

From Tenure Security to Inequality Reproduction: Reassessing Indonesia's PTSL Program Through a Structural Poverty Lens

Affan Hilman Sutarto^{1,*}, Harianto², Ujang Sumarwan¹, Yudha Heryawan Asnawi¹

¹Business School, IPB University, Jl. Raya Pajajaran, Bogor, West Java, 16151, Indonesia

²Department of Agribusiness, Faculty of Economics and Management, IPB University, Jl. Kamper, Bogor, West Java, 16680, Indonesia

*Correspondence e-mail: affanhilmansutarto541@gmail.com

Received: April 9, 2026 | Revised: July 24, 2026 | Accepted: August 18, 2026 | Online Publication: August 20, 2026

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the effectiveness of the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) program in addressing structural poverty in rural Indonesia, using Parungsari Village in Lebak Regency, Banten Province, as a case study. Although PTSL was introduced to improve tenure security, legal certainty, and access to capital, its implementation reveals tensions between legalizing land ownership and enduring agrarian inequalities. The study applies a mixed-methods case study approach, showing that community participation is the most influential factor shaping the program's outcomes, followed by land productivity, the use of agricultural technology, certificate ownership, and access to agricultural credit. Empirical results indicate that the program disproportionately advantages large and absentee landowners, while smallholders and landless groups receive limited benefit. Instead of reducing inequality, land certification often reinforces existing class-based divisions and demonstrates limited measurable impact on household welfare or agricultural productivity. The article argues that PTSL can contribute to poverty reduction only when integrated into a broader agrarian reform framework that couples asset legalization with improved access to agrarian resources. Policy implications highlight the need to prevent and resolve agrarian conflicts, strengthen community capacity and post-certification support, and implement an integrated agrarian reform strategy to promote equitable rural development and address structural poverty.

Keywords: agrarian inequality, land titling, PTSL, rural poverty, tenure security

INTRODUCTION

Poverty remains a persistent and complex development challenge in Indonesia despite ongoing policy reforms and improvements in national indicators. Recent estimates from the World Bank, based on the updated 2024 global poverty standards, suggest that 5.4 percent of the Indonesian population live below the extreme poverty line, while 19.9 percent fall beneath the lower-middle-income country poverty threshold and as many as 68.3 percent fall below the upper-middle-income benchmark. National data from Statistics Indonesia (BPS) show a comparatively lower poverty rate of 8.5 percent in the same year, an improvement from 9.3 percent in 2023. Nevertheless, this figure remains above the government's poverty reduction target of 6.5–7.5 percent as outlined in the Fiscal Policy Statement of the 2026 Draft National Budget. These discrepancies reflect not only methodological differences but also deeper structural dimensions of deprivation that remain resistant to policy interventions.

Existing scholarship indicates that poverty in Indonesia is characterized predominantly by chronic rather than transient conditions, demonstrating long-term immobility rather than short-run vulnerability. Research by Sugiharti et al. (2022) identifies several structural determinants of chronic poverty—including aging household heads, female-headed households, informal or casual employment, large family size, limited access to essential services, and low asset ownership. Although rural residency and casual agricultural work increase exposure to poverty risks, a proportion of these cases remain transient rather than perpetual, indicating heterogeneity in rural livelihood trajectories. Other studies similarly

argue that poverty in Indonesia is not episodic, but deeply embedded in enduring socio-economic hierarchies (Purwono et al., 2021).

Analytically, poverty is often approached in two ways: as a measurable condition at a given moment and as a consequence of historically accumulated and unequal power relations. The latter perspective has gained prominence in agrarian studies, which emphasize that rural poverty correlates closely with unequal access to land, insecure tenure, and asymmetrical agrarian power structures (Shohibuddin & Soetarto, 2023). This relationship is reflected in the substantial rise of land-poor smallholders in recent decades. As Sumarti (2024) demonstrates, households cultivating less than 0.5 hectares increased by over 10 million between 1976 and 2023, accompanied by a growth in the proportion of marginal farm households living below the poverty line.

Policy responses have historically attempted to address rural poverty through agricultural modernization or land administration reforms. However, previous programs—including those initiated during Indonesia's Green Revolution—tended to disproportionately benefit larger landholders while excluding smallholders and landless farmers (Sajogyo, 1973; Wiradi, 2009). More recent initiatives such as land certification were expected to facilitate credit access and improve productivity (Sari et al., 2019; Amir et al., 2020; Kurniawan et al., 2020; Judijanto, 2025;) yet evidence suggests mixed outcomes and limited structural transformation, especially where collateralized loans result in land dispossession.

Within this policy landscape, the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) program—launched in 2019 represents the most ambitious attempt to formalize land rights nationwide. Intended as part of a wider agrarian reform agenda, PTSL seeks to accelerate legal recognition of land ownership, expand access to agricultural finance, and provide accurate spatial governance data. The program has progressed rapidly in Lebak Regency, Banten Province, where certification rates increased substantially between 2021 and 2024. However, the region remains among the poorest in the province, and the majority of its farming households continue to cultivate less than 0.5 hectares.

This contradiction raises a critical policy question: to what extent does land certification function as a meaningful pathway for structural poverty reduction in rural Indonesia? This study addresses this question by examining PTSL implementation in Parungsari Village, Lebak Regency, with specific focus on distributional outcomes, livelihood effects, and the socio-political mechanisms through which certification interacts with existing agrarian structures. The novelty of this research lies in its integration of structural poverty analysis with empirical assessment of land administration reform outcomes—moving beyond the prevailing focus on tenure security or credit access to evaluate whether PTSL alters agrarian relations, redistributes opportunities, or inadvertently reinforces existing inequalities. Drawing on Sajogyo's (2006) framework of equitable development, the article assesses whether PTSL enhances access to productive resources, broadens livelihood opportunities, strengthens legal equality, and contributes to more just agrarian arrangements.

By engaging these analytical and empirical dimensions, the study seeks to enrich current debates on land reform and rural poverty reduction, while offering policy insights on how land administration programs may be redesigned to better support inclusive rural development and break the cycle of structural poverty.

METHODS

This article is based on a case study of the implementation of the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) in Parungsari Village, Sajira Sub-district, Lebak Regency. The case study employed an exploratory research design that combined qualitative and quantitative approaches in order to achieve the research objectives by providing a detailed, systematic, and comprehensive explanation of the potential uses of PTSL data. In addition, the study seeks to capture the current structure of land tenure in Lebak Regency, to describe the dynamics of land control and socio-agrarian relations within local communities, and to formulate policy recommendations for land administration reform related to the implementation of PTSL, particularly in Lebak. Lebak Regency was selected as the research site due to decades of pronounced land tenure shifts, agrarian inequality, and associated social conflicts in Banten Province, which the government has sought to mitigate by accelerating the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) program. This study leverages PTSL to map contemporary land tenure dynamics in the region, ultimately formulating strategic policy recommendations to foster more equitable and just socio-agrarian development.

This 13-month study comprised six months of fieldwork (2024-2025), with the remaining period dedicated to data analysis and report writing. This study utilizes primary data, gathered directly through focus group discussions (FGDs), in-depth interviews, and participant observation, and uses secondary data sourced from official documents, regional maps, and demographic statistics from the Ministry of ATR/BPN and BPS. The research workflow begins with village-level FGDs involving 8 to 12 key informants to understand the local socio-agrarian context, which subsequently serves as the baseline for refining in-depth interview guides. Following the FGDs, these in-depth interviews are conducted with informants selected via a snowball sampling technique, starting from an initial key informant and progressively expanding the respondent network to capture comprehensive local insights.

To determine priority policy strategies for Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) in Lebak Regency, the issues and policy improvements identified through SSM and ISM were further analyzed using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP). This methodology encompasses constructing a multi-criteria hierarchy of objectives, criteria, and alternatives; conducting pairwise comparisons on a 1-to-9 scale to establish relative priorities; validating judgment reliability through a consistency ratio where;

$$CR = CI/RI \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

$$CI = (\lambda_{maks} - n)/(n - 1) \dots\dots\dots (2)$$

and ultimately formulating final decisions based on the highest synthesized rankings of the criteria and alternatives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Poverty and Land Tenure Inequality in Lebak Regency and Parungsari Village

Lebak Regency is one of the areas with persistently high poverty rates in Banten Province. According to Statistics Indonesia (BPS), the poverty rate in Lebak reached 10.29 percent in 2021, an increase from the previous year, largely due to the socio-economic impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. More recent data, however, show an improvement: in 2024, the poverty rate declined to 8.44 percent of the total population, equivalent to approximately 111,710 people. This decline reflects some degree of economic recovery and the effectiveness of social intervention programs implemented by both central and local governments. Yet, when compared regionally, Lebak’s position remains concerning, as it continues to rank second in terms of poverty incidence in Banten after Pandeglang. The persistently high poverty rate indicates that structural transformation of the local economy has not fully materialized, and that gaps remain in access to agrarian resources, basic services, and economic opportunities at the local level. The poverty rate is closely correlated with land accessibility. The 2023 Agricultural Census shows that 99.94 percent of individual farming enterprises in Banten Province operate on agricultural land averaging only 0.36 hectares. By contrast, legally incorporated agricultural enterprises, which account for only about 0.03 percent of all agricultural enterprises in the province, manage an average of 115.92 hectares. Other farming entities such as farmer groups, educational institutions, and religious organizations, representing only about 0.02 percent of agricultural enterprises, manage an average of 4.09 hectares. These figures indicate that most farmers in Banten cultivate less than 0.5 hectares, placing them in the category of poor, near landless smallholders (*petani gurem*). In Lebak Regency specifically, smallholders account for 77.10 percent of all farmers—157,995 out of a total of 204,922 (BPS, 2023). The number of smallholders has risen significantly compared to previous censuses: in 2003, there were 104,810 smallholder households out of 200,509 farm households, and in 2013, there were 115,758 out of 187,064 farm households.

Table 1. Population of Near Landless Smallholders in Lebak Regency

Year	Farm Households	Near Landless Farm Households	
		n	%
2003	200,509	104,810	52.27
2013	187,064	115,758	61.91
2023	204,922	157,995	77.10

At the sub-district level, in Sajira—where Parungsari Village is located—the 2023 Agricultural Census recorded 7,689 smallholder households out of 9,112 total farm households, or 84.38 percent. This high proportion confirms that the majority of farmers in Sajira are land-poor smallholders. When compared with provincial-level data, it becomes evident that while most individual farming households operate on very small plots, incorporated agricultural enterprises control disproportionately large areas of land. This points to an underlying allocative inequality in the distribution of agrarian resources, heavily concentrated in the hands of corporate entities.

In the case of Parungsari Village, there is a long history of agrarian conflict between local cultivators and PT The Bantam & Preanger Rubber Co. Ltd. The root of the conflict lies in the expiration of the company's plantation concession (Hak Guna Usaha, HGU) in 2002, which had originally been granted in 1994. After the HGU expired and the plantation was left idle and unproductive, residents from four neighboring villages began cultivating the ex-concession land. Their occupation was motivated not only by the availability of unused land but also by indications of informal handovers from the company and prolonged state inaction. Over time, the cultivated areas expanded and became productive farmland sustaining local livelihoods. However, tensions resurfaced in 2005 when the company unexpectedly attempted to reclaim the land and sought to renew its HGU, provoking strong resistance from cultivators who had long relied on the land for their subsistence. For the community, the ex-HGU land had become more than an agrarian object; it had transformed into a vital source of livelihood and an irreplaceable space of life.

During the 1980s, Parungsari Village was administratively split into Paja and Mekarsari Villages. Around the same period, a 400-hectare military training project (DODIKLAT-PUR) was established across three villages, including Kampung Kopi in Parungsari. Despite resistance from Kampung Kopi residents and the Parungsari village government, strong pressure from local authorities and the military forced them to comply. Simultaneously, 87 hectares of the company's concession land were released due to declining productivity. The local government allocated 50 hectares to a housing developer and 37 hectares to the village government to establish a new settlement for relocated Kampung Kopi residents. Each relocated household received 300 square meters of ex-HGU land for housing, with small residual plots cultivated as paddy fields. Meanwhile, other parts of the released land were occupied and farmed by former company workers during the plantation's decline. These two conflicts—over the HGU land and the military training project—reflect the latent tensions between state, corporate, and community agrarian interests, highlighting the weaknesses of land governance in Indonesia, particularly regarding land conversion and redistribution following the expiration of concession rights. In other words, these conflicts exemplify allocative inequalities in agrarian resources that have contributed to the marginalization of smallholder farmers and local communities.

Field findings also indicate that landholding in Parungsari is dominated by outsiders, leading to the prevalence of absentee ownership in several areas. Only a small number of local residents hold plots larger than two hectares. Most of the population consists of near landless smallholders and the landless. Those without land generally include migrants, newly married couples, households that gradually lost land due to economic pressures, and those who never owned land in the first place. Landless residents fall into two categories: those who own houses but lack farmland, often migrants living in residential areas; and those who neither own houses nor farmland, often younger households living with parents in remote hamlets. Cases were also found of households that previously owned land but, due to subdivision among heirs and distress sales, eventually lost their land entirely.

Participation of Small Landholders in Land Certification and Its Impact on Agrarian Resource Control

It is important to note that Lebak Regency has been designated as one of the priority areas for the implementation of the Complete Systematic Land Registration (PTSL) program, in line with Government Regulation No. 24/1997 and Ministerial Regulation of ATR/BPN No. 6/2018. The program seeks to accelerate asset legalization through mass land registration and certification. In fiscal year 2018, Lebak received a substantial target: 58,650 land parcel maps and 50,250 land certificates, with an achievement rate of 99.69 percent. The program covered 15 sub-districts and 40 villages, indicating the early success of its implementation at the local level. By 2023 and 2024, the allocation targets increased, covering approximately 10,000 hectares and 32,599 parcels in 2023, and in 2024 encompassing 65,248 parcels for mortgage certificates and 31,576 hectares for land-use management.

Prior to PTSL, various land certification programs had been conducted in Parungsari (from the 1970s to the 2000s). These included PRONA (National Agrarian Project) and other land administration initiatives prior to 1980–1984 (locally also referred to as PRONA, even if under different names). Certification in the 1980s was based on *girik* ownership documents. These early initiatives attracted little local interest. Most applicants were large landowners holding more than two hectares, absentee owners from Tangerang and Jakarta, or non-resident landowners in Parungsari. By 2015, the PRONA program in Parungsari ended, with about 40 percent of village land certified.

Normatively, PTSL in Lebak represents a systematic state effort to build inclusive and equitable land governance, while also encouraging farmers to access capital in order to improve welfare. Yet, in practice, participation varied across social groups. During earlier PRONA programs in Parungsari, smallholders and especially landless tenants showed little interest in participating, considering certification irrelevant to their needs. This suggests that certification programs were not well connected to broader agrarian reform agendas. For smallholders, the main reasons were unaffordable administrative fees and the prioritization of daily subsistence needs. Moreover, PRONA itself faced limitations in equipment, transportation, terrain, time, and personnel, all of which constrained its reach. Conversely, interest came predominantly from large landowners and absentee owners who had the financial means and administrative knowledge to pursue certification.

When PTSL was introduced with reduced administrative barriers and costs—and with no restrictions on the maximum land size to be registered—smallholder participation remained limited. Although PTSL in Parungsari succeeded in certifying about 60 percent of land parcels overall, many villagers responded with indifference. This is understandable, as many households owned no land, and those with very small plots continued to view certification fees as beyond their means.

Table 2. Community Participation in Land Certification Programs in Parungsari

No.	Program	Community Participation	Arguments
1	PRONA	- Landless and small landholders chose not to participate - Landowners with more than 2 hectares and absentee landowners living outside the village chose to participate	- Non-participation due to lack of land or unaffordable fees - Participation due to awareness of the legal importance of certification
2	PTSL	Landless and small landholders reluctant to participate	Non-participation due to lack of land or unaffordable fees

The limited participation of smallholder and landless households in land certification programs, including PTSL, raises key questions: To what extent does PTSL address inequalities in the distribution and allocation of agrarian resources that underpin structural poverty? What are its strengths and limitations in overcoming structural poverty?

This study finds that in Parungsari, PTSL has in fact accentuated landholding inequality at the village level. Most villagers own three to five parcels, with only a few owning ten parcels scattered across non-contiguous plots. Those with more than five parcels are considered wealthy, using their land not only for farming but also for livestock. Only a handful of residents own more than two hectares, and these are often fragmented and mostly held by outsiders, particularly from Muara Angke, Jakarta, whose land has been certified since the 1980s.

In other words, state land certification programs have been of limited practical benefit for Parungsari residents, as no significant changes in general welfare have occurred. Instead, certification has tended to reinforce visible inequalities: the landless remain landless, while large landowners consolidate their assets and enhance their value. The landless include migrants, newly married couples, households that gradually lost their land through inheritance fragmentation or distress sales, and those who never owned land at all. Some own houses without farmland, while others lack both houses and farmland, often younger families living with parents in remote hamlets. Many who are currently landless once owned land but lost it through inheritance division or sales until it was completely depleted.

From this perspective, PTSL has strengthened the legal certainty of land ownership status, previously based mainly on oral family transmission or inheritance, but has been limited in addressing village-level agrarian inequalities. Moreover, PTSL and earlier land administration programs have been largely ineffective in preventing land dispossession. The majority of Parungsari residents hold less than two

hectares, often less than one hectare. Households with under one hectare of land—whose plots typically allow only two cycles of paddy cultivation per year with subsistence-level yields—often choose to work abroad as migrant laborers, particularly in Saudi Arabia. By 2019, some 300 residents had become migrant workers. Through remittances, some were able to reinvest in land purchases, expanding their holdings from small to more substantial plots.

In Parungsari Village, most land transfers occur through inheritance (*hibah*) and sale. Such transfers often take place either before registering the land under the PTSL program or concurrently with it. First, transfers by inheritance or sale prior to PTSL typically involved cases in which parents had already distributed land informally to their children or grandchildren, while the land's tax notification letter (*Surat Pemberitahuan Pajak Terutang*, SPPT) remained consolidated under the parents' name rather than subdivided according to each heir's share. In some instances, land was passed down with partial compensation in cash or gold, effectively constituting a sale. Second, transfers that coincided with PTSL were accelerated by the program, as certification formalized ownership status more quickly. For example, parcels initially given to children or grandchildren only through oral agreements became legally clarified under PTSL. Approximately 5–10 percent of land transfers in Parungsari occurred through sale, whether between villagers or with outsiders. Around 20 percent of landowners in Parungsari are non-residents. Sales are usually conducted informally, and negotiations take longer when sellers aim for higher prices. Price levels are closely tied to location: the closer a parcel to provincial or district roads is, the higher its market value.

The experience of Parungsari demonstrates that PTSL has succeeded in providing legal certainty over land ownership. Unfortunately, this legal certainty has not always translated into economic stimulus, enabling households to access credit and participate in economic markets to strengthen their agrarian livelihoods, as envisioned by Hernando de Soto, who emphasized the importance of transforming “dead capital” into productive household assets. Without substantial support from government agencies or professional empowerment institutions, certification programs risk becoming counterproductive. In short, the implementation of PTSL in Parungsari does not fully reflect the characteristics of a pro-poor land policy. While PTSL has provided tenure security by clarifying legal ownership, it has struggled to address the widespread reality of small-scale landholdings and has, in fact, reinforced visible inequalities in land distribution. The program remains insensitive to existing social stratifications based on land control and has not succeeded in significantly enhancing local agricultural productivity. In other words, PTSL in Parungsari delivers tenure security for landowners without transforming inequality structures or stimulating broader agricultural productivity.

Land Policy Reform to Address Poverty

On the one hand, PTSL has succeeded in providing tenure security through legal protection in the form of land certificates; on the other hand, it has also reinforced existing inequalities in landholding. At the same time, PTSL has managed to reach a wider coverage of land parcels. In the case of Parungsari Village, Lebak Regency, land certification under PTSL reached 60 percent. This level of achievement was influenced by five determining factors. The study found that the success of PTSL implementation is shaped by five key factors: land certificate ownership, land productivity, community participation in the program, access to agricultural credit, and the use of agricultural technology. Among these, community participation emerged as the most decisive factor for the success of PTSL in Parungsari. This was largely due to the mobilization of PTSL acceleration committees from the village level down to neighborhood (RT/RW) units. Land productivity ranked second, followed by the use of agricultural technology in third place, land certificate ownership in fourth, and agricultural credit access in last place. These findings indicate that community participation—as the primary agrarian actors in the program—should be prioritized in national land policy reform to support the success of PTSL. In addition to accelerating targeted program implementation, community involvement also generates multiple benefits such as dispute resolution and opportunities to enhance productivity. Furthermore, land productivity remains an essential factor to be addressed in national land policy reform. Productive land not only secures household subsistence but also fosters the potential for independent and sustainable economic capacity, a process that requires both access to technology and agricultural credit.

However, the limitations of PTSL in addressing inequalities in the distribution and allocation of agrarian resources—which contribute to the persistence of structural poverty—raise a further question: *what land policy reforms can be pursued to enable PTSL to serve as a foundation for rural poverty alleviation?*

Table 3. The Factors for the success of PTSL implementation in Lebak Regency

No	Factors	Weight	Priority
1	Land Certificate Ownership	0.110	4
2	Land Productivity	0.209	2
3	Community Participation in PTSL Program	0.401	1
4	Agriculture Credit Accessibility	0.087	5
5	The Use of Agricultural Technology	0.193	3

CR = 0,071

In the case of Parungsari and Lebak Regency, this article finds that policies regulating the prevention and resolution of land and agrarian conflicts should be the top priority, as they share the same function of guaranteeing rights to land ownership and protecting households from potential disputes. Yet, such policies must be complemented by stronger empowerment and community support policies (both social and economic) after households obtain land certificates, in order to reduce poverty. In other words, policies focused on empowerment and post-certification assistance should be prioritized to support access to agricultural credit and technology. Access to credit and technology for enhancing productivity will only be effective if agrarian actors are equipped with knowledge and facilitated through government-led empowerment and community support policies. Naturally, this must also be accompanied by a more comprehensive agrarian reform agenda that combines *asset reform* with *access reform* (access to capital, skills/knowledge, institutions, markets, and other resources).

Table 4. National Land Policy Reform within the PTSL Program Based on Socio-Agrarian Dynamics in Lebak Regency

Success Factors of PTSL	Policy Alternatives		
	<i>Policy 1:</i>	<i>Policy 2:</i>	<i>Policy 3:</i>
	Strengthening Comprehensive Agrarian Reform (Asset Reform complemented by Access Reform: access to capital, skills/knowledge, institutions, markets, etc.)	Strengthening Empowerment and Community Assistance (social and economic) after Obtaining Land Certificates to Reduce Poverty	Promoting Policies for the Prevention and Resolution of Land and Agrarian Conflicts
Factor 1: Land Certificate Ownership	This policy serves as a framework that facilitates the quality of PTSL implementation		Conflict resolution as a priority ensures secure land certificate ownership, while empowerment strengthens farmers' capacity, and asset reform supports the implementation of agrarian reform
Factor 2: Land Productivity	and therefore must be integrated with the two subsequent policies		Conflict resolution guarantees that productive activities can take place; empowerment serves as a means of improvement, and asset strengthening functions as a step toward enhancing land productivity
Factor 3: Community Participation in the PTSL Program			Conflict resolution as a priority tends to motivate community participation; empowerment reinforces participation, and asset strengthening becomes the outcome of such participation
Factor 4: <i>Access to Agricultural Credit</i>		Policy priority to facilitate access to agricultural credit	Conflict resolution ensures access to agricultural credit; empowerment provides training and facilitation, and asset strengthening supports access and capacity building
Factor 5: Use of Agricultural Technology		Policy priority to facilitate access to agricultural technology	Conflict resolution ensures the effective use of agricultural technology; empowerment provides extension services and facilitation tailored to farmers' needs, and agrarian reform serves as the institutional framework

From the Table 4, the prevention and resolution of land and agrarian conflicts (Policy 2) emerge as the priority for national land policy reform to support the effective implementation of PTSL within socio-agrarian contexts. In other words, PTSL must first and foremost be capable of preventing and resolving land and agrarian conflicts. Such conflict prevention and resolution will provide a solid foundation for advancing community empowerment and asset strengthening. Agrarian conflict resolution serves as a strategic starting point to ensure legal certainty of land ownership, encourage community participation, open access to agricultural financing, and enable the effective adoption of agricultural technologies. Together, agrarian conflict resolution, farmer empowerment, and asset strengthening form an integrated and synergistic policy framework that reinforces legality, enhances productivity, and expands the economic capacity of rural communities.

From the perspective of land ownership, conflict resolution is the primary prerequisite for the issuance of valid and functional land certificates, while community empowerment strengthens the position of agrarian subjects in the implementation of agrarian reform, and asset strengthening serves as an instrument to ensure the sustainability of benefits derived from certified land. In the context of land productivity, conflict resolution enables agricultural activities to proceed without disruption, empowerment functions as a means to enhance production capacity, and asset strengthening contributes to the sustainable development of the agricultural sector. A similar pattern applies to community participation, access to agricultural credit, and the use of technology: conflict resolution acts as the main entry point, empowerment provides training and facilitation mechanisms, and asset strengthening guarantees tangible outcomes from the interventions undertaken.

Table 5. Alternative of Policy Proposals

No	Alternative of Policy Proposals	Weight	Priority
1	Land Certificate Ownership		
	Policy 1	0.225	2
	Policy 2	0.198	3
	Policy 3	0.577	1
	<i>Consistency Ratio (CR)</i>	0.076	
2	Land Productivity		
	Policy 1	0.205	3
	Policy 2	0.251	2
	Policy 3	0.544	1
	<i>Consistency Ratio (CR)</i>	0.094	
3	Community Participation in PTSL Program		
	Policy 1	0.255	3
	Policy 2	0.365	2
	policy 3	0.380	1
	<i>Consistency Ratio (CR)</i>	0.072	
4	Credit Accessibility		
	Policy 1	0.264	3
	Policy 2	0.459	1
	Policy 3	0.277	2
	<i>Consistency Ratio (CR)</i>	0.008	
5	Use of Technology		
	Policy 1	0.309	2
	Policy 2	0.499	1
	Policy 3	0.192	3
	<i>Consistency Ratio (CR)</i>	0.04	

Based on this analysis, conflict resolution (Policy 3) should be prioritized as the initial foundation, followed by the strengthening of empowerment and community assistance policies (social and economic) after land certification (Policy 2) as a supporting process. Meanwhile, the strengthening of a more comprehensive agrarian reform policy (Policy 1) should serve as the overarching framework governing PTSL as a whole. The integration of these three elements indicates that the realization of policies within PTSL must be carried out in a gradual, systematic, and locally grounded manner to ensure sustainable and wide-reaching impacts. In other words, PTSL cannot merely stop at asset legalization; it must also address agrarian inequality (and/or agrarian conflicts) and proceed to the stage where

communities are empowered to manage their land, actively participate in rural development, and ultimately break free from the trap of structural poverty.

Table 6. The alternative policies prioritized to reform PTSL

Policy Alternative	Weight	Priority
Policy 1	0.252	3
Policy 2	0.357	2
Policy 3	0.391	1

The scheme of national land policy reform within the PTSL program aligns with Sajogyo’s concept of the eight pathways for equitable development. The “father of rural sociology” argued that in order to achieve equitable development capable of alleviating structural poverty, reforms must be directed along several pathways: the “pattern of land tenure” (which determines opportunities for farmers and agricultural laborers), the “pattern of access to capital, new knowledge, advanced technology, and modern inputs,” and the “pattern of market access” (Sajogyo, 2006). As long as agriculture continues to dominate rural economies, the pattern of land tenure remains the decisive pathway that shapes opportunities for work and livelihoods in rural areas, and thus serves as the primary channel for advancing equitable development in villages (Sitorus, 1998; Sajogyo, 2006). For this reason, it is crucial to pursue programs of “land reform” and “tenancy reform” to address persistent inequalities in land tenure (Sajogyo, 2006). In this context, land reform refers to efforts at redistributing land in order to reduce agrarian inequality, whereas tenancy reform entails revising sharecropping, mortgage, and rental arrangements between cultivators and landowners in ways that favor tenant farmers belonging to the weakest strata of the rural population.

By first reforming patterns of land tenure—through land reform and tenancy reform—the process can then proceed with strengthening structures of capital ownership, improving access to advanced knowledge and technology, and integrating rural economies into market systems or “patterns of market access.” Sajogyo proposed the provision of community-based business capital through *credit reform* programs, implemented by new financial institutions such as village banks and cooperatives, moving beyond traditional forms like rotating savings groups (*arisan*). Furthermore, the dissemination of knowledge and technology to economic actors, both farmers and laborers, must be facilitated by extension institutions supported by research activities and advanced technological resources. Finally, the provision of production inputs, which are increasingly dependent on external sources—such as irrigation, fertilizers, pesticides, as well as post-harvest and marketing services—needs to be systematically designed to ensure equitable and sustainable access for rural economic actors.

Both Sajogyo’s Pathways for Equitable Development and the scheme of national land policy reform within the PTSL program identify the reduction of land tenure inequality as the starting point. However, empirical findings from this study in Parungsari reveal the opposite: a persistent gap between the ideal and actual practice, where no significant improvement in general welfare can be observed following the implementation of PTSL. On the contrary, land certification programs have tended to make inequalities in landholding across social strata more visible. This highlights the central challenge for PTSL—how the program can be effectively designed to reduce landholding inequality, which forms the structural basis for equitable rural development and enables rural communities to escape structural poverty.

CONCLUSION

The agenda of land registration and state-led asset legalization has consistently been framed within the orientation of fostering popular economic growth. This orientation is inseparable from the spirit of agrarian reform mandated by the 1960 Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA) as well as Indonesia’s openness to foreign and private investment, particularly following the growing influence of the World Bank in accelerating land administration. As a result, two dominant tendencies have emerged in the treatment of land: marketization and commodification. These tendencies have transformed land into an economic commodity detached from its deeper cultural and social bonds with farmers and communities. Within this context, the PTSL program was designed both to provide access to capital through the availability of land certificates and to ensure legal certainty of ownership rights. On the one hand, PTSL has significance in safeguarding tenure security and preventing potential land disputes. On the other, it has not been able to halt processes of land dispossession nor address structural agrarian inequality. These

tensions must serve as a serious reflection point for policymakers in redesigning future land and agrarian policies.

It is important to emphasize that PTSL, as a presidential initiative and national strategic program, represents a major policy breakthrough after nearly two decades of stagnation in Indonesia's agrarian policy. The National Agrarian Reform Program (PPAN) under President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono was an earlier milestone, but it lacked the scale and strategic impact of PTSL under President Joko Widodo. The case of Lebak Regency shows that structural poverty has not been fully addressed through PTSL, partly because of the complexity of poverty itself, but also because PTSL has prioritized asset legalization and land administration while neglecting structural agrarian redistribution. Nevertheless, one strength of PTSL is its massive public outreach, raising awareness of the importance of legal rights and formal ownership in preventing agrarian conflicts and overlapping land claims.

Findings from the Analytical Hierarchy Process further underscore that community participation in PTSL is driven primarily by the priority of conflict resolution: (1) resolving conflicts ensures legal certification and strengthens the implementation of agrarian reform; (2) conflict resolution enables productive activities, while empowerment enhances capacity, and asset strengthening supports land productivity; (3) conflict resolution motivates community participation, empowerment reinforces participation, and asset strengthening becomes the outcome; (4) conflict resolution ensures access to agricultural credit, empowerment provides training and facilitation, and asset strengthening supports access and capacity building; and (5) conflict resolution guarantees the adoption of agricultural technologies, empowerment provides extension and facilitation, while agrarian reform serves as the enabling framework.

For this reason, any reform of land policy aimed at positioning PTSL as a foundation for rural poverty alleviation must go beyond asset legalization and land administration to directly confront structural agrarian inequality. PTSL must also address the root causes of agrarian conflict, often linked to state concessions for large-scale industries (mining, forestry, and plantations) that marginalize community agrarian rights. In short, PTSL must be understood as an integral component of genuine agrarian reform as mandated by the Basic Agrarian Law of 1960. Looking forward, the most pressing policy directions are: (1) preventing and resolving land and agrarian conflicts; (2) strengthening comprehensive agrarian reform that combines *asset reform* with *access reform* (access to capital, skills and knowledge, institutions, markets, etc.); and (3) consolidating empowerment and post-certification community assistance (social and economic) to ensure that land certificates translate into poverty reduction.

Acknowledgement. I would like to express my gratitude to the authors, who also served as my doctoral supervisors. Without their guidance, direction, input, and motivation, this journal article would never have been written.

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

Declaration of Generative AI Use. The author(s) did not use any generative AI or AI-assisted tools during the preparation of this work. The author(s) take full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the content.

CRedit Contribution. AHS Conceptualization, Methodology, Analysis, Writing, Review & Editing; H Supervision & Validation; US Supervision & Validation; YHA Supervision & Validation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbas, RR, Soetarto, E, Pandjaitan, NK, & Satria, A (2021). Land Grabbing di Telukjambe Barat, Karawang, Jawa Barat dan Tautan Teoritiknya pada Karya David Harvey dan SMP Tjondronegoro. *Jurnal Sosiologi Pedesaan*, 9(3). <https://doi.org/10.22500/9202135107>
- Adamie, BA (2021). Land Property Rights and Household Take-Up of Development Programs: Evidence from Land Certification Program in Ethiopia. *World Development*, 147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105626>
- Adma, S (2020). Pengaruh Implementasi Kebijakan Pendaftaran Tanah Sistematis Lengkap Terhadap Tertib Pertanahan di Kota Bontang. *Jurnal Administrative Reform*, 8(1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.52239/jar.v8i1.4085>
- Agusta, Ivanovic. (2025, May 9). Ukuran dan Program Penanggulangan Kemiskinan. *Kompas.id*.

<https://www.Kompas.id/artikel/ukuran-dan-program-penanggulangan-kemiskinan>

- Agyei-Holmes A, Buehren N, Goldstein M, Osei R, Osei-Akoto I, & Udry C (2020). The effects of land title registration on tenure security, investment and the allocation of productive resources: evidence from Ghana. *Policy Research Working Paper*.
- Alkhudri, AT, Dharmawan, AH, Kinseng, RA, & Tjondronegoro, SMP (2018). *Metamorfosis Gerakan Sosial di Banten: Dari Romantisme Identitas ke Isu Agraria Lingkungan*. *Sodality*, 6(1), 24-31.
- Amir, RA., Barus, B, & Soetarto, E (2020). Dinamika Spasial Tanah Terdaftar dan Implikasinya Terhadap Sistem Penghidupan Masyarakat Lokal di Kabupaten Takalar. *Journal of Regional and Rural Development Planning*, 4(2), 134–153. <https://doi.org/10.29244/jp2wd.2020.4.2.134-153>
- Andriamihaja, OR, Metz, F, Zaehring, JG, Fischer, M, & Messerli, P (2021.) Identifying Agents of Change for Sustainable Land Governance. *Land Use Policy*, 100:104882. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2020.104882>
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Lebak. (2022). *Statistik Kesejahteraan Rakyat Kabupaten Lebak 2022*. Lebak.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Lebak. (2023). *Hasil Pencacahan Lengkap Sensus Pertanian 2023. Tahap I*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Lebak. (2023). *Hasil Pencacahan Lengkap Sensus Pertanian 2023. Tahap II*.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Lebak. (2023). *Kabupaten Lebak dalam Angka 2023*. Lebak.
- Bahfein, S. (2022, Jan 8). 79,1 juta bidang tanah di seluruh Indonesia telah terdaftar via PTSL. *Kompas.com*. <https://www.kompas.com/properti/read/2022/01/08/070000821/79-1-juta-bidang-tanah-di-seluruh-indonesia-telah-terdaftar-via-ptsl>
- Bakker, L (2018). Agrarian justice and Indonesian law. *SHS Web of Conferences*. 54(03020). <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185403020>
- Bangko, BS, Pinudji, S (2014). *LARASITA: Kebijakan, urgensi dan pelayanan publik dalam dimensi baru layanan pertanahan*. Malang: Aditya Media Publishing.
- Basya, B (2017). *Berebut Kesempatan Dalam Program Legalisasi Aset: Redistribusi dan Sertifikasi Lahan di Cipari*. Seri Working Paper Kebijakan Agraria dan Pembangunan Pasca Orde Baru, No.10/WP-KAPPOB/I/2017.
- Baum, HS (2015). Citizen participation. In JD Wright (Eds.), *International encyclopedia of the social & behavioral sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 3, pp. 625–630). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.74005-0>
- Benitez, J, Delgado-Galvan X, Izquierdo J, Perez-Garcia R (2015). Consistent Completion of Incomplete Judgments in Decision Making Using AHP. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 290, 412-422. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2015.05.023>
- Bernstein, H (2010). *Class dynamics of agrarian change*. Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.
- Borras, SM, Franco, JC (2010). Contemporary Discourses and Contestations around Pro-Poor Land Policies and Land Governance. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 10(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-0366.2009.00243.x>
- Bouthavong, S, Hyakumura, K, Ehara, M, Fujiwara, T (2016). Historical Changes of Land Tenure and Land Use Rights in a Local Community: A Case Study in Lao PDR. *Land*, 5(11), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land5020011>
- Cahyono, E (2013). Eksklusi Atas Nama Konservasi (Studi Kasus Masyarakat Sekitar/Dalam Kawasan Taman Nasional Ujungkulon Banten). *Sosiologi Reflektif*, 8(1), 209-245. <https://ejournal.uin-suka.ac.id/isoshum/index.php/sosiologirefleksif/article/view/519>
- Checkland, P (1981). *Systems thinking, systems practice*. Chichester: Wiley & Sons.
- Checkland, P, Poulter, J (2010). *Learning for action: A short definitive account of soft systems*

- methodology, and its use for practitioners, teachers and students. New York: Wiley.
- Checkland, P, Scholes, J (1990). *Soft system methodology in action*. England: Jhon Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Diantoro, TD (2020). Dinamika Kebijakan Resolusi Konflik Tenurial Kawasan Hutan Era Joko Widodo. *Media of Law and Sharia*, 1(4), 245-267. <https://doi.org/10.18196/mls.v1i4.20272>
- Dye, TR (1981). *Understanding public policy*. Englewood: Prentice-Hall.
- Enemark, S (2012). Sustainable land governance: three key demands. *FIG Working Week*. 5998, 1-19.
- Fadhil, R, Maarif, MS, Bantacut, T, Hermawan, A (2017). Model Strategi Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Agroindustri Kopi Gayo dalam Menghadapi Masyarakat Ekonomi ASEAN. *Jurnal Manajemen Teknologi*, 16(2), 141-155. <https://doi.org/10.12695/jmt.2017.16.2.3>.
- Garg, S (2017). Impact of overpopulation on land use pattern. In S Garg (Eds.), *environmental issues surrounding human overpopulation*. India.
- Goodman, LA (1961) Snowball Sampling. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 32, 148-170. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177705148>
- Holdena, ST, Ghebru, H (2013). Household welfare effects of low-cost land certification in Ethiopia. *Centre for Land Tenure Studies Working Paper*.
- Holm, LB, Dahl, FA, Barra, M (2013). Towards a Multimethodology in Health Care –Synergies Between Soft Systems Methodology and Discrete Event Simulation. *Health Systems*. 2(1), 11-23. <https://doi.org/10.1057/hs.2012.21>
- Ibnudin, MU (2016). Faktor Penentu Pengalihan Sertifikat Tanah Hasil Program Redistribusi: Kasus pada Petani di Desa Karossa Kecamatan Tassoko Kabupaten Mamuju Sulawesi Barat. *Sosiohumaniora*. 18(3), 248-254. <https://doi.org/10.24198/sosiohumaniora.v18i3.10103>
- Judijanto, L (2025). Sertifikasi Tanah, Kepastian Hak, dan Implikasinya Terhadap Akses Modal serta Kesejahteraan Ekonomi: Studi Literatur. *Borjuis: Journal of Economy*, 2(4), 209–217.
- Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang (2016). Peraturan Menteri Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Kepala Badan Pertanahan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 11 Tahun 2016 tentang Penyelesaian Kasus Pertanahan. Jakarta.
- Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang (2018). Keputusan Kepala Badan Pertanahan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 34 Tahun 2007 tentang Petunjuk Teknis Penanganan dan Penyelesaian Masalah Pertanahan. Jakarta.
- Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang (2018). Peraturan Menteri Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Kepala Badan Pertanahan Nasional Nomor 6 Tahun 2018 tentang Pendaftaran Tanah Sistematis Lengkap. Jakarta.
- Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang (2019). Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Kegiatan IP4T Tahun 2019. Jakarta: Badan Pertanahan Nasional.
- Khalis, T (2021). Dampak pendaftaran tanah sistematis lengkap (PTSL) terhadap akses kredit perbankan di Desa Punung Kecamatan Punung Kabupaten Pacitan Provinsi Jawa Timur [Thesis]. Yogyakarta: Sekolah Tinggi Pertanahan Nasional.
- Kogha, FDD. (2022, Sep 27). Tembus angka 81,6 juta, capaian program PTSL alami loncatan signifikan. *Wahananews.com*. <https://wahananews.co/daerah/tembus-angka-816-juta-capaian-program-ptsl-alami-loncatan-signifikan-64d56je1QV>
- Kurniawan, A, Sudibyanung, & Supriyanti, T (2020). Pemanfaatan Sertipikat Tanah Hasil Pendaftaran Tanah Sistematis Lengkap untuk Peningkatan Modal Usaha di Kabupaten Madiun. *Jurnal Tunas Agraria*, 3(3), 94–119. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jta.v3i3.124>
- Kusdiane, SD, Soetarto E, & Sunito, S (2018). Alih Fungsi Lahan dan Perubahan Masyarakat di Kecamatan Cimanuk, Kabupaten Pandeglang. *Sodality*, 6(3), 246-251. <https://doi.org/10.22500/sodality.v6i3.23465>
- Li, TM (2012). *The will to improve: Governmentality, development, and the practice of politics*.

Durham: Duke University Press.

- Limbong, B (2012). Politik pertanahan. Jakarta: Margaretha Pustaka.
- Listyanti, AA, Jamilah, L, Firmansyah, A (2018). Perjanjian jual beli tanah redistribusi di Desa Mekarmukti dihubungkan dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960 tentang Peraturan Dasar Pokok-Pokok Agraria Juncto Buku III Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata. *Prosiding Ilmu Hukum*. 4(1), 195-201.
- Mardiana, YS, Siregar, H, Juanda, B (2016). Pengaruh Sertifikasi Tanah Terhadap Nilai Tanah dan Kondisi Ekonomi Masyarakat di Kabupaten Sukoharjo. *Jurnal Aplikasi Bisnis dan Manajemen*. 2(3), 304-211. <https://doi.org/10.17358/jabm.2.3.304>
- Mengesha, AK, Mansberger, R, Damyanovic, D, Stoegelehner, G (2019). Impact of Land Certification on Sustainable Land Use Practices: Case of Gozamin District, Ethiopia. *Sustainability*. 11(20):5551. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11205551>
- Mujiburohman, DA (2018). Potensi Permasalahan Pendaftaran Tanah Sistematis Lengkap (PTSL). *Bhumi*. 4(1), 90-103. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v4i1.209>
- Peraturan Pemerintah RI (2004). Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 16 Tahun 2004 tentang Penatagunaan Tanah. Jakarta.
- Prabowo, HL (2019). Study of Parcels-Based Land Use Planning in Urban Areas and Rural Areas (Case Study of Mantrijeron Sub-District, Yogyakarta City and Bambanglipuro Sub-district, Bantul Regency). *Journal of Geospatial Information Science and Engineering*, 2(1), 171-184. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jgise.41848>
- Prianto, Y, Gazali, NB, Sumantri, VK, Suntoso, E (2019). The Effect of Legal Culture Shift on Land Tenure in Leuwidamar District, Lebak-Banten. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 439, 558-565. DOI 10.2991/assehr.k.200515.094
- Proches, CNG, & Bodhanya, S (2017). An Application of Soft Systems Methodology in The Sugar Industry. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. 14(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/160940691501400101>
- Pujriani, DW (2021). Meninjau implementasi dan kinerja kebijakan pendaftaran tanah di Indonesia. Working Paper Sajogyo Institute. 1(1). Bogor: Sajogyo Institute.
- Purwono, R, Wardana, WW, Haryanto, T, & Mubin, MK (2021). Poverty Dynamics in Indonesia: Empirical Evidence from Three Main Approaches. *World Development Perspectives*, 23. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wdp.2021.100346>
- Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan ATR/BPN RI (2013). Laporan Akhir Penelitian Keberdayaan Masyarakat dalam Percepatan Pendaftaran Tanah. Jakarta.
- Rachman, NF (2013). Rantai Penjelaras Konflik-konflik Agraris yang Kronis, Sistemik dan Meluas di Indonesia. *Bhumi*, 37, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v0i37.148>
- Rachman, NF (2015). Memahami Reorganisasi Ruang Melalui Perspektif Politik Agraria. *Bhumi*, 1(1), 33-44. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v1i1.39>
- Rudiyanto, A (2016). Kajian Persiapan Perubahan Sistem Pendaftaran Tanah Publikasi Positif di Indonesia. Jakarta: Bappenas, Direktorat Tata Ruang dan Pertanahan.
- Saaty, TL (1980). The analytic hierarchy process. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sajogyo (2006). Peluang usaha, peluang bekerja dan lembaga sosial. In F Wahono, AB Widyanta, & Y Indarto (Eds.), *Ekososiologi: Deideologisasi teori, restrukturisasi aksi (petani dan perdesaan sebagai kasus uji)*. Cindelar Pustaka Rakyat Cerdas.
- Sajogyo Institute. (2019). Potret Ketimpangan Penguasaan Tanah di Indonesia. Final Programmatic Report Sajogyo RPJMN Study. Jakarta: Bappenas.
- Sajogyo. (1973). Modernization without Development in Rural Java. A paper contributed to the study on change in agrarian structures, organized by FAO, 1972-73. Bogor: Bogor Agricultural University.

- Sari, SA, Sihombing, M, & Purwoko, A (2019). Impact of a Complete Systematic Land Registration Program (PTSL) Against the Regional Economy in Deli Serdang Regency. *Wacana*, 22(2), 74–81.
- Sarjita, Budhiawan, H, & Mujiburohman, DA (2013). Gugatan atas penetapan tanah terlantar di Provinsi Banten. In AN Luthfi (Eds.), *Membaca ulang politik dan kebijakan agraria*. Yogyakarta: Pusat Penelitian dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat, Sekolah Tinggi Pertanahan Nasional.
- Shohibuddin, M (2010). Prolog: Memahami dimensi-dimensi kemiskinan masyarakat adat. In Achmaliadi, Restu & M Shohibuddin (Eds.), *Memahami dimensi kemiskinan masyarakat adat* (pp. I—XXI). AMAN, ICCO.
- Shohibuddin, M (2018). *Perspektif agraria kritis*. Yogyakarta: STPN Press.
- Shohibuddin, M (2019). *Ketimpangan agraria di Indonesia: Pendekatan studi, kondisi terkini, dan kebijakan penanganannya*. Bogor: IPB Press.
- Shohibuddin, M, & Soetarto, E (2005). *Reforma agraria prasyarat utama bagi revitalisasi pertanian dan pedesaan*. Bandung: Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria.
- Shohibuddin, M, & Soetarto, E (2023). Krisis agraria dan produksi kemiskinan: sebuah perspektif relasional. In A. Wibowo & M. Shohibuddin (Eds.), *Mewujudkan Demokratisasi Agraria*. Bogor: Pusat Studi Agraria Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- Sihaloho, M, Dharmawan, AH, Rusli, S. (2007). Konversi Lahan Pertanian dan Perubahan Struktur Agraria (Studi Kasus di Kelurahan Mulyaharaja, Kecamatan Bogor Selatan, Kota Bogor, Jawa Barat). *Sodality*. 1(2), 253-270.
- Sinabutar, P (2015). *Penataan tenurial dan peran para pihak dalam mewujudkan legalitas dan legitimasi kawasan hutan negara [Doctoral dissertation, Institut Pertanian Bogor]*. Bogor.
- Sitorus, F (1998). Menuju Sosiologi Kemakmuran: Mencari Kerangka untuk Pemikiran Sosiologi Sajogyo. In Makalah disampaikan pada Diskusi Bulanan Kelompok Dokis dan Laboratorium SAK, PKF-Sosek, Faperta IPB, Bogor. 27 Agustus 1998.
- Soto, HD (2000). *The mystery of capital: Why capitalism triumphs in the west and fails everywhere else*. New York: Basic Books.
- Sugiharti, L, Purwono, R, Esquivias, MA, & Jayanti, AD (2022). Poverty Dynamics in Indonesia: The Prevalence and Causes of Chronic Poverty. *Journal of Population and Social Studies*, 30, 423–447. <https://doi.org/10.25133/JPSSv302022.025>
- Sumarti, T (2024). Otonomi Sosiologi Indonesia dan Arah Transformasi Sosial dalam Ketahanan Pangan: Belajar dari Pudjiwati Sajogyo. *The 6th Sajogyo and Pudjiwati Lecture 2024*.
- Surayya, I (2020). Ideologi Hukum Pendaftaran Tanah dalam Sistem Hukum Agraria. *Jatiswara*. 35(1), 43-50. <https://doi:10.29303/jatiswara.v34i1.224>
- Surur, F (2017). Dampak pendaftaran tanah sistematis lengkap terhadap sosial ekonomi petani di Kelurahan Lancirang Kecamatan Pitu Riawa Kabupaten Sidenreng Rappang. In Sidipurwenty, et al.(Eds.), *Pendaftaran tanah sistematis lengkap dalam rangka modernisasi administrasi pertanahan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Badan Pertanahan Nasional.
- Susanti, A, Hidayat, K, & Sukesu, K (2013). Struktur Penguasaan Tanah Pertanian dan Hubungan Kerja Agraris pada Masyarakat Tengger. *Habitat*. 24(1), 32-43.
- Susilowati, MHD (2017). Potensi Wilayah Sekitar Pantai Selatan Kabupaten Lebak Provinsi Banten dalam Mendukung Pembangunan Pariwisata. *Jurnal Pendidikan Geografi*. 22(2), 105-112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um017v22i22017p105>
- Taherdoost, H (2017). Decision Making Using the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP); A Step by Step Approach. *International Journal of Economics and Management Systems*. 2, 244-246. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3224206>
- Tolo, EYS (2016). Collective Land Certification Policy as an Alternative to Land Conflict Resolution and Rural Development in Flores, Indonesia. *International Journal of Science and Organization*.

23(2), 77-85. <https://doi.org/10.20476/jbb.v23i2.9005>

Undang-Undang Dasar Tahun 1945 (1945).

Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960 (1960). Undang-Undang Pokok Agraria.

Widowati, DA, Luthfi, AN, Guntur, IGN (2014). Asas-asas keagrariaan merunut kembali riwayat kelembagaan agraria, dasar keilmuan agraria dan asas hubungan keagrariaan di Indonesia. Yogyakarta: STPN Press.

Winoto, J (2007). Reforma agraria: Mandat politik, konstitusi dan hukum dalam rangka mewujudkan tanah untuk keadilan dan kesejahteraan rakyat. Jakarta: Badan Pertanahan Nasional.

Wiradi, G (2008). Pola penguasaan tanah dan reforma agraria. In SMP Tjondronegoro, G Wiradi (Eds.), Dua abad penguasaan tanah: Pola penguasaan tanah pertanian di Jawa dari masa ke masa. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Wiradi, G (2009). Reforma Agraria Perjalanan Yang Belum Berakhir. Sajogyo Institute, Yayasan Akatiga dan Konsorsium Pembaruan Agraria.