

**POLICY COMMUNICATION AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL FORESTRY DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE MINISTRY OF FORESTRY'S OFFICIAL NEWS IN 2025**

**Faris Al Fakhoor**

Universitas Muhammadiyah Kotabumi

[faris.alfakhoor@umko.ac.id](mailto:faris.alfakhoor@umko.ac.id)

**Abstract.** This study explores how Social Forestry policy communication is constructed in the official news platform of the Ministry of Forestry throughout 2025. Employing a qualitative design and Critical Discourse Analysis, the research examines all Social Forestry-related news articles published during the year. The analysis focuses on textual structures, discursive strategies, and the broader socio-political context to understand how policy meanings and actor roles are shaped in official communication. The findings suggest that Social Forestry is consistently framed as a strategic national program linked to community empowerment, economic resilience, and environmental sustainability. Government institutions are presented as key policy drivers, while local communities are primarily portrayed as program beneficiaries. Quantitative achievements and program milestones serve as central elements in reinforcing policy credibility. The study highlights how official media functions as a strategic communication arena in articulating state policy priorities and constructing legitimacy. These insights contribute to the broader discussion on public policy communication and the role of institutional media in shaping public narratives.

**Keywords:** Policy Communication, Social Forestry, Critical Discourse Analysis, Government Communication, Public Policy Narratives

**Abstrak.** Penelitian ini mengkaji bagaimana komunikasi kebijakan kehutanan sosial dibangun dalam media resmi Kementerian Kehutanan pada tahun 2025. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif dan Analisis Diskursus Kritis, penelitian ini menganalisis semua artikel berita terkait Kehutanan Sosial yang dipublikasikan di situs web resmi kementerian sepanjang tahun. Analisis ini berfokus pada fitur teks, praktik diskursif, dan konteks sosial yang lebih luas untuk mengungkap bagaimana aktor-aktor diwakili dan bagaimana hubungan kuasa direproduksi melalui komunikasi kebijakan. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa Kehutanan Sosial secara dominan diframing sebagai agenda nasional strategis yang selaras dengan ketahanan pangan, pembangunan ekonomi, dan keberlanjutan lingkungan. Aktor pemerintah diposisikan sebagai subjek sentral dan otoritatif, sementara komunitas sebagian besar diwakili sebagai penerima manfaat daripada negosiator kebijakan yang aktif. Prestasi statistik dan hasil program berfungsi sebagai alat utama legitimasi kebijakan. Studi ini menyimpulkan bahwa komunikasi kebijakan resmi beroperasi lebih sebagai mekanisme konsolidasi institusional daripada ruang partisipatif dialogis. Temuan ini berkontribusi pada pengembangan studi komunikasi kebijakan dengan menyoroti peran media negara dalam membentuk makna dan legitimasi kebijakan publik.

**Kata Kunci:** Komunikasi Kebijakan, Kehutanan Sosial, Analisis Diskursus Kritis, Komunikasi Pemerintah, Narasi Kebijakan Publik

## INTRODUCTION

Social Forestry has emerged as a strategic policy framework aimed at expanding community access to forest resources while promoting environmental sustainability and rural economic development. In Indonesia, the program is positioned as a key instrument for reducing inequality in forest management and strengthening local livelihoods. Beyond its technical and regulatory dimensions, Social Forestry is fundamentally a communication-driven policy, as its legitimacy, acceptance, and public meaning are shaped through institutional narratives and official representations.

Despite the growing body of research on Social Forestry, most previous studies have focused on policy implementation, community participation, governance challenges, and socio-economic impacts. Limited attention has been given to how the policy is discursively constructed in official government communication platforms. Studies on government communication and public policy narratives highlight that institutional media do not merely disseminate information; they actively frame issues, define actors, and structure public understanding. However, empirical research examining the discursive strategies of official policy communication in the forestry sector remains relatively underexplored.

This study addresses that gap by analyzing how Social Forestry is represented in the official news published by the Ministry of Forestry throughout 2025. Using Critical Discourse Analysis, the research investigates textual features, discursive patterns, and the broader socio-political context to understand how policy legitimacy and actor positioning are constructed.

The contribution of this study lies in bridging policy communication and discourse analysis within the context of

environmental governance. By focusing on institutional media as a strategic arena of meaning production, this research provides insight into how state communication shapes public policy narratives and reinforces institutional authority. The findings contribute to the development of communication studies, particularly in understanding the discursive dimension of public policy in developing countries.

## METHOD

This study is closely related to several previous studies within the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) corpus, yet it retains its own distinctiveness in terms of subject matter and data sources.

### **Similarities with Previous Research.**

**Norman Fairclough's Theoretical Framework:** The primary similarity between this study and the research by Rahmayani (2022) and the framework described by Hidayah & Anindhita (2022) is the use of Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model. All three studies agree that language is not merely a tool of communication but a social practice that carries ideological interests and power.

**Analysis of Online Media:** Similar to Rahmayani's (2022) study, which examined electronic media (online media), this manuscript also focuses its analysis on digital texts published via the internet.

**Focus on the Construction of Reality:** This research shares similarities with Lypova's (2024) study in terms of exploring how discourse is used to construct strategic images or narratives (such as narratives of policy success or a nation's diplomatic image) to influence public perception.

### **Differences from Previous Research.**

**Subject Matter (Issue):** The most striking difference lies in the issue under

examination. While Rahmayani (2022) focuses on political figures (Boris Johnson's victory) and Lypova (2024) examines diplomatic discourse and international conflicts in China, your manuscript specifically examines Social Forestry Policy, an issue of environmental conservation and economic empowerment.

**Characteristics of Media Sources:** Rahmayani (2022) uses commercial news media, which tend to exhibit specific media biases. In contrast, your manuscript utilizes official government media (ministry websites), where texts are produced by state authorities as channels for formal policy communication.

**Specific Methodology:** While Lypova (2024) notes trends in the use of corpus and multimodal analysis in AWK studies in China, your manuscript focuses more on the in-depth qualitative application of Fairclough's three-dimensional model to unpack discursive hegemony in Indonesia's domestic policies.

**Temporal and Locational Context:** This study is unique in its temporal scope as it draws on data from 2025, providing a current snapshot of policy communication in Indonesia, unlike other sources that cover the 2010–2024 period or data from 2022.

This study fills a research gap by applying Fairclough's CDA model to authoritative government media, unlike most CDA studies, which more frequently examine commercial mass media.

Policy communication has become a crucial dimension of contemporary public governance. In modern administrative systems, policy operates not only through regulatory instruments and implementation mechanisms but also through communication practices that shape meaning, legitimacy, and authority. Government communication does not merely transmit information; it also sets priorities, defines problems, and positions

institutional actors within a broader socio-political landscape. Through official platforms, state institutions actively shape how policies are understood and evaluated by the public. Communication, therefore, functions as a strategic arena where governance narratives are produced and consolidated.

In this broader context, Social Forestry represents a policy framework that goes beyond technical forest management. It is often articulated as a tool for community empowerment, equitable access to resources, rural economic development, and environmental sustainability. As a public policy initiative, Social Forestry simultaneously integrates development, ecological, and socio-political objectives. Previous research has largely focused on implementation challenges, land rights arrangements, participatory mechanisms, and socio-economic outcomes at the community level. These studies provide important insights into policy effectiveness and governance performance. However, relatively limited attention has been given to examining how Social Forestry is discursively constructed in official government communications.

Understanding policy as discourse requires acknowledging that institutional narratives contribute to shaping public perceptions and reinforcing authority. Official communication does not merely report on policy progress; it selectively highlights achievements, frames the representation of actors, and packages policy success through specific thematic patterns. Such discursive processes influence how legitimacy is constructed and how responsibility is distributed among actors.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) offers a conceptual and methodological framework for analyzing these dynamics. CDA views language as a shaper of social reality and as embedded in power relations.

This approach enables researchers to analyze textual features, discursive strategies, and contextual structures to reveal how policy narratives are constructed and normalized. In policy studies, CDA has been used to uncover how governments frame reforms, position beneficiaries, and legitimize institutional authority. Applying this approach to Social Forestry communications allows for a systematic investigation of how empowerment, development, and sustainability are articulated in official discourse, as well as how these narratives contribute to the stabilization of policy meanings.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

An analysis of news coverage on Social Forestry published throughout 2025 indicates that this policy has consistently been positioned as a strategic national priority, rather than merely a sectoral forestry initiative. The institutional narrative places Social Forestry within a broader agenda related to economic development, rural transformation, and environmental sustainability. This positioning expands the symbolic scope of the policy, making it an integral component of national progress. Through repeated thematic emphasis, the discourse elevates Social Forestry from an administrative program to a development tool. This construction reflects how official communication shapes the meaning of the policy beyond its technical implementation.

The dominant narrative emerging from the corpus is the portrayal of Social Forestry as a mechanism for community empowerment. Articles frequently link this program to improved livelihoods, increased productivity, and inclusive growth. Empowerment language is consistently associated with measurable outcomes, implying that empowerment is verified through quantifiable achievements. The

alignment between empowerment and productivity instills a development rationale within the discourse. Consequently, community progress is framed not only as social justice but also as economic performance.

Sustainability emerged as a focal point of another discourse throughout the news coverage. Environmental management was presented as inseparable from economic resilience, thereby eliminating potential tensions between conservation and development. This narrative repeatedly suggests that Social Forestry simultaneously protects forest ecosystems and creates income opportunities. This dual framework positions the policy as both environmentally responsible and economically rational. Thus, this discourse avoids binary representations and promotes an image of integrated governance.

Frequent references to numerical indicators constitute a significant discursive pattern. News articles highlight the hectares distributed, the farmer groups involved, and the productivity gains achieved within a specific timeframe. These numerical references serve not only as descriptive statistics but also as rhetorical tools that reinforce institutional accountability. By highlighting measurable achievements, this discourse signals transparency and quantifiable progress. This strategic use of data contributes to perceptions of administrative efficiency and policy effectiveness.

The timeframe also plays a crucial role in shaping policy dynamics. Many articles emphasize the expansion, acceleration, and long-term commitment to Social Forestry targets. The use of forward-looking language positions this policy as one that is constantly evolving and future-oriented. This orientation fosters institutional continuity and firmness, reinforcing the idea that Social Forestry is not a temporary

initiative, but rather a sustainable governance priority. Through this timeframe, the discourse cultivates hope for sustained progress.

The representation of actors reveals a subtle yet consistent power dynamic within the narrative. Government officials are highlighted as the initiators, coordinators, and evaluators of policy implementation. Their statements often steer the narrative's flow, providing authoritative interpretations of achievements and objectives. This recurring dominance reinforces the visibility of institutional leadership. Consequently, the state is discursively positioned as the primary driver of transformation.

On the other hand, local communities are often depicted as beneficiaries of policy interventions. Although participation is acknowledged, autonomy is frequently limited to the context of receiving aid or implementing predetermined programs. Community voices are rarely portrayed as shapers of policy direction or re-definers of its agenda. This imbalance reflects a hierarchical distribution of discursive authority. This position reflects institutional centrality in formal communication practices.

This discourse also highlights collaboration and partnership as recurring themes. References to synergy between government agencies, local authorities, and community groups appear consistently throughout the corpus. Such language reflects inclusivity and collective responsibility. However, despite the emphasis on partnership, narrative control remains dominated by institutions. This representation of collaboration reinforces cohesion while maintaining structural authority.

Further intertextual connections embed Social Forestry within the national development narrative. Articles frequently link this program to food security initiatives,

rural development strategies, and broader economic resilience agendas. These references position Social Forestry within a comprehensive governance framework. By integrating this policy into various strategic domains, the discourse reinforces its perceived relevance. These interconnections solidify Social Forestry as a cross-sectoral solution.

Another notable feature is the absence of a significant conflict framework. Challenges such as land disputes, bureaucratic delays, or community resistance are rarely highlighted. Instead, the dominant narrative prioritizes success stories and collaborative achievements. This selective emphasis contributes to a harmonious representation of policy implementation. The lack of tension reinforces institutional cohesion.

The repetition of certain terms throughout the year contributes to discursive normalization. Key terms related to empowerment, sustainability, and productivity recur with high frequency. This repetition stabilizes certain interpretations and reduces discursive variability. Over time, these recurring frameworks become internalized within institutional communication. Consequently, such policies appear naturally beneficial and strategically irreplaceable.

The symbolic construction of forests within the discourse is also worth noting. Forests are not only framed as ecological assets requiring protection but also as productive spaces capable of generating economic value. This reframing aligns conservation with development goals. By redefining forests as productive resources, this narrative integrates environmental governance into the national economic rationality. This symbolic transformation expands the legitimacy of development policies.

The emphasis on program milestones reinforces the narrative of sustainable achievement. Milestones serve as narrative reference points that mark progress at defined intervals. They provide structured evidence of progress and signal institutional monitoring. This milestone-based narrative reinforces the perception of disciplined governance. It also supports a linear narrative of improvement.

Discursive strategies of legitimization are evident in the consistent portrayal of institutional competence. Officials are frequently associated with verbs indicating initiative and evaluative statements confirming success. These narratives rarely question administrative capacity or strategic direction. Instead, they reinforce authority through confident accounts of achievements. This strategy reinforces public perceptions of policy reliability.

On a broader level, findings indicate that official media operate as strategic communication arenas. Websites do not merely document activities; they curate narratives that reinforce cohesion and authority. Through selective emphasis and thematic alignment, these platforms shape the boundaries of interpretation for public understanding. Institutional discourse thus contributes to the stabilization of policy meanings.

The integration of empowerment, sustainability, and productivity within a single narrative framework demonstrates discursive sophistication. Rather than presenting conflicting priorities, this discourse aligns them. This alignment reduces potential ideological tensions. The policy is thus framed as universally beneficial and structurally aligned with national interests.

The cumulative effect of these discursive patterns is the production of legitimacy. Legitimacy is constructed not

through explicit persuasion, but through narrative consistency and symbolic integration. Repetition, the positioning of actors, and the framing of achievements collectively reinforce trust. Institutional authority is strengthened through discursive cohesion. Such policies have become commonplace in public communication.

From a communication studies perspective, these findings demonstrate how institutional discourse shapes perceptions of policy. Official narratives function as tools for meaning-making. They define problems, propose solutions, and allocate responsibility within a structured framework. Policy communication thus becomes an active dimension of governance.

This analysis also highlights the interaction between discourse and power. Language choices subtly reflect institutional hierarchies and governance priorities. Even inclusive terminology does not always redistribute discursive authority. Instead, it often operates within existing institutional boundaries. This observation aligns with broader theoretical discussions on discourse and power relations.

Ultimately, these findings indicate that Social Forestry communications in 2025 function as a cohesive narrative system. Through thematic consistency, the representation of strategic actors, and an achievement-oriented framework, institutional media foster a stable understanding of policy progress. This discourse reinforces both development ambitions and administrative competencies. Thus, it demonstrates how policy communication is integral to the reproduction of institutional legitimacy in the context of contemporary governance.

## **CONCLUSION**

Overall, this study concludes that the Ministry of Forestry's communication of

Social Forestry policies on its official news platforms throughout 2025 was not merely the dissemination of neutral information, but rather a strategic instrument for building legitimacy and consolidating institutional authority. This central objective was achieved through interlocking patterns of discursive repetition across three levels:

- a. Narrative Reinforcement through Statistical Evidence (Textual Dimension): Through the 2025 data corpus, the use of operational figures such as the existence of 16,952 Social Forestry Business Groups (KUPS) and data on millions of visitors to conservation areas serves as a rhetorical tool to create an impression of accountability and administrative efficiency. Terminology such as “empowerment” and “sustainability” is consistently repeated to justify the policy as an irreplaceable national solution.
- b. Centrality of Government Actors (Discourse Practices): Official media communication practices position the government as the “gatekeeper” of information, actively curating success stories while minimizing the framing of conflicts or land disputes. Government officials are positioned as authoritative subjects (initiators), while local communities are represented as passive beneficiaries within an achievement-oriented narrative structure.
- c. Stabilizing Meaning and Power (Social Practice): The integration of text and discourse ultimately reproduces power relations in which the state consolidates its authority over the management of natural resources. By framing forests not merely as ecological assets but as “productive economic spaces,” this discourse successfully aligns Social Forestry policies with the ideology of national development.

Thus, the government’s official communication has successfully produced legitimacy through a stable narrative cohesion, transforming public policy into a well-established social reality in the public mind.

The application of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in this study ultimately aims to uncover the dialectical relationship between social structures and linguistic practices, wherein language not only reflects the reality of Social Forestry policies but also actively shapes and constructs that reality

Through Norman Fairclough’s framework, CDA serves as a tool to unpack the ideological normalization often hidden behind official narratives that appear neutral or informative. By analyzing how government media texts integrate empowerment, sustainability, and productivity, this approach reveals strategic efforts to produce institutional legitimacy and reinforce the state’s dominance over access to forest resources.

## REFERENCES

- Andini, N., & Wahyuni, H. (2021). Governmentality and digital discourse: Analyzing Indonesian ministry’s website on forestry issues. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 37(3), 154–172. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2021-3703-09>
- Bachtiar, R., & Syahputra, I. (2022). Konstruksi wacana pemberdayaan masyarakat dalam program perhutanan sosial: Studi analisis wacana kritis. *Jurnal Komunikasi Ikatan Sarjana Komunikasi Indonesia*, 7(1), 12–25. <https://doi.org/10.25008/jkisk.v7i1.612>

- Darmawan, R., & Triastuti, R. (2023). Analisis wacana kritis Norman Fairclough pada kebijakan pengelolaan lingkungan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik (JISPO)*, 13(1), 45–62. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jispo.v13i1.23401>
- Dukalskis, A. (2021). Authoritarianism and the media: Legitimizing policy through state-controlled platforms. *Democratization*, 28(5), 901–918. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2021.1892120>
- Fauzi, A., & Zuhadi, A. (2024). Sustainable development discourse in Indonesian public policy: A critical perspective on environmental governance. *Sustainability*, 16(3), 1102. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16031102>
- Forest and Society. (2023). Corruption in social forestry in Indonesia. *Journal of Forest and Society*, 12(2), 45–60.
- Guenther, G. (2024). *The language of climate politics: Fossil-fuel propaganda and how to fight it*. Oxford University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1981). *The theory of communicative action* (Vols. 1–2). Beacon Press.
- Hidayah, A., & Anindhita, W. K. (2022). Critical discourse analysis: Language theoretical framework. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 31(1), 9–16.
- Huda, A. S. (2022). Digital government communication: A critical discourse analysis of policy socialization on official websites. *Informasi*, 52(1), 89–104. <https://doi.org/10.21831/informasi.v52i1.48201>
- Iswari, N., Ekayani, M., & Nurrochmat, D. R. (2025). *Analisis wacana implementasi program perhutanan sosial di Indonesia*. IPB University.
- Jin, Z., & Mihalcea, R. (2023). *Natural language processing for policymaking*. In Handbook of Computational Social Science for Policy (pp. 141–162). Jurnal Hutan dan Masyarakat. (2021). Dampak sosial ekonomi program perhutanan sosial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hutan dan Masyarakat*, 9(3), 75–92.
- Kementerian Kehutanan. (2025). Kementerian Kehutanan Republik Indonesia. <https://www.kehutan.go.id>
- Kendrick, H., & De-Poli, C. (2024). *Critical discourse analysis (CDA)*. Global Observatory of Long-Term Care.
- Larasati, D. (2021). The myth of empowerment: A critical discourse analysis of forestry policies in rural Indonesia. *Rural Sociology*, 86(4), 780–802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ruso.12398>
- Lypova, I. (2024). Osoblyvosti doslidzhen krytychnoho analizu politychnoho diskursu v suchasnomu Kytayi. Aktualni Problemy Inozemnoyi Filolohiyi i Linhvodydaktyky, 6, 126–130.
- Mad Yahya, & Roselani, N. G. A. (2024). *Analisis wacana eko-kritis dokumen Climate Resilience Development Policy Indonesia: Pendekatan sistem transitivitas* (Tesis Magister, Universitas Gadjah Mada).
- Majone, G. (1989). *Evidence, argument, and persuasion in the policy process*. Yale University Press.
- MAKILA: Jurnal Penelitian Kehutanan. (2023). Kinerja sistem agroforestri pada izin perhutanan sosial. *MAKILA: Jurnal Penelitian Kehutanan*, 11(2), 55–70.
- Maryudi, A., & Fisher, M. R. (2020). The power of labels: Investigating the influence of terminology on

- Indonesian social forestry policies. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 115, 102144.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.forpol.2020.102144>
- Montessori, N., Farrelly, M., & Mulderrig, J. (Eds.). (2019). *Critical policy discourse analysis*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Nurrochmat, D. R., et al. (2021). The power of discourses: Hegemony and counter-hegemony in Indonesian forest policy. *Land Use Policy*, 108, 105551.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105551>
- Nugroho, B., & Setiadi, A. (2023). Ideology and policy: A critical analysis of social forestry discourses in Indonesia's media institutions. *Forests, Trees and Livelihoods*, 32(1), 45–64.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14728028.2023.2178901>
- Penelitian Sosial dan Ekonomi Kehutanan. (2022). Manfaat, pandangan, dan alternatif program perhutanan sosial di Kabupaten Pematang. *Jurnal Penelitian Sosial dan Ekonomi Kehutanan*, 8(1), 15–30.
- Prasetyo, Y., & Kurnia, N. (2023). Media digital dan legitimasi kekuasaan: Konstruksi wacana pemerintah dalam isu pembangunan berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 21(2), 167–182.  
<https://doi.org/10.31315/jik.v21i2.8901>
- Prastio, G. D., & Sulistyningrum, E. (2023). *Evaluasi dampak program perhutanan sosial terhadap pembangunan desa di Indonesia* (Studi kasus pada skema hutan desa) (Tesis Magister, Universitas Gadjah Mada).
- Putra, A. S., & Puspitasari, D. (2022). Critical discourse analysis of agrarian reform in Indonesia: A Faircloughian perspective. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 27(2), 210–228.  
<https://doi.org/10.22452/jati.v27i2.11>
- Rahmayani, F. A. (2022). Critical discourse analysis: Submitting the news about Boris Johnson's victory in the election of England Prime Minister through online media. *SRAWUNG: Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1(1), 1–13.
- Saltelli, A., & Di Fiore, M. (2023). *Mind the framings: Match purpose and context*. In *The Politics of Modelling: Numbers Between Science and Policy* (pp. 25–42). Oxford University Press.
- Saltelli, A., & Di Fiore, M. (2023). *Mind the hubris: Complexity can misfire*. In *The Politics of Modelling: Numbers Between Science and Policy* (pp. 60–78). Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, A. L., & Ingram, H. (1997). *Policy design for democracy*. University Press of Kansas.
- Suhandi, A. (2020). Analisis wacana praktik sosial Norman Fairclough terhadap isu pembangunan berkelanjutan di media pemerintah. *Jurnal Penelitian Komunikasi*, 23(2), 145–158.  
<https://doi.org/10.20422/jpk.v23i2.712>
- Svarstad, H., & Benjaminsen, T. A. (2020). Reading radical environmentalism through critical discourse analysis. *Environmental Politics*, 29(4), 631–650.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2020.1755146>

- Tarumingkeng, R. C. (2025). *Critical discourse analysis (CDA): Pengertian, teori dan aplikasi*. RUDYCT e-PRESS.
- Wanamukti: Jurnal Penelitian Kehutanan. (2022). Identifikasi tutupan lahan di areal perhutanan sosial: Studi kasus di Jawa Tengah. *Wanamukti: Jurnal Penelitian Kehutanan*, 10(1), 23–40.
- Zheng, H., & Huang, Y. (2022). Social media and government legitimacy: A discourse analysis of official policy narratives. *Policy & Internet*, 14(2), 345–362.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.284>