated water was then utilized as the primary source for irrigation, supporting both fisheries and agricultural activities.

One of the factors behind the initiation of the Saung Pandu program was the presence of underlying social conflicts with the local community. Prior to the implementation of the Saung Pandu program, conflicts between the company and the community, who were vying for the land that now serves as the location for the program, were frequent. In fact, there were instances of community demonstrations demanding their rights to the land in that area. Eventually, the Saung Pandu program was conceived as a community empowerment initiative aimed at reducing conflicts through a more harmonious collaboration between the company and the community.

The Saung Pandu program faced challenges during its implementation. One of the challenges was the emergence of land ownership claims, which led to demands for monetary compensation. Several factors contributed to these challenges, such as the uncertainty that can arise from land management and the unpredictable harvest yields, which became the main stimulus for the challenges. Moreover, some individuals took advantage of their strategic positions as residents in the company's buffer zone to bolster their claims. Claims that their parents had managed the land in the past were used as a basis for making unilateral land claims. These challenges subsequently affected the level of community participation, which, when measured in terms of tokenism, was limited.

The occurrence of challenges such as member segmentation, dominance of certain individuals, and imbalanced participation can be traced back to how the program was initiated. The program's conceptualization, the methods of information dissemination by the company, and how the information is interpreted by the community all reflect the empowerment process and can have an impact on participation.

It is necessary to delve deeper into the process of interaction among actors in the initiation and development of the Saung Pandu program to understand the dynamics of conflict

management. The program was initially intended to transform social turmoil into synergistic cooperation but instead resulted in dissociative relationships among the targeted actors. Therefore, this paper aims to analyze two processes: (1) the community empowerment process in the Saung Pandu Program, and (2) the community's participation in the program management.

B. METHOD

Creswell (2019) describes qualitative research methods as an effort to explore and understand the meaning attributed by individuals or a group of people to social issues or a particular phenomenon. Straus and Corbin define qualitative methods as a theory derived from systematically collected and analyzed data through a research process (Wardhono, 2011). The empowerment within the Saung Pandu Program is analyzed within a sequential causal scheme and its relation to specific situations (in this case, the abstraction of the theory used) to explain the actual conditions within the Saung Pandu Program.

This research selects informants purposively. Informants are selected based on their knowledge level related to the research object in order to answer the research problem formulation. This study utilizes data collection techniques such as participatory observation, in-depth interviews, and literature study. Observations are conducted through regular field visits, as well as participating in community empowerment processes and activities.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. Empowerment Process

Community empowerment is essentially a process of gaining power, which can be envisioned as preconditions related to democratic principles such as participation, freedom, and representation (Bornemann & Sabine, 2019). Community empowerment is a form of criticism towards development that has often been seen as centralized and top-down, viewing individuals as objects of development (Midgley, 2020). Community empowerment serves as an evaluation of development that prioritizes community development through a community-based approach (Quimbo, 2019).

The process refers to how the outcomes are obtained and realized, as well as the active involvement of the community (Suyatna et al., 2015). Ife (2013) explains that the process encompasses aspects and outcomes such as process integrity, awareness enhancement, participation, cooperation, development pace, peace, consensus, and community building. Ife divides the perspectives of the empowerment process into several groups (Widayanti, 2012), namely:

- a. Structuralist perspective: a view that interprets empowerment as an effort to liberate individuals from fundamental structural systems or oppressive structural systems.
- b. Pluralist perspective: a view that interprets empowerment as an effort to enhance the power of individuals or groups to compete with each other within certain rules.
- c. Elitist perspective: a view that interprets empowerment as an effort to influence the elite group, form alliances with the elite, and strive for changes in elitist practices and structures.
- d. Post-structuralist perspective: a view that interprets empowerment as an effort to change discourses and appreciate subjectivity in understanding social reality.

Kartasmita (in Mulyawan, 2016), emphasizes that empowerment should be conducted through several stages, including:

- a. Creating an environment or climate that allows the potential of the community to develop, achieved by raising awareness of individual capabilities for growth.

- b. Strengthening the existing power potential of the community through stimuli in the form of financial assistance, infrastructure development, and opening access to various opportunities that will empower the community further.
- c. Protecting vulnerable communities to prevent unfair competition. Empowerment does not make the community reliant on the provided assistance, but rather encourages self-effort.

The process of empowerment is an effort to provide power to communities who lack power due to being confined by oppressive social systems and structures (Ife, 2013). Oppressive social systems and structures are forms of power implementation. Power, according to Foucault (Mudhoffir, 2013), is explained through five propositions:

- a. Power is not something acquired, achieved, used, or distributed as something that can be held or even extinguished. Instead, power operates from various places within continuously moving relations.
- b. Power relations are not hierarchical structural relations that presuppose the existence of those who dominate and those who are dominated.
- c. Power comes from below, assuming that there is no longer any separation because power encompasses both the dominated and the dominators.
- d. Power relations are intentional and non-subjective.
- e. The existence of power is always accompanied by anti-power or resistance. Resistance is not outside power relations, everyone is within power, and there is no way out of power.

When associated with community empowerment in the Saung Pandu program, individuals involved can be seen as a group with the potential to become more empowered and improve their quality of life. From this perspective, the empowerment process goes beyond strengthening or enhancing human resources capacity, but also involves strengthening social institutions by providing input and opening access to opportunities that can empower the community through their potential (Mulyawan, 2016). The potential refers to both human resources and natural resources that can be utilized. Empowerment should consider the following aspects (Noor, 2011):

- a. Target determination, meaning the empowerment process should be targeted and directed towards communities in need, and appropriately designed to address their specific needs and issues.
- b. Involvement and implementation by the targeted community. In this regard, community participation is crucial, as their involvement will support the program's effectiveness in addressing issues according to the community's needs.
- c. Utilizing a group approach, as working individually within the community would be more challenging in solving problems compared to collaborating within a group.

Ife (2013) explains that the empowerment process involves stages of awareness raising, participation, capacity building, and empowerment. Ife & Toseriero (in Indrawati, 2016) emphasize the importance of empowerment in equipping communities for sustainable change. The awareness-raising stage refers to the efforts to provide understanding to the community regarding the potential they possess, whether it is the resources in their surroundings or within themselves. Participation refers to the involvement of individuals or groups in the empowerment process.

2. Community Awareness

Community empowerment within the framework of the process can be seen in several stages: awareness, participation, capacity building, and empowerment (Ife, 2013). The awareness process is conducted through program socialization, mapping the existing potentials

and barriers in the community as issues used to raise awareness, especially regarding resource management opportunities and potential obstacles. Identifying these resource opportunities can be done through Focused Group Discussions (FGDs).

Table. List of Activities Related to Capacity Building for Saung Pandu

No	Date	FGD Activity	Number of Participants
1	December 31, 2020	FGD and The Socialization of "Saung Pandu" Program and Integrated Agricultural Enterprises Occurred in 2020.	21
2	January 2, 2020	FGD in 2020, Evaluation of activities in 2019, Approving the proposed 2020 work plan, Discussing and establishing program achievement targets based on pre-established achievement indicators	46
3	January 21, 2021	FGD in 2021, Evaluation of activities in 2020, Approving the proposed 2021 work plan, Discussing and establishing program achievement targets based on pre-established achievement indicators	25
4	January 21, 2021	FGD in 2021, Evaluation of activities in 2020, Approving the proposed 2021 work plan, Discussing and establishing program achievement targets based on pre-established achievement indicators	18
5	January 23, 2021	FGD for the restructuring of Saung Pandu group	8
6	February 11, 2022	FGD Saung Pandu	6

Source: Researcher's Documentation

3. Capacity Building

Capacity building refers to the efforts in community empowerment to enhance the capacity of individuals, organizations, and the improvement of values and norms systems (Ife, 2013). Enhancing individual capacity is done through learning processes and field support, while strengthening organizations can involve creating new organizations or reinforcing existing ones. Additionally, strengthening organizations is achieved by conducting training sessions related to the focus of Saung Pandu empowerment, with an emphasis on resource management.

From the improvement of human resources quality, the potential within individuals can be maximized, which has implications for enhancing their ability to escape from their current living conditions and achieve greater prosperity. The capacity building conducted in the empowerment of the Saung Pandu community has been accomplished through trainings aimed at enhancing knowledge.

The empowerment process aims to provide power to groups that lack strength, with two key concepts: power or strength and vulnerable groups (Ife, 2013). Capacity building shows how power is distributed to enhance strength, referring to individuals' ability to change and improve access opportunities for others (Syukri, 2010). In the process, the power to generate strength can offer solutions to the barriers they face. Implementing training related to the program's focus serves as a means of capacity building and enhancing the community's knowledge, which will become their strength in managing access to improve their well-being.

4. Empowerment

Empowerment refers to the process of granting individuals the authority to maximize their potential, giving power, authority, and opportunities to the community (Ife, 2013). In reference to the goal of empowerment, which aims to provide power or strength, empowering individuals becomes the final stage in the empowerment process. Creating a free climate becomes essential for individuals to access all the opportunities and resources they possess and/or that exist around them to improve their standard of living. In community empowerment, we can see how empowering a group is done through a release or exit strategy scheme.

In general, the exit strategy scheme described in the governance of community empowerment, which is developed by a company, can be outlined as follows:

- a. **Phase Down:** This phase involves gradually reducing the company's involvement in the program in preparation for the phase over or phase out. During this phase, the company progressively decreases its contributions and prepares for the next steps.
- b. **Phase Over:** In this phase, the full responsibility for the activities and management of the program is transferred to an institution or individual in the program implementation area. The company hands over the program's responsibilities during this phase.
- c. **Phase Out:** This phase refers to the company's complete withdrawal from the program by discontinuing resources without transferring the responsibilities to another institution or party.

In the Saung Pandu program, the empowerment process is inherently embedded in its implementation. This is demonstrated by the freedom given to the group's managers to establish markets and engage in buying and selling agricultural, livestock, and freshwater fish products. The autonomy in finding solutions by the group members, which then becomes input for the company in problem-solving, is also evident in the form of empowerment provided by the company. As a result, the beneficiaries can interpret the authority they possess to manage. This process demonstrates empowerment, granting authority over existing potential, enabling the community to improve their living standards and achieve greater prosperity.

Overall, the empowerment activities in the Saung Pandu program, funded by the company, have a duration of 5 years. In the final year of implementation, a release phase will be carried out as a form of authorization for the management of the assistance stimulus provided. Therefore, it cannot be clearly identified if this process has been conducted, as the empowerment of the Saung Pandu community has not reached the program's end period. Simply put, the release phase reflects the achievement of program objectives, aiming to build individuals who maximize their potential to achieve a prosperous standard of living.

5. Community Participation in the Saung Pandu Program

Community empowerment is a collective activity where individuals work together to develop structures that create opportunities for each party involved to become more interdependent collaboratively, aiming to achieve common goals and seeking ways that have an impact on each person and are valued by others. According to Ife (2013), the process of empowerment involves stages of awareness-raising, participation, capacity building, and empowerment. Community participation is one of the most essential stages in the empowerment process.

Arnstein explains participation metaphorically through the "ladder of participation," which consists of eight rungs (Fatimah, 2021). These eight levels of participation can be categorized into three groups of participation forms:

- a. Absence of community participation, which includes manipulation and therapy.
- b. Symbolic forms of community participation (tokenism), which encompass placation, consultation, and information-sharing.

- c. Forms of community participation that are fully controlled by the community, including partnership, delegation of authority, and community control.

The classification mentioned above can serve as a form of participation analysis to assess the parties involved, control, and distribution of power or authority (Nisa et al., 2022). The levels of participation described by Arnstein are as follows:

- a. Manipulation: The lowest level of participation where the community is exploited for the benefit of certain parties by manipulating information, promising a better situation even if it is not delivered.
- b. Therapy: Participation is seen as a form of mental maintenance. There is communication between the community and decision-makers, but it is one-way and aims to change the mindset of the community.
- c. Informing: One-way communication is established, but there is still a lack of ideas absorbed by the community, and the community has not yet had influence in their participation.
- d. Consultation: At this stage, two-way communication has been established, but the community or target beneficiaries are still unable to provide their aspirations.
- e. Placation: This stage involves two-way communication that has led to discussions between the authorities and the community. At this stage, the authorities can appoint individuals or communities to be included in the group.
- f. Partnership: At this level, the community or target beneficiaries have become equal partners with the authorities.
- g. Delegation of power: At this level, the authorities have delegated authority to the community or target beneficiaries to make decisions and solve problems, negotiate without external pressure.
- h. Community control: This level explains how good community participation is characterized by community control. It shows how the community or target beneficiaries participate in social dynamics based on the control they fully possess.

The process, inclusivity, building trust, and developing a sense of togetherness to achieve shared goals are the primary urgencies in community development. Therefore, the idea of community development can encompass and extend to all community development processes.

The results of field data analysis indicate that the Saung Pandu Program aligns with the essence of community empowerment, which requires continuous efforts to maximize community participation (Ife and Tesoriero, 2016). The aim is to actively involve every individual in the community in its processes and activities, as well as to create a better future for both the community and individuals (Ife, 2016).

Cohen and Uphoff (Kalesaran, 2013) distinguish the participation described by Ife and Tesoriero into four simpler categories:

- a. Participation in decision-making refers to involvement in decision-making based on engagement in formulating ideas or concepts in the development process. Simply put, it signifies the extent to which someone contributes ideas or concepts to development.
- b. Participation in program implementation is described as the involvement in the entire development process, including planning and execution. This includes resource management, activities, administration, coordination, program elaboration, and program implementation.
- c. Participation in benefit sharing refers to the distribution of benefits from development that can influence participation. The better the distribution of benefits from development, the more significant the participation can be, as the benefits are distributed and perceived equally by the target beneficiaries of development.

- d. Participation in the evaluation stage refers to the goal of measuring whether the implemented development program has made a significant impact, aligns with the planning, and achieves the objectives of development.

Participation in the four categories can then be distinguished into two forms of participation, namely material and non-material participation (Sagita, 2016). Ife and Tesoriero (2016) explain that the effectiveness and efficiency of participation need to be assessed to align the implementation objectives with the ongoing process. Community participation in the Saung Pandu Program can be analyzed in terms of participation in the various stages of community development or empowerment, including participation in planning, implementation, benefit sharing, and evaluation of community development.

6. Community Participation in Planning and Decision-Making

Program Saung Pandu is a community empowerment program that is formulated based on observations of natural resources and human resources potential. According to the quoted interview, the planning process, which includes the exploration of potential and issues, as well as the determination of goals and steps to address problems, actively involves the local community and stakeholders.

The involvement of the community is the starting point for efforts to create an inclusive climate in the Saung Pandu Program to raise awareness among the community about their own potential and the potential that exists around them. According to Ife and Tesoriero (2016), participation in development planning, including decision-making (plan formulation), is crucial.



Figure 1. Documentation of Saung Pandu Program Socialization

The image above illustrates the involvement of the community in the initiation and socialization of the Saung Pandu Program. The involvement in the planning process emphasizes the community's ability to participate in political activities, which include expressing aspirations and making decisions for themselves.

The inclusive empowerment approach, through two-way dialogue between the community and other stakeholders in the program, reinforces a form of empowerment that exists at the post-structuralist level. This form of empowerment considers discourse within a social entity, where subjectification and objectification are examined to understand social reality (Ife, 2016). The involvement of stakeholders and the community highlights a process of empowerment that prioritizes locality and synergy among different sectors in order to build an inclusive community empowerment initiative that targets the right areas.

7. Community Participation in Implementation

Participation in Implementation is described as a form of engagement that encompasses the entire development process, including planning and execution. It involves various aspects

such as resource management, activities, administration, coordination, program elaboration, and program execution (Kalesaran, 2013).



Figure 2. The Process of Building Saung Pandu Warehouse

Non-material participation at the implementation level includes the active involvement of community members in voluntarily and cooperatively building program infrastructure. Material participation refers to the financial contribution from the community allocated to infrastructure development activities. The community's financial participation demonstrates their empowerment to purchase both small and large commodities. The development process supported financially by group members reflects their desire to actively engage in improving their living standards through the Saung Pandu Program. Participation in implementation, as shown by the contributions of group members to infrastructure development and group advancement, represents participation in the operational execution of the established plan (Ife and Tesoriero, 2016).

8. Community Participation in Benefit Realization Refers

The sales of agricultural, fisheries, and livestock products are carried out independently by group members. Community participation can be identified as having a reasonably good level. The entire process of agriculture, fisheries, and livestock, from upstream to downstream, is independently conducted by the beneficiaries. The self-reliance in benefiting from the process demonstrates community participation in a non-material form. As explained by Ife and Tesoriero (2016), this type of participation involves receiving, maintaining, and developing the outcomes of development (participation in benefits).



Figure 3. Documentation of Aquaponic Agricultural Activities at Saung Pandu

The participation in benefiting from this is derived from the company's infrastructure development and capacity building efforts in the Saung Pandu Program. All stages of the process are carried out by group members. As beneficiaries, group members are able to assess the extent to which empowerment is implemented according to the plan and the extent to which

the outcomes can fulfill the community's needs, thereby generating participation (Ife and Tesoriero, 2016).

9. Participation in Evaluation

Participation in the evaluation stage, as explained by Cohen and Uphoff, refers to the aim of measuring whether the implemented development program has been able to deliver significant impact, align with the planning, and achieve the development goals (Kalesaran, 2013). Monitoring and evaluation are conducted whenever needed by the company, involving the community in the process.



Figure 4. Documentation of FGD for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Saung Pandu

The issues that arise during implementation and the training outcomes are then elaborated in the evaluation instrument, which subsequently becomes the basis for field monitoring. The problems are recorded based on reports from the community as beneficiaries and the implementers in the field. Solutions are sought through discussions with the beneficiaries who directly carry out the program. The participation of group members is identified as non-material participation, involving ideas and suggestions for problem-solving, as well as their effort in the execution. Group members can think critically and provide constructive solutions to the existing issues. Empowerment through these steps represents an inclusive approach that prioritizes the local aspects in the empowerment process undertaken by the company.

Ife and Tesoriero (2016) explain that qualitative indicators of empowerment position the community as beneficiaries who are capable of expanding their participation in decision-making processes within broader forums, fostering networking with other organizations, and having their ideas influence the implementation process, thereby transforming ideas into actions.

10. Challenges in Community Participation

The process of community empowerment is a collective activity that focuses on local aspects. Local aspects are a key element in empowering the community to address issues effectively. Simply put, locality can be described as the perspective used to view problems from the beneficiaries' standpoint, as well as to find solutions to those problems. Local perspectives can be realized by selecting a local hero or an individual with potential as a leader within the social group in the community. The strength of a local hero is needed to provide understanding from the beneficiaries' perspective. However, if their influence becomes too dominant, it can hinder achieving active community participation.

In the Saung Pandu Program, there are constraints in achieving community participation as both a process and a goal. Similar to the concept of tokenism, where strong domination exists from the group leader or local hero, in the Saung Pandu Program, the

influence of the group leader is less dominant compared to the daily management committee. Arnstein (in Nisa et al., 2022) explains that participation at this stage is characterized by the absence of genuine participation. The involvement of group members throughout the Saung Pandu Program appears to be superficial. The expression of aspirations differs among individuals, and reaching a midpoint or consensus becomes challenging. Additionally, there are constraints from each member or daily responsible party that are quite dominant, making it difficult to find common ground in cases of differing opinions. The authority of the group leader is also considered not strong enough to effectively manage the organization.

Members of the group who are more dominant tend to accommodate information more, resulting in the program moving in line with the interests of the more dominant group members. According to Foucault (Mudhoffir, 2013), domination becomes a form of power practice that implicates a situation where the range of choices for subject actions is severely limited. In line with this, less dominant group members have limited room to maneuver in the Saung Pandu Program, leading them to choose not to be extensively involved. The program is accommodated based on the interests of each dominant group member in program management. The participation of group members becomes an abstraction of land ownership and group segmentation. The flow of information in program management does not ensure comprehensive accommodation of the needs of group members. Ultimately, the involvement of group members is perceived as mere attendance statistics rather than active participation by members who share the common goal of improving well-being through program implementation.

D. CONCLUSION

The community empowerment process in the Saung Pandu program has been conducted well, but it lacks optimal community participation. Community participation in planning and decision-making, implementation, benefit realization, monitoring, and evaluation is predominantly dominated by a few group members. The assumption that the program implementation is limited to group members who claim to have land in the Saung Pandu program area is a major constraint. This assumption affects the planning and decision-making level, where most of the ideas and suggestions come from members who feel they have rights over the land used for the Saung Pandu location. This is evident from the fact that out of the 47 group members listed in the Formation Decree, only 8-10 individuals actively participate in Saung Pandu activities. This is further supported by the decrease in the involvement of group members in Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) conducted annually. Other community members who wish to be involved in the Saung Pandu group or Saung Pandu group members who do not feel they have land rights are ultimately marginalized.

Based on the conducted research, a well-implemented community empowerment process does not necessarily guarantee optimal community participation. The background of program implementation initiated by the company and the community's understanding of land ownership status are influential factors in community empowerment and participation. The location background of Saung Pandu empowerment activities essentially leads to more participation that accommodates only a few members.

REFERENCES

1. Logho, M. A., Resmawan, E., Alaydrus, A., & Barat, K. G. T. K. B. (2019). Peran Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) PT. Badak NGL dalam Perberdayaan Masyarakat di Kelurahan Gunung Telihan Kota Bontang. *eJournal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 7(1), 51-64.
2. Badan Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Nasional. (2009). *Pedoman Evaluasi Kinerja Pembangunan Sektoral*. Jakarta: Badan Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Nasional.

3. Banks, M. A., Vera, D., Pathak, S., & Ballard, K. (2016). Stakeholder management as a source of competitive advantage. *Organizational dynamics*, 1(45), 18-27.
4. Bornemann, B., & Weiland, S. (2019). Empowering people—Democratising the food system? Exploring the democratic potential of food-related empowerment forms. *Politics and Governance*, 7(4), 105-118.
5. Carroll, A. B. (2015). Corporate social responsibility: The centerpiece of competing and complementary frameworks. *Organizational Dynamics*, 44(2), 87–96
6. Creswell, J. W. (2019). *Research Design Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Campuran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
7. Crowther, D., & Aras, G. (2008). *Corporate social responsibility*. Bookboon.
8. Fahlepy, R. F. (2019). Kendala Penerapan Corporate Social Responsibility dalam Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. *Jurnal de jure*, 11(1).
9. Fatimah. (2021). Model Partisipasi Perempuan dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Bidang Kesehatan di Kabupaten Jayapura. (*Univeristas Hasanudin Makasar*).
10. Firmansyah, H. (2012). Ketercapaian Indikator Keberdayaan Masyarakat dalam Program Pemberdayaan Fakir Miskin (P2FM) di Kota Banjarmasin. *Jurnal Agribisnis Pedesaan*, 02(02).
11. Hadi, A. P. (2010). Konsep pemberdayaan, partisipasi dan kelembagaan dalam pembangunan. *Yayasan Agribisnis/Pusat Pengembangan Masyarakat Agrikarya (PPMA)*.
12. Harahap, A. S. (2010). Pengaturan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) di Indonesia. *Lex Jurnalica*, 7(3), 18021.
13. Hofland, I. (2012). *Research Thesis the Relationships Between CSR and Competitiveness: The Indonesian Case*. Enschede: University of Twente.
14. Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2016). Alternatif Pengembangan Masyarakat di Era Globalisasi Community Development. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
15. Ife, J. (2013). *Community Development in An Uncertain World, Vision, Analysis and Practice*. Australia: Cambridge University Press.
16. Ilham, A. (2013). Upaya Pemerintah Medorong Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan di Wilayah Kecamatan Bontang Barat. *Jurnal Administrasi Reform*, 1(1).
17. Indrawati, D. R., Faida, L. R. W., & Maryudi, A. M. (2016). Pemberdayaan masyarakat dalam pengelolaan das mikro: Konsep dan implementasi. *Jurnal Kawistara*, 6(2), 175-187.
18. Ismail et al. (2014). *Implementasi Program Corporate Social Responsibility terhadap Warga dan Lingkungan di Kelurahan Guntung (Studi Kasus pada Departemen Humas PT. Pupuk Kaltim)*. Samarinda: Universitas Mulawarman.
19. Kalesaran, F. (2015). Partisipasi dalam program nasional pemberdayaan masyarakat mandiri perkotaan kelurahan Taas Kota Manado. *Jurnal Ilmiah Society*, 1(15), 56-73.
20. Kurniawati, W. (2017). Evaluasi Program Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Dalam Pendidikan Daerah Lingkar Tambang. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan: Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pembelajaran*, 2(2), 88-98.
21. Laksana, N. S. (2013). Bentuk-bentuk partisipasi masyarakat desa dalam program desa siaga di Desa Bandung, Kecamatan Playen, Kabupaten Gunung Kidul, Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Jurnal kebijakan dan manajemen publik*, 1(1), 56-66.
22. Lindawati, A. S. L., & Puspita, M. E. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility: Implikasi Stakeholder dan Legitimacy Gap dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Perusahaan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*, 6(1), 157-174.

23. Mardikanto, T. (2018). *CSR Corporate Social Responsibility Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
24. Midgley, J. (2020). *Pembangunan Sosial Teori & Praktik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
25. Motik, S. S. et al. (2015). *Pedoman KADIN tentang Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan (CSR) untuk Mendukung Pembangunan Berkelanjutan*. Jakarta.
26. Mulyawan, R. (2016). *Masyarakat, Wilayah, dan Pembangunan*. Bandung: UNPAD Press.
27. Mudhoffir, A. M. (2014). Teori kekuasaan Michel Foucault: Tantangan bagi sosiologi politik. *MASYARAKAT: Jurnal Sosiologi*, 75-100.
28. MVO Nederland, CSR Netherlands. (2016). *Research Publications: Country Scan CSR in Indonesia*. CSR Netherlands.
29. Noor, M. (2011). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat. *CIVIS: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, 01(02).
30. Nisa, S. L., Nurhadi, E., & Hendrarini, H. (2022). Mengukur Keseriusan Petani Dalam Mengikuti Program Asuransi Usahatani Padi Berdasarkan Tangga Partisipasi Arnstein. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Agroinfo Galuh*, 9(1), 351-361.
31. Nugraha, G. I. K. (2017). Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan (CSR) PT. Antam, Tbk. (Studi Literatur Aspek Ekonomi, Sosial, dan Lingkungan). *Vocatio*, 2(1), 546901.
32. Nugroho, E. R. (2014). Politik Hukum Pembaharuan Undang-Undang Nomor 40 Tahun 2007 tentang Perseroan Terbatas (Kajian Pasal 74 beserta Penjelasannya). *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, 21(3), 485-506.
33. Primahendra, R. (2018). *Mengelola CSR*. Jakarta: AMERTA Consulting and Resourcing.
34. PT Badak NGL. (2020). *Laporan CSR PT Badak NGL Tahun 2020*.
35. PT Badak NGL. (2019). *Laporan CSR PT Badak NGL Tahun 2019*.
36. PT Badak NGL. (2018). *Laporan CSR PT Badak NGL Tahun 2018*.
37. PT Badak NGL. (2017). *Laporan CSR PT Badak NGL Tahun 2017*.
38. Quimbo, M. A. T., Perez, J. E. M., & Tan, F. O. (2018). Community development approaches and methods: Implications for community development practice and research. *Community Development*, 49(5), 589-603.
39. Retnaningsih, H. (2015). *Permasalahan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) dalam Rangka Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (The Problem on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) for Community Empowerment)*. Jakarta: Pusat Pengkajian Pengolahan Data dan Informasi (P3DI) Sekertariat Jendral DPR RI.
40. Sagita, N. I. (2016). Partisipasi Warga Masyarakat dalam Penilaian Kinerja Kecamatan di Kota Bandung. *Cosmogov*, 2(2), 308-329.
41. Santoso, M. B., & Raharjo, S. T. (2014). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) dari sudut pandang perusahaan. *Share: Social Work Journal*, 4(1).
42. Sudiarso, M. D. P. (2017). *Pengaturan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Setelah Berlakunya Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 47 Tahun 2012 tentang Tanggung Jawab Sosial dan Lingkungan Perseroan Terbatas* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Gadjah Mada).
43. Sunaryo, B., & Utama, H. (2017). Evaluasi dan Analisis Dampak Program *Corporate Social Responsibility* Badak LNG. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, 6(3).
44. Sugiyono. (2018). *Metode Penelitian Evaluasi (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan Kombinasi)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
45. Suharto, E. (2009). *Membangun Masyarakat Memberdayakan Rakyat, Kajian Strategis Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Sosial dan Pekerjaan Sosial*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
46. Sukihana, I. A., & Kurniawan, I. G. A. (2017). Tanggung Jawab Sosial Perusahaan dari Profit menuju Stakeholders Oriented Studi CSR di Tabanan. *Kertha Patrika*, 39(03).

47. Suyatna, H., et al. (2015). *Pembangunan Masyarakat: Sebuah Analisis Komparatif*. Yogyakarta: Azzagrafika.
48. Syukri, M. (2010). Otonomi Pemberdayaan: Refleksi Pendidikan bagi Pemberdayaan Perempuan. *Jurnal Visi Ilmu Pendidikan*, 02(01).
49. Undang Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor. 23 Tahun 1997 tentang Lingkungan Hidup
50. Undang Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor. 25 Tahun 2007 tentang Penanaman Modal
51. Undang Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor. 40 Tahun 2007 tentang Perseroan Terbatas
52. Utama, H., & Sunaryo, B. (2018). Evaluasi dan Analisis Dampak Program *Corporate Social Responsibility* Badak LNG. *Economics Development Analysis Journal*, 6(3), 366-385.
53. Wardhono, V. J. W. (2011). Penelitian Grounded Theory, Apakah Itu. *Bina Ekonomi: Majalah Ilmiah Fakultas Ekonomi Unpar*, 15(1), 23-35.
54. Widayanti, S. (2012). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: Pendekatan Teoritis. *Jurnal Welfare, Jurnal Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial*, 01(01).