

## COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND SOCIAL RECONSTRUCTION POST NATURAL DISASTERS BASED ON LOCAL WISDOM IN SIGI DISTRICT CENTRAL SULAWESI PROVINCE

Hasan Muhamad<sup>1,\*</sup>, Dewi Cahyawati Abdulah<sup>2</sup>, Nora Ariani<sup>2</sup>, Afdal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Departemen of Sociology, Tadulako University, Sulawesi Tengah, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Pancamarga Institute of Administrative Science, Sulawesi Tengah, Indonesia

Corresponding author email: [hajirrr110@gmail.com](mailto:hajirrr110@gmail.com)

### Article Info

Received: Sep 04, 2024

Revised: Apr 19, 2025

Accepted: May 25, 2025

OnlineVersion: Jun 01, 2025

### Abstract

This study investigates two key objectives: (1) the role of community participation and social reconstruction following the earthquake and liquefaction disaster in Sigi Regency and (2) the strategic utilization of local wisdom as a foundational element for long-term recovery and resilience. Employing a qualitative research design, the study collected both primary and secondary data through observations, in-depth interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), and documentation, supported by the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) approach to ensure community engagement and contextual depth. Findings reveal that post-disaster community participation was notably high, with active involvement in reconstruction efforts, leading to widespread support for rehabilitation programs initiated by both governmental and traditional institutions. Furthermore, the revival and application of the molibu tradition, a local wisdom-based reconciliation and decision-making practice, emerged as a powerful cultural mechanism that significantly enhanced social reconstruction. The study found that, before incorporating this tradition, there was limited participation from key community actors, particularly traditional leaders. This research presents a culturally grounded model of disaster recovery, emphasizing the integration of Indigenous knowledge systems, such as Molibu, into formal post-disaster management strategies. It contributes to both academic discourse and practical policy by producing a Sinta-indexed journal article, a localized disaster management textbook, and recommendations for regional policymaking. The study also advocates for the institutionalization of local wisdom at the village level, ensuring its transmission across generations and its sustainability as a tool for resilience in disaster-prone communities.

**Keywords:** Community Participation; Local Wisdom; Post Disaster; Social Reconstruction



© 2025 by the author(s)

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

---

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a country that is highly vulnerable to disasters due to its geographical, geological, hydrological, and demographic conditions. According to Law Number 24 of 2007 on Disaster Management, the potential for both natural and human-induced disasters is considerable, with the capacity to cause loss of life, environmental degradation, material damage, and long-term psychological trauma. One of the most severe disasters in recent memory occurred on September 28, 2018, when a 7.4 magnitude earthquake struck Central Sulawesi Province, triggering a tsunami and liquefaction. The impact was devastating, especially in four key regions: Palu City, Sigi Regency, Donggala Regency, and Parigi Moutong Regency. In Sigi Regency alone, the disaster claimed 453 lives, injured 807 people, and caused extensive damage to more than 30,000 homes, with economic losses exceeding IDR 6.9 trillion (National Earthquake Study Center Team, 2018). The severity of this disaster disrupted not only infrastructure and livelihoods but also the social and cultural fabric of affected communities.

In disaster-prone areas such as Sigi Regency, effective disaster management must go beyond technical interventions and institutional preparedness. Community participation is essential, particularly in the post-disaster phase where social recovery and reconstruction are critical (Charles et al., 2022; Zhong et al., 2022; Carrasco et al., 2023; Ngulube, 2024; Ngulube et al., 2024; Mushtaha et al., 2025). However, this participation is most effective when grounded in the cultural values and traditional wisdom of the local community. Indigenous practices offer valuable tools for social resilience, solidarity, and collective decision-making. One such tradition is *molibu*, a customary practice of the Kaili ethnic group in Central Sulawesi. *Molibu* is a form of communal dialogue and deliberation that involves representatives of various elements in the village to collectively address problems and make binding decisions. It reflects a deep-rooted cultural mechanism for maintaining harmony, resolving conflict, and ensuring that community actions are carried out with mutual responsibility and accountability.

Despite the growing recognition of local wisdom in disaster risk reduction, many existing studies have primarily focused on pre-disaster mitigation or institutional recovery mechanisms. For example, Efendi et al. (2022) investigated the role of local wisdom in early warning systems during the mitigation phase but did not explore its role in post-disaster social reconstruction. Muchlis et al. (2022) emphasized the importance of social capital in community resilience but did not delve into traditional cultural practices such as *molibu*. Farel et al. (2024) assessed community participation in tourism development, which, although methodologically similar, did not address disaster contexts. Meanwhile, Santoso Meilanny Budiarti et al. (2017) documented how local knowledge helps communities detect disaster signs, yet this research focused on disaster prevention rather than recovery. Irdansyah and Meiyani (2018) explored the reconstruction role of Village-Owned Enterprises in Bima Regency but lacked cultural grounding and focused on economic, not social, aspects. These studies show a common limitation—they do not adequately examine how local cultural wisdom guides post-disaster social reconstruction, particularly in a context as complex and vulnerable as Sigi Regency.

This gap is significant because disaster recovery is not only about rebuilding physical infrastructure but also about restoring social order, cohesion, and identity. The absence of cultural integration in post-disaster programs often results in disconnection between recovery efforts and community values. Therefore, this study aims to fill this gap by exploring how community participation and social reconstruction efforts in Sigi Regency are shaped by local wisdom, with a specific focus on the *molibu* tradition. Given that Sigi is located along the Palu-Koro fault line and faces multiple high-risk threats—earthquakes, landslides, floods, forest fires, and liquefaction—understanding and utilizing cultural mechanisms like *molibu* becomes crucial for sustainable recovery.

This study investigates two key objectives: (1) the role of community participation and social reconstruction following the earthquake and liquefaction disaster in Sigi Regency, and (2) the strategic utilization of local wisdom as a foundational element for long-term recovery and resilience. By highlighting the strength of community-based cultural practices in disaster management, this research seeks to contribute both theoretically and practically to the discourse on disaster resilience. It offers valuable insights for policymakers, NGOs, and disaster response actors on how culturally sensitive approaches can enhance the effectiveness of recovery efforts and ensure that communities not only rebuild but emerge stronger and more united after disaster strikes.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts the principles of qualitative methodology as the foundation of the research, as stated by Moleong (2008), who explains that this type of research aims to understand phenomena as they naturally occur. In line with this, Endraswara (2006) emphasizes the perspective of local residents, while Faisal (2010) underlines the objective of research to reveal phenomena as they are. The rationale for using a qualitative approach is that it allows greater flexibility in interaction between the researcher and the research subjects, thereby ensuring more accurate information discovery. The subjects in this study consisted of 16 individuals, comprising: 1) Village heads from the three villages; 2) The Disaster Risk Reduction Forum; Disaster preparedness teams/Disaster alert groups/Disaster relief volunteers; and 3) Partners from Non-Governmental Organizations. Informants were selected purposively (intentionally) based on the following considerations: 1) The Disaster Risk Reduction Forum, which includes representatives of community leaders, traditional leaders, religious leaders, educators, entrepreneurs, women leaders, and youth leaders; 2) Village governments considered to understand the problems in the village, including community participation; 3) Non-governmental organizations involved in disaster management programs, namely Perkumpulan Imunitas Sulawesi Tengah.

In addition to in-depth interviews, this study also conducted Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) at the village level as part of the Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) method, as stated by Muhamad et al. (2022, p. 29), involving parties directly related to the core issues of the research. The object of this research is community participation and post-disaster social reconstruction based on local wisdom. The research locations are: 1) Jono Oge Village, Sigi Biromaru Sub-district; 2) Lolu Village, Sigi Biromaru Sub-district; and 3) North Sibalaya Village, Tanambulava Sub-district, Sigi Regency, Central Sulawesi Province. Data analysis was adjusted according to the problems and objectives of the research, starting from the field entry phase and continuing until a conclusion was reached. The final step of the qualitative analysis process is to provide answers to the research questions as stated by Nasution (2023). In addition, the researcher also conducted data and information triangulation, as explained by Mikkelsen (2011) and Muhamad et al. (2022).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### *Community Participation*

Community participation is essential in every development program, particularly in social reconstruction, as stated in laws and government regulations that explicitly open space for community participation, especially for affected communities and groups. However, in its development, community participation has received little attention; even when it exists, it tends to be forced or coerced. From a terminological point of view, public participation can be defined as a relationship between two groups: the group that is not involved in decision-making and the group that has the authority to make decisions. According to Goulet (1989), community participation is essentially a way to discuss the material incentives they need. In line with this, Ife & Tesoriero (2016) emphasize that community participation is the active involvement of individuals and community groups in the decision-making process and in the implementation of development programs. Community participation can take various forms, such as involvement in planning, implementation, monitoring, and program evaluation (Uphoff, 1992; Khatibi et al., 2021; Huttunen et al., 2022; Kiss et al., 2022; Auliya & Putri, 2024; Halimah et al., 2024; Rahmayanti, M., & Kwalat, 2024).

Community participation in disaster-related matters is still considered inadequate, as people perceive that when a disaster occurs, it becomes a personal and governmental responsibility—particularly that of the village government. Therefore, individual responsibility does not become institutionalized as social responsibility. Ideally, anticipation before, during, and after a disaster should be built as an important element to minimize the impact of a disaster. After the disaster occurred, the anxiety of residents in the three villages drove them to cooperate with the village government and related parties. The cooperation among villagers can be seen in the repair of the Gumbasa River irrigation system, which was non-technical (emergency-based) due to the earthquake, and was quickly completed so that farming land, plantations, and fishponds owned by the community could be cultivated again to restore the economy. Community participation after the disaster was mainly driven by solidarity over shared circumstances and mutual needs for irrigation water that was cut off and had rendered productive land abandoned. As explained by Shet Ariyanto, the village secretary of Jono Oge, there was collaboration among community members to repair the irrigation system, albeit limited to

their abilities, because a complete repair would require not only funds but also heavy machinery. Therefore, the community agreed to restore the irrigation system temporarily while waiting for full repairs by the government.

Community participation in the village began with a large meeting (*molibu desa*), meaning *molibu* was conducted by involving all community representatives, including traditional leaders, youth leaders, women leaders, and representatives of the village government. The *molibu* culture is rarely practiced in terms of disaster preparedness, even though Sigi Regency is categorized as a disaster-prone area. However, after the disaster, a new awareness emerged: that participation will receive support from the community if they are involved from the beginning—before the disaster, in terms of preparation; during the disaster, in terms of what actions should be taken; and after the disaster, in terms of recovery efforts.

During the earthquake and liquefaction disaster, the area of Dusun II, RT III was swept away as far as Vou Village, which borders Langaleso Village and Dusun I. Other areas such as Dusun III, IV, and V were also affected. At that time, residents of Jono Oge Village evacuated separately. On the initiative of some community members and the village government, efforts were made to collect data and locate Jono Oge residents scattered in various evacuation sites in neighboring villages to regroup them into a unified evacuation block. As a result of this experience, a strong determination emerged to cooperate—from recording casualties to building temporary shelters. Due to the series of disasters and community needs, it was deemed necessary to establish a Disaster Risk Reduction Forum, initiated by an NGO and formalized by a village head decree. Its organizational structure consisted of various community leaders. This forum maintained good coordination with the NGOs. The presence of this institution marked a new milestone in community participation, which had been previously absent. Through the establishment of this forum, several programs were introduced such as disaster awareness campaigns, disaster mitigation, creation of evacuation maps, designation of assembly points, and installation of hazard signs. Community participation was evident in many forms: ideas, money, material contributions, and labor (Mustanir et al., 2022).

Following the disaster, many parties participated, including NGOs such as Islamic Relief, ACT, and Wahana, who supported the village especially in forming the Disaster Preparedness Team. Their contributions included clothing, food, and disaster education. Most aid was provided post-disaster; however, social preparedness as part of social reconstruction was not implemented before the disaster (e.g., understanding natural warning signs or preparation measures) nor during the disaster (e.g., emergency actions and unsocialized evacuation routes). Hence, community participation in the three villages—Jono Oge, Lolu, and Sibalaya Utara—was minimal during the pre-disaster phase (in terms of disaster knowledge) and during the disaster itself. This was due to their exclusion from the design of various disaster-related programs.

Participation was not only from external parties, but also from village governments. As stated by the Village Head of Lolu, Imran Ladjedi, he coordinated his community regarding essential needs after the disaster. He urged the village officials to allocate budget for rice supplies to support the evacuees, especially those affected by liquefaction. At the time, the community could not fully support basic needs due to their own hardships. Their assistance was limited to labor, such as helping distribute aid to evacuation tents (interview, July 22, 2023). This statement illustrates that while community participation did exist during the disaster, it was limited—mostly in the form of labor contributions in building shelters, recording victims, and distributing basic aid.

Similarly, the Village Head of Jono Oge (Darius) stated that a few days after the disaster, he and village officials gathered residents who had evacuated separately, to centralize them for easier aid distribution and to establish a temporary settlement. The construction of temporary shelters received a positive response from the community as a form of their participation (interview, June 9, 2023).

### *Social Reconstruction*

Reconstruction can be interpreted as the process of rebuilding something to restore it to its original condition. In this context, reconstruction carries essential values that must remain present in every rebuilding program. Economic and social aspects are expected to return to, at the very least, their previous conditions (Irdansyah & Meiyani, 2018). Disaster risk reduction is a development strategy that emphasizes the empowerment of individuals and communities with the goal of increasing capacity (Efendi et al., 2022). Therefore, social construction is built upon the reality within a society based on institutionalized traditions. In social life, social construction of reality is understood as a social process

through action, which leads to the recovery of various aspects of life. Capacity-building for individuals and communities is a part of this social reconstruction.

In this study, reconstruction is based on field realities, indicating that social reconstruction emerged from community participation and the role of external parties who empathized with the suffering caused by the disaster. As Ngangi (2011) explains, social construction includes claims and viewpoints on how to relate to others, taught through cultural transformation. Similarly, Turner (2012) emphasizes that structural social events that reflect social order can be the result of egalitarian negotiation rather than exploitation and domination. The main issue lies in human experience of the world, which is always based on socially inherited meanings (Turner, 2012; Ingold, 2022; Rolla, & Figueiredo, 2023; Slavich et al., 2023; Anriani & Nasution, 2024; Hasibuan et al., 2024; Muis et al., 2024).

Social construction during the 2018 natural disaster in Sigi Regency can be observed in two aspects: physical (structural mitigation) and psychological (non-structural mitigation). Physical reconstruction was more prominent, such as the construction of temporary shelters during the event and permanent housing post-disaster for survivors. As stated by the Village Head of Jono Oge, shortly after the earthquake and liquefaction, rehabilitation and infrastructure reconstruction efforts began, involving parties like UNDP in collaboration with the IMUNITAS Association for demolishing uninhabitable buildings through labor-intensive programs, and social recovery by IDEP Bali and YPAL (Yayasan Panorama Alam Lestari) in disaster response. Additionally, the NGO ADRA assisted with economic recovery by forming livestock business groups (interview, June 9, 2023). Through reconstruction, the physical burden on the community was somewhat alleviated, especially considering Jono Oge was one of the worst-hit villages—not only by the earthquake but also by liquefaction, which wiped out its prized agricultural lands. According to Shet Ariyanto, the Village Secretary of Jono Oge, the village had once been a model village in agriculture (interview, June 9, 2023). Structural mitigation efforts contributed to restoring the social condition of the community, even if not to its exact original state, at least to a level where people felt their burden was lessened. This return to pre-disaster conditions fostered solidarity through shared suffering, which in turn encouraged more active participation (Ayuningtyas, 2022).

As for non-structural social reconstruction (psychological aspect), it was carried out through disaster awareness campaigns, the formation of a Disaster Risk Reduction Forum (FPRB), and capacity-building efforts by both the government and NGOs. These efforts were recognized as beneficial. A member of the FPRB stated that post-disaster activities such as disaster awareness campaigns and disaster simulations conducted by NGO facilitators brought joy and laughter among participants, helping them gradually forget their sadness. This was echoed by Shadiq Maumbu, S.Sos., M.Si. (Director of IMUNITAS Central Sulawesi and Chairman of the Provincial Disaster Risk Reduction Forum), who stated that what had been done by the FPRB needed further institutional and community capacity enhancement in disaster management. Through this capacity-building, emotional recovery gradually took place (interview, September 8, 2023).

Awareness campaigns and simulations were part of educating the community on disaster causes, response, and evacuation procedures (Ayu et al., 2024). Community responses to these programs reflected their involvement—they enthusiastically supported each program, though some pre-disaster and during-disaster programs still lacked community inclusion. This was acknowledged by Saiful Taslim (Chair of the Sigi District Disaster Reduction Forum), who stated that it was essential to involve communities in every program and enhance the quality and quantity of the Regional Disaster Management Agency, particularly in supporting the formation of disaster-resilient villages. (interview, September 22, 2023). Due to these continuous efforts, by 2021, Sigi Regency had established around 30 disaster-resilient villages, including Jono Oge Village (Sigi Biromaru Subdistrict), Sibalaya Utara Village (Tanambulava Subdistrict), and Lolu Village (Sigi Biromaru Subdistrict) in Sigi Regency, Central Sulawesi Province (Sigi District Community and Village Empowerment Office, 2021).

### *Local Wisdom*

Local wisdom as a tradition not only functions as a means to preserve cultural identity, but also as a platform to strengthen social bonds and solidarity among community members. As seen in the ombo culture of the Lindu indigenous people, who wisely utilize lake resources as a form of local wisdom (Saleh et al., 2024). This shows that local wisdom tends to maintain the balance between nature and humans, as exemplified by the Bajo tribe who uphold harmony between humans and the

environment (Samudin & Muhamad, 2023). In line with this, as stated by Njatrijani (2018), wisdom is a way of life, local knowledge, and life strategies in responding to various needs. Etymologically, local wisdom consists of two words: wisdom and local. According to Taufan et al., (2023), other terms for local wisdom include local knowledge and local genius. Local wisdom is formed by wise and prudent attitudes in understanding matters related to life sustainability, particularly concerning natural resources and the environment. These wise attitudes are passed down from generation to generation, such as *molibu*, which is a tradition inherited from previous generations (Santoso et al., 2017)

In the process of planning beneficiaries, it should not be determined unilaterally, but rather through *molibu* (deliberation) at the village level. This is because local communities understand their living conditions better than outsiders. *Molibu* as a tradition among communities in Central Sulawesi, especially in Sigi Regency, is a vital pillar in building harmony and achieving shared goals (Rus'an & Muhamad, 2023). Philosophically, *molibu* is a method used for problem-solving and collective decision-making. Basically, *molibu* is a process of dialogue and discussion conducted by a group of people to reach a consensus. In the local context, *molibu* is not only seen as a decision-making mechanism but also as a manifestation of noble values that form the foundation of society. Through *molibu*, individuals from different backgrounds can respect, listen to, and understand one another. This emphasizes the importance of collective decision-making by considering the aspirations and interests of all involved parties. Socio-cultural factors can influence the education system, which shows that local wisdom becomes the foundation for decision-making in the community.

The main goal of *molibu* is to reach a fair, wise, and mutually accepted decision. In this process, each individual has an equal opportunity to express their opinion, and all perspectives are considered equally. Through *molibu*, various interests and different viewpoints can be discussed and harmonized. This enables the creation of comprehensive solutions that fulfill the aspirations of all parties. The decisions made through *molibu* have binding power and are carried out with full responsibility. *Molibu* can be applied in program planning by involving all parties, and decisions from *molibu* tend to generate participation from all members, because the program becomes part of them—protected and ensured to run sustainably.

*Molibu* is a tradition of the Kaili ethnic group in resolving problems, a tradition preserved and practiced by local communities. However, after natural disasters, outsiders often don't understand this tradition, so their participation in social reconstruction tends to be limited or seem indifferent. As stated by Ardad Saleh (59 years old), a traditional leader in North Sibalaya Village, several years after the disaster, outsiders only started involving traditional leaders in forming village groups that care about disaster response. "Before the earthquake and liquefaction, we from the traditional institution were not involved in the outreach stage—what to do if a disaster occurred? Our position was merely spectators in the program. That made us reluctant to be involved, because we weren't invited." (interview, July 10, 2023). Ardad Saleh also acknowledged that *molibu* holds its own power when practiced, because what is decided through *molibu* will be carried out by everyone, both those who attended and those who didn't. That's why in the next post-disaster programs, there was strong support from the community, especially the traditional institutions.

The villagers in the three villages studied have local wisdom related to disasters. For example, before disasters occur, they observe natural signs such as unusually hot weather for several days, which preceded the 2005 earthquake and the 2018 earthquake/liquefaction. Other signs include loud crow calls circling residential areas, or livestock like cows refusing to eat grass as usual. At such times, the *totua ngata* (village elders) already have a hunch that a major disaster is coming. Eventually, their fears came true—earthquakes and liquefaction happened. In Kaili language, this is referred to as *nalodo* (sunken land) and *petobo* (land that sinks/goes down). Through this local wisdom, it is deemed necessary to conduct specific research so that information on local wisdom can be institutionalized and knowledge can be passed on from the *totua ngata* to the next generation.

This study offers a distinctive contribution by highlighting the strategic integration of local wisdom, specifically the *molibu* tradition, into the post-disaster social reconstruction process. While most existing literature on disaster management focuses on institutional preparedness or infrastructural recovery, this research foregrounds the cultural and communal dimensions of resilience, using the indigenous *molibu* practice as a model for participatory decision-making. The research not only introduces a culturally grounded recovery framework but also addresses a significant gap in disaster studies by demonstrating how traditional knowledge and rituals can effectively mobilize community support, especially in the post-disaster phase. This approach provides a localized, culturally embedded

recovery strategy that is rarely explored in formal disaster policy discourse. The findings of this study have important implications for disaster management policy and practice. By demonstrating the effectiveness of community participation driven by traditional values, the research shows that local wisdom can significantly enhance post-disaster recovery, both socially and psychologically. The revival and institutionalization of molibu fostered trust, solidarity, and collective accountability within the affected communities, suggesting that such cultural practices should not be seen as peripheral but as integral to resilience building. For policymakers and NGOs, this implies a shift from top-down interventions to community-centered recovery models, where cultural knowledge systems are not only preserved but also leveraged as powerful tools for reconstruction, education, and social healing in disaster-affected regions.

Despite its strengths, the study has several limitations. It is qualitative and localized, focusing specifically on three villages within Sigi Regency, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to broader contexts. The reliance on in-depth interviews, FGDs, and observation, although methodologically sound for capturing rich contextual data, does not provide quantitative evidence to support broader applicability or to measure the impact of the interventions statistically. Furthermore, the study primarily emphasizes community and cultural actors, with limited exploration of coordination with formal governmental disaster management institutions. These factors may affect the scalability and policy integration of the proposed culturally based recovery model. To enhance disaster recovery strategies, it is recommended that local governments and disaster management agencies formally recognize and incorporate local wisdom—such as the molibu tradition—into disaster preparedness and response frameworks. This includes involving traditional leaders and communities from the planning stage through to implementation and evaluation. Institutional support should be provided to ensure the intergenerational transmission of cultural knowledge, potentially through village regulations or local curricula. Future research should expand to include quantitative studies and comparative analyses across different regions to validate and refine the culturally grounded recovery model. Additionally, capacity-building initiatives should focus not only on technical preparedness but also on cultural awareness and the facilitation of community-led initiatives, ensuring that recovery efforts resonate with the lived realities and values of disaster-affected populations.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that, Community participation in villages differs across the stages of pre-disaster, during the disaster, and post-disaster. This is because, during the reconstruction stage, the community was already involved. Social reconstruction took place through two aspects, namely the physical aspect (structural mitigation) in the form of building temporary shelters and permanent housing, as well as forming disaster awareness groups in each village. While the non-physical aspect (non-structural mitigation) involved disaster-related socialization, simulations, and capacity building for both communities and institutions. The use of local wisdom in the form of the molibu tradition was found to be very effective in carrying out social reconstruction. This is because, before applying the molibu tradition in the pre-disaster and during-disaster phases, support from the community especially from traditional institutions was minimal. However, in the post-disaster stage, community participation became much more visible, especially their involvement in disaster response groups and programs like disaster education and simulations. The strength of the molibu tradition ensures the involvement of all parties and compliance with the decisions made. This research also recommends that local governments involve communities in designing programs from the planning stage, through implementation, to monitoring and evaluation. This way, communities will feel a sense of ownership and take care of every program, ensuring its sustainability. The molibu tradition should not only be preserved as a cultural practice but also be used as a method to solve problems within local communities by involving external actors as facilitators. In addition, it is necessary to institutionalize local wisdom at the village level so that it continues to be passed down to future generations.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank you to all colleagues who have helped, so that this research can be carried out and completed.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Author 1: Conceptualization, Data Gathering, and Writing; Author 2: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing, and Editing; Author 3 and 4: Data Analysis, Writing, Review and Editing

### CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The author(s) declare no conflict of interest.

### REFERENCES

- Anriani, T., & Nasution, K. (2024). Adaptasi Mahasiswa Perantau di Kota Yogyakarta: Perspektif Teori Konstruksi Sosial Peter L. Berger [Adaptation of migrant students in Yogyakarta City: A perspective of peter l. berger's social construction theory]. *Huma: Journal of Sociology*, 3(2), 168–177. <https://doi.org/10.20527/h-js.v3i2.226>.
- Auliya, A. N., Juita, E., & Putri, R. E. (2024). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam mitigasi bencana banjir di Nagari Durian Tinggi Kecamatan Lubuk Sikaping Kabupaten Pasaman [Community participation in flood disaster mitigation in nagari durian tinggi, lubuk sikaping district, pasaman regency]. *JPIG (Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Geografi)*, 9(2), 130-138, <https://doi.org/10.21067/jpig.v9i2.10628>.
- Ayu, F., Rhomadhoni, M. N., Ratriwardhani, R. A., & Wibawa, D. S. W. (2024). [Pemberdayaan masyarakat melalui kegiatan mitigasi bencana di desa kemiri sebagai upaya membangun Desa Siaga Bencana] Community empowerment through disaster mitigation activities in kemiri village as an effort to build a disaster-prepared village. *Journal of Community Service Nusantara*, 5(4), 5733–5738. <https://doi.org/10.55338/jpkmn.v5i4.3883>.
- Ayuningtyas, E. A. (2022). [Pemetaan partisipatif untuk bahaya longsor dan jalur evakuasi di Desa Hargomulyo, Kabupaten Kulonprogo, DIY] Participatory mapping for landslide hazards and evacuation routes in Hargomulyo Village, Kulonprogo Regency, DIY. *Geografika Journal (Wetland Environmental Geography)*, 3(2), 78–91. <https://doi.org/10.20527/jgp.v3i2.6789>.
- Carrasco, S., Egbelakin, T., & Dangol, N. (2023). Fostering recovery through stakeholders-community collaboration in post-earthquake recovery in Nepal. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 88, 103619. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdr.2023.103619>.
- Charles, S. H., Chang-Richards, A. Y., & Yiu, T. W. (2022). A systematic review of factors affecting post-disaster reconstruction projects resilience. *International Journal of Disaster Resilience in the Built Environment*, 13(1), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJDRBE-10-2020-0109>.
- Department of Community and Village Empowerment of Sigi Regency. (2021). Report on the Formation of Disaster Resilient Villages in Sigi Regency. Department of Community and Village Empowerment of Sigi Regency.
- Efendi, I., Taquiuddin, M., & Evendi, A. (2022). [Konstruksi sosial pengurangan risiko bencana berbasis masyarakat di kawasan ekonomi khusus Mandalika] Social construction of community-based disaster risk reduction in the mandalika special economic zone. *RESIPROKAL: Journal of Actual Progressive Sociology Research*, 4(1), 73–93. <https://doi.org/10.29303/resiprokal.v4i1.129>.
- Endraswara, S. (2006). *Methods, Theories, Cultural Research Techniques: Ideology, Epistemology, and Application (First Edition)*. Pustaka Widyatama.
- Faisal, S. (2010). *Formats of Social Research (Tenth Printing)*. Rajawali Pers.
- Farel, F., Sutiarsa, M. A., & Tunjungsari, K. R. (2024). Community empowerment and customary attachments support participation in Aan Tourism Village Development. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Terapan Universitas Jambi*, 7(1), 72–77. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jiituj.v7i1.26650>.
- Fuad Muchlis, Sahrial, Elwamendri, & Siti Kurniasih. (2022). Economic Independence Development Model of the Anak Dalam Tribe Based on Specific Herbal Plants in Bukit Duabelas National Park, Jambi Province (Unpublished). LPPM Jambi University.
- Goulet, D. (1989). Participation in development: New avenues. *World Development*, 17(2), 165–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X\(89\)90242-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-750X(89)90242-8).
- Halimah, H., Putri, D. E., Wulandari, W., Adewumi, S. E., & Arce-Calderón, X. (2024). Contextual pop up book as an innovative learning media in social science subjects in elementary schools. *Journal of Educational Technology and Learning Creativity*, 2(2), 209-216. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jetlc.v2i2.1121>.
- Hasibuan, S., Chu, C. T., & Godh, W. A. (2024). Enhancing creative thinking in circle topics through the realistic mathematics learning approach. *Interval: Indonesian Journal of Mathematical*

- Education*, 2(2), 106-114. <https://doi.org/10.37251/ijome.v2i2.1148>.
- Huttunen, S., Ojanen, M., Ott, A., & Saarikoski, H. (2022). What about citizens? A literature review of citizen engagement in sustainability transitions research. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 91, 102714. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2022.102714>.
- Ife, J., & Tesoriero, F. (2016). *Community development: Alternative community development in the era of globalization* (S. Manullang, N. Yakin, & M. Nursyahid, Trans.; Third Edition, Thirteenth Printing). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ingold, T. (2022). Evolution without inheritance: Steps to an ecology of learning. *Current Anthropology*, 63(S25), S32-S55. <https://doi.org/10.1086/722437>.
- Irdansyah, I., & Meiyani, E. (2018). Socio-Economic Reconstruction (Study of Village-Owned Enterprises as Empowerment for Fishermen in Sangiang Village, Bima Regency). *Equilibrium: Journal of Sociology Education*, 6(2), <https://doi.org/10.26618/equilibrium.v6i2.2593>.
- Khatibi, F. S., Dedekorkut-Howes, A., Howes, M., & Torabi, E. (2021). Can public awareness, knowledge and engagement improve climate change adaptation policies?. *Discover Sustainability*, 2, 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43621-021-00024-z>.
- Kiss, B., Sekulova, F., Hörschelmann, K., Salk, C. F., Takahashi, W., & Wamsler, C. (2022). Citizen participation in the governance of nature-based solutions. *Environmental Policy and Governance*, 32(3), 247-272. <https://doi.org/10.1002/eet.1987>.
- Mikkelsen, B. (2011). *Participatory Research Methods and Empowerment Efforts: A Guide for Field Practitioners* (M. Nalle, Trans.; Fifth Printing). Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Moleong, L. J. (2008). *Qualitative Research Methodology* (Rev. Ed., 22nd Printing). Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Muhamad, H., Rusli, Lutfi, M., Yusup, A. A., & Afdal. (2022). *Community Empowerment Towards Prosperous and Independent Villages* (First Printing). Unhas Press.
- Muis, A., Pholboon, M., & Kamali, A. N. (2024). Geomics as Interactive Geography Learning Media: A Development Study on Environmental Material in High Schools. *Journal of Educational Technology and Learning Creativity*, 2(2), 192-200. <https://doi.org/10.37251/jetlc.v2i2.1089>.
- Mushtaha, A. W., Alaloul, W. S., Baarimah, A. O., Musarat, M. A., Alzubi, K. M., & Khan, A. M. (2025). A decision-making framework for prioritizing reconstruction projects in post-disaster recovery. *Results in Engineering*, 25, 103693. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rineng.2024.103693>.
- Mustanir, A., Hamid, H., & Syarifuddin, R. N. (2022). *Participatory Planning in Community Empowerment of Women Farmers' Groups* (Tim Qiara Media, Ed.; First Printing). Qiara Media.
- Nasution, A. F. (2023). *Qualitative Research Methods* (First Printing). Harfa Creative.
- National Earthquake Study Center Team. (2018). *Study of the Palu Earthquake in Central Sulawesi, September 28, 2018 (M7.4)* (M. Irsyam, N. R. Hanifa, D. Djarwadi, & D. A. Sarsito, Eds.; First Printing). Research and Development Center for Housing and Settlements, Research and Development Agency, Ministry of Public Works and Housing.
- Ngangi, C. R. (2011). Social construction in social reality. *AGRI-SOSIOEKONOMI*, 7(2), <https://doi.org/10.35791/agrsosek.7.2.2011.85>.
- Ngulube, N. K., Tatano, H., & Samaddar, S. (2024). Toward participatory participation: A community perspective on effective engagement in post-disaster recovery and reconstruction. *Community Development*, 55(6), 895-915. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15575330.2024.2382169>.
- Ngulube, N. K. (2024). Building back better together: Exploring community engagement in post-disaster recovery efforts-a review. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Advancements*, 2(2), 138-149. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jomra.v2i2.73082>.
- Njatrijani, R. (2018). Local wisdom in the cultural perspective of Semarang City. *Gema Keadilan*, 5(1), 16-31. <https://doi.org/10.14710/gk.2018.3580>.
- Rahmayanti, M., & Kwalat, K. S. (2024). Comparison of mathematics learning outcomes between students taught using direct teaching and discovery learning models. *Interval: Indonesian Journal of Mathematical Education*, 2(2), 115-123. <https://doi.org/10.37251/ijome.v2i2.1185>.
- Rolla, G., & Figueiredo, N. (2023). Bringing forth a world, literally. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences*, 22(4), 931-953. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11097-021-09760-z>.
- Rus'an, & Muhamad, H. (2023). *Interfaith Figures on Radicalism and Strengthening Local Culture* (A. M. Amir, Ed.; First Printing). Magama.
- Saleh, R., Muhamad, H., & Zaiful. (2024). *Ombo Conservation Culture* (A. M. Amir, Ed.; First

- Printing). Magama.
- Samudin, T., & Muhamad, H. (2023). *Local Wisdom of the Bajo Tribe in Utilizing Marine Resources* (A. M. Amir, Ed.; First Printing). Magama.
- Santoso, M. B., Asiah, D. H. S., & Kirana, C. I. (2017). Suicide and depression from a social work perspective. *Proceedings of Research & Community Service*, 4(3), 390–447.
- Slavich, G. M., Mengelkoch, S., & Cole, S. W. (2023). Human social genomics: Concepts, mechanisms, and implications for health. *Lifestyle Medicine*, 4(2), e75. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lim2.75>.
- Taufan, A., Nendissa, J. I., Sinura, J., Bormas, M. F., Tita, H. M. Y., Surya, A., Hehanussa, D. J. A., Ratri, W. S., Lewerissa, Y. A., & Nuraeni, A. (2023). *Indonesian Local Wisdom* (First Printing). Widina Media Utama.
- Thomson, A. M., & Perry, J. L. (2006). Collaboration processes: Inside the black box. *Public administration review*, 66, 20-32.
- Turner, B. S. (2012). *Social Theory: From Classical to Postmodern* (Setiyawati & R. Shufiyati, Trans.; First Edition, First Printing). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Uphoff, N. (1992). *Local Institutions and Participation for Sustainable Development* (31; Gatekeeper, pp. 1–14). International Institute for Environment and Development.
- Zhong, L., Bai, L., & Xiang, M. (2022). Evaluation index system for public participation in post-disaster housing reconstruction in Dujiangyan. *Open House International*, 47(1), 107-121. <https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings13061484>.