



Contents lists available at [Journal IICET](#)

**JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)**

ISSN: 2502-8103 (Print) ISSN: 2477-8524 (Electronic)

Journal homepage: <https://jurnal.iicet.org/index.php/jppi>



## Changes in agrarian structure, capital, and access (case study of land redistribution program in Pasawahan Village, Ciamis District)

**Galih Andreanto<sup>\*</sup>, Endriatmo Soetarto, Rina Mardiana**

Study Program Sociology Rural School Postgraduate, IPB University, Darmaga Bogor 16680, Indonesia

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received Sep 20<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Revised Oct 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022

Accepted Nov 21<sup>st</sup>, 2022

#### Keyword:

Equality access,  
Reform agrarian true,  
Change agrarian,  
Post land redistribution

### ABSTRACT

The agrarian structure is a changing place where people fight for certain positions. This study looks at how the agrarian structure changed before, during, and five years after the land redistribution program was put into place in Pasawahan Village, Ciamis, West Java. For this research, both quantitative and qualitative descriptive case studies are used. Respondents whose information was used came from a group of 540 land redistribution recipients who owned a total of 838 plots of land. The results showed that there was a big difference between the agrarian structure before land redistribution, at the time land redistribution was put into place, and after it was put into place. When land redistribution is put into place, economic and symbolic capital, access to jobs, and access to knowledge have a negative effect on the agrarian structure. At the same time, capital makes the agrarian structure better. Access to knowledge has a bad effect on the agrarian structure, while redistribution of land, economic and symbolic capital, and access to technology all have a positive effect. After the land is redistributed, capital has a positive effect on the agrarian structure..



© 2022 The Authors. Published by IICET.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-SA license  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0>)

### Corresponding Author:

Galih Andreanto,  
IPB University  
Email: [bunggalih@apps.ipb.ac.id](mailto:bunggalih@apps.ipb.ac.id)

## Introduction

Redistribution program claimed land as part from reform run agrarian government must checked change structure agrarian. is structure created agrarian going to equivalent structure or the other way around ? According to Lutfi (Luthfi, 2018) policy reform agrarian ideally designed for complete emergency problem agrarian in the form of neglect former HGU land, conflict agrarian and hardship get access. Condition inaccessibility that give birth to vulnerability third, namely criminalization resident . This post try look for because change structure agrarian at the location of the land redistribution program reviewed from draft individual access and capital redistribution program recipient land in village Pasawahan, Ciamis .

Various study about draft structure agrarian has done, according to (Wiradi, 1984) structure agrarian related with formal mastery, mastery effective, spread allocation and allocation. Draft structure agrarian affairs was also studied by Elias H ( Tuma , 1965) , agrarian covers mastery land (land tenure), pattern cultivation (pattern of cultivation) and boundaries mastery as well as scale operations (terms of holding and scale of operation). Structure studied agrarian in study this try explain conception structure agrarian from various studies agrarian previously with expand range time for see change agrarian in pre moment until post redistribution land. Study

this attempted lift draft structure agrarian according to Tuma (1965) in Russel King (2019) with be equipped aspect tenure security (Safitri, 2010) so that could more holistic describe reality structure agrarian post redistribution program land. So that indicator in variable structure agrarian covers quantity mastery land, ownership land, land utilization as well as tenure security which includes existence certificate, perception actor about aspect safe or whether or not mastery land and perception actor about aspect ownership complete or conditional (Safitri, 2010 in Simarmata, 2012).

Analyzer for check change structure agrarian in research this use draft access and capital from individual redistribution program recipient land. Expansion momentum scale for understand change structure agrarian meant for explore change existing agrarian in continuity time ok before existence redistribution land, moment running redistribution land and post implementation redistribution land. Process and relationship mapping access as well as network positioning power the effect to structure agrarian is very important studied. This thing for understand more in differentiation classes livelihood the long countryside this considered homogeneous.

In study (Nuridin, 2018) change of power on structure agrarian make the process of use, governance, production management up to consumption develop to more direction good. This is also related with kahian access by (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) emphasize importance analysis useful access for mapping dynamic processes and relationships access. In connection this (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) differentiate two category mechanism access, namely: right-based access and structural and relational access mechanisms. Category first covers mechanism access enforced by sanctions law, custom customs, and conventions (read: legal access); will However, it also includes mechanisms obtained access through ways that violate rights, for example deep theft (read: illegal access) study this defined access to land. Whereas second category is strength decisive structural and relational how something access could achieved, controlled and maintained. This thing covers a number of factor as following: technology, capital, market, energy work and opportunities work, knowledge, authority, identity social, as well relations social (Ribot & Peluso, 2003). More carry on (Peluso & Ribot, 2020) emphasize that meaning framework work access as guide analyze and identify point intervention potential in skeleton repair conflict and conditions ecological.

In skeleton understand power working in the structure arena agrarian - Pierre Bourdieu's thoughts on work work power could used, because power could hide self through various capital (capital). Capital according to (Bourdieu, 1996) is bunch source true strength and power could used. "That is, 'capital' is used by Bourdieu to map relationships strength and power in society. by detail according to (Bourdieu, 1996) classified capital into economic capital, cultural capital, social capital and symbolic capital.

Study about land redistribution with various perspective has many studied, for example studies (Junita, 2011) about impact update agrarian to tenure security. Other studies that do not lost important is about impact reform agrarian from lower to well-being (Sokoastri & Soetarto, 2012). Temporary studies more in Mamuju about change structure agrarian, found diversion certificate to the other party post land redistribution as much as 28.9% (Ibnudin, 2016). Temporary study related with change agriculture in the Village Pasawahan in 2010 was reported by (Munawar, 2010) which showed findings that, in the Village Pasawahan condition well-being farmer post reclaiming, still not yet whole prosperous because part big income farmer still low that is 80% rate income not enough from Rp. 1,100,000/ month. Studies the newest in Pasawahan reported by (Afriliyeni et al., 2021) who found category 88.89% farmers in Pasawahan is in the category low access reform. Research in Ciamis by (Herdiana et al., 2014) showing that level endurance food in Ciamis is 54.08% houses ladder susceptible food, 26.94% house ladder stand food, 12.65% house ladder vulnerable food, and 6.33% of houses ladder not enough food.

Studies on redistribution the land that is this conducted not yet see differentiation access and capital on site redistribution land. Though thereby study in other locations regarding structure agrarian by (Sirait, 2017) has has notice comparison of pre and post momentum redistribution land on land forestry based on class based on ownership land in Cinit and Simpang Duren. From a number of research that examines about impact and implications post land redistribution in various perspective, not yet someone is analyzing because change structure agrarian from inspection access and capital. So from that study this try collaborate draft access (Ribot & Peluso, 2003) and capital (Bourdieu, 1996) for understand more carry on dynamics structure agrarian issues that occur at the location of the redistribution program land in Pasawahan, Regency Nice. Changes agrarian is very possible occur consequence differentiation condition individual access and capital receiver redistribution program benefits organized land in Organization farmer Local (OTL) Pasawahan II Union Farmer Pasundan (SPP). The problem of absence setting access and predictable capital will return accelerate change structure agrarian.

History of struggle farmers in Pasawahan has showing that k need organizing strong people find effective linking to success occupation land and aggregate the process of carrying out the redistribution process land by

the state. Coalition broad and pro reform politics agrarian intertwined like that appearance so that strengthening the transfer of knowledge and strengthening the morale of the people farmer Pasawahan. Pro -reform coalition agrarian it also signifies that no existence compromise with ruler land large that is party plantation PT. Cipicung. Based on description above study this aim for analyze change structure agrarian before, during and after redistribution land. Study this want analyze influence access and capital to structure agrarian before, during and after implementation redistribution land.

## Method

Study this use paradigm *postpositivism* for analyze reality social from side objective and subjective community. Paradigm the customized with meaning for explain draft access and capital for understand change structure agrarian as well as link quantitative data with qualitative . because of that approach that will used is through approach quantitative data supported by qualitative data (Corbetta, 2003) . So study this run with approach *mixed methods* that is method convergence Among method qualitative and quantitative (Creswell, 2009) . Data collection is done through survey individual redistribution program recipient land in village Pasawahan as well as interviews and FGDs on informants and respondents . The supervision of qualitative research is necessary for quantitative research, whether it be in the generation of theory or in the development of a deeper understanding of certain phenomena.

Variable affected is structure agrarian and variable free are capital and access . Election location in village Pasawahan, Ciamis conducted by purposive with consideration i.e, research site is redistribution program locations land in 2016. Second, location study is the place where there is history occupation land by organized OT. Third, there are network contact activists who are in location good research and reception with on site organizers research . Fourth, acceptance government village Pasawahan as well as Agricultural Vocational School Pasawahan for made location research.

Population in study this is individual land redistribution program recipient with unit of analysis that is individual as program recipient Respondent interviewed in accordance with guide questionnaire. Besides that administrator community or organization farmer local, Non Governmental Organizations and Government Village Becomes subject informant. Informant interviewed with guide Interview structured and unstructured structured. Amount surveyed respondents from population 540 subjects receiver redistribution land in 838 plots land . Size amount the sample under study use formula slovin  $n = N / (1 + Ne^2)$  is a minimum of 230 samples and then sample taken randomly on location research. Successful data sample researched in research this a total of 279 respondents or 51 percent from population . Election sample conducted by intentionally (purposive) in order to get answer related structure agrarian , capital and access with right and true (Singarimbun et al., 2017).

Activity study this held start month February 2021 to February 2022. Data collection is carried out in September - December 2021. Primary data obtained from a survey of distribution program recipients land in village Pasawahan, while secondary data sourced from OTL SPP, Government Village and Land Office BPN Nice. Various results study previously also used ingredient reference. Primary data collection techniques are carried out through surveys, interviews in-depth , FGD, observation and study literature .

Instrument test study through validity test (correlation Pearson) shows that instrument research used is valid and test reliability use Cronbach's Alpha shows that instrument used in questionnaire showing results reliable or value  $> 0.6$ . For normality test use Kolmogorov-Smirnov test variable test access and modal show Sig. 0.217  $> 0.05$  which means the data is normally distributed. For Multicollinearity test as part from assumption test classic in analysis regression multiple showing results no there is correlation between variable independent that is modal variables and access to be tested or each other free with score appropriate tolerance criteria more big of 0.1 or with VIF value  $< 10$  which indicates no occur multicollinearity between independent variable . Heteroscedasticity test use Correlation Spearman's Rho Modal variable with results pass the heteroscedasticity test with score Sig. (2- tailed )= 0.486 $>0.05$ . For Heteroscedasticity Test use Correlation Spearman's Rho variable Access passed the heteroscedasticity test with score Sig. (2- tailed )= 0.925 $>0.05$ .

Collected data are quantitative data and qualitative data . Quantitative data that has been collected will input and processing with use Ms. application . Excel and statistical test with SPSS version 25 application . Statistical test consist from the Kruskal Wallis test for see different structure agrarian between momentum, i.e. the momentum before redistribution land (before 2016), when implementation redistribution land (2016) and after redistribution land (2021). For see influence variable access and capital to structure agrarian each momentum with multiple linear regression test .Whereas for the qualitative data management process this could divided Becomes three Step that is data reduction , data presentation , and verification (Singarimbun et al., 2017).

## Results and Discussions

### Structure Agrarian , Capital and Access

Distribution category structure very low, medium, high and very high agrarian determined with refers to the quantity mastery land , ownership , use and calculated tenure security based on formula quartile with look for score from standard deviation whole respondent and difference with the average structure agrarian activities obtained in the pre momentum execution, time implementation, post implementation of land redistribution program.

**Table 1.** Comparison Category Structure Agrarian in the pre- moment redistribution land, moment implementation redistribution land and post implementation land redistribution

Category	Momentum		
	Pre Redis (%)	Moment Redis (%)	Post Redis (%)
Very Low	2.87	6.1	6.45
Low	26.52	34.4	31.9
Currently	37.99	36.2	32.97
Tall	27.6	14.7	16.49
Very high	5	8.6	12.19
Total	100	100	100

Source : primary data, 2022

Referring table 1 above occur trend increase consistent in category structure very low and very high agrarian. P in time implementation redistribution there is respondents who do not dominate land same once. This thing because existence practice borrow name for get certificate land by members other families or by other fellow citizens OTL members . Because other is lateness get certificate from BPN, some inhabitant get certificate in 2017. Practice sell buy land on site redistribution and borrow name strengthened with SM statement (45), “ In the past he sell village land and buy on medium land fought for because price more cheap , he search results the production . The OTL chairman is also a pioneer, that 's why many people join occupation , Mekarsari village at first he that formerly ” BC, 45 years.

Besides that found still existence citizens who don't utilise land same very because ability not physical qualified because age go on, land controlled by members family other, land for sale a small portion no utilise land because have no capital, so forced no process owned land.



**Figure 1.** Percentage amount respondent seen from existence certificate right belong to  
Source : primary data, 2022

Referring Figure 1 above, there are 14% of respondents no hold certificate right belong to, while 86% of respondents still hold certificate alone. Respondents who do not hold certificate caused by several factor that is , certificate held by members family other , certificate pawned to the bank, land already for sale , and some have since beginning no once hold certificate alone consequence practice borrow name by fellow OTL members .

For knowing there is or whether or not difference structure agrarian before implementation redistribution land (before 2016), when implementation redistribution land (2016) and after land redistribution (in 2021) the Kruskal Wallis test was carried out. Component structure measured agrarian covers mastery land, ownership land, utilization land as well as tenure security. Kruskal Wallis test for see difference structure agrarian in three moments of time different.

**Table 2.** Statistical test results *Kruskal Wallis* is a different test structure agrarian before , during and after land redistribution

Test Statistics <sup>a,b</sup>	
	Amount Structure
Kruskal-Wallis H	356.537
df	2
asympt. Sig.	.000

Source : primary data, 2022

From the *Kruskal Wallis test* obtained *Asymp Value* . *Sig.*  $0.000 < 0.05$  which indicates there is difference structure agrarian before , during and after redistribution land . More carry on obtained results structure mean difference agrarian in three moments of time different with the average data in table 3 below this .

**Table 3.** The results of the average ranking test of the structure agrarian before , during and after land redistribution

Ranks	
Time	Mean Rank
Before	196.32
Moment	517.19
After	534.49
Total	

Source : primary data, 2022

Refer to table 3 above on momentum before implementation land redistribution structure mean value agrarian is 196.32 and increasing to 517.19 at the time implementation redistribution land. Enhancement return happened five years post implementation redistribution Becomes the average size of the structure is 534.49.

**Table 4.** Kruskal Wallis Further Test Differences Structure agrarian

Sample1.Sample2	Sig.	Adj.Sig .
Before.When *	,000	,000
Before.After *	,000	,000
When.After *	0.391	1,000 <sub>m</sub>

Source : Primary Data, 2022. \* Level significant level 0.05

Based on further test The resulting *Kruskal Wallis* as in table 4 above , the value of *Sig.*  $0.000 < 0.05$  gives meaning difference significant structure agrarian , namely structure agrarian between the momentum before land redistribution with moment land redistribution and structure agrarian between the momentum before land redistribution with after land redistribution different significant. Whereas structure agrarian Among moment land redistribution to after land redistribution no different.

Difference significant structure agrarian before and when as well as before and after implementation redistribution prove that the land redistribution program succeed increase structure agrarian. This thing because before the redistribution program done, community by limited just could control and use land used plantation and in Thing ownership only part small who has land in the village outside the plantation area of PT. Cipicung. Whereas no occur change structure agrarian after five years implementation redistribution land, thing this because small happening diversion land based on sell buy, inherit or pawn in principle diversion land that happened no change significant structure agrarian in the village pasawahan .

### Capital and Access Before Implemented Land Redistribution

In skeleton analyze influential type of capital to structure agrarian before implementation land redistribution through multiple linear regression test as presented in table 5.

Referring to table 5 there are influence on the variables of economic capital and symbolic capital to structure agrarian before redistribution land. Beta values on economic and symbolic capital in the table above worth positive, meaning the two capitals take effect by positive to structure agrarian before redistribution land . From the test results above , it can be concluded that there is the influence of economic and symbolic capital to structure agrarian before implementation redistribution land .

Related with analysis influence variable influential access to structure agrarian before implementation land redistribution could seen through regression test multiple as presented in table 6 below this.

**Table 5.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results capital variable against structure agrarian before land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Standardized Coefficients Beta		
(Constant)	6.413		7.124	.000
Economic Capital*	.138	.156	2,369	.019
Social Capital *	-.029	-.045	-.504	.615 <sub>tn</sub>
Cultural Capital *	-.116	-.128	-1,535	.126 <sub>mr</sub>
Symbolic Capital *	.137	.185	2,097	.037
Human Capital *	.011	.011	.154	.877 <sub>mr</sub>
Institutional Capital *	-.010	-.018	-.198	.843 <sub>mr</sub>
Moral Capital*	.190	.144	1,923	.055 <sub>mr</sub>

Source: primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 269) = 1.968822$ , \* level 95% confidence

**Table 6.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results variable access to structure agrarian before land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Standardized Coefficients Beta		
(Constant)	5.853		8.606	.000
Land Access *	.133	.215	3.030	.003
Access Technology *	.070	.112	1,400	.163 <sub>tn</sub>
Access to Economic Capital*	.007	.009	.100	.920 <sub>mr</sub>
Market Access *	.116	.168	2,000	.047
Access Employment *	-.014	-.017	-.207	.836 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Authority *	-.027	-.060	-.705	.482 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Negotiation *	.023	.054	.658	.511 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Knowledge *	-.074	-.136	-1.484	.139 <sub>mr</sub>

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 268) = 1.968855$ , \* level 95% confidence

Referring to table 6 there are influence on variables access land and market access to structure agrarian before redistribution land. Beta values in the table above worth positive on access land and market access, meaning second access the take effect by positive t against structure agrarian before redistribution land. From the test results above, it can be concluded that there is influence access land and market against structure agrarian before redistribution land. Access to land is one category mechanism contextual access with draft mechanism access through right based access containing legal and illegal access. Mechanism access this work before happening land redistribution or during the occupation land used plantation PT. Cipicung without the actors hold right on land from the country. From this data showing access to land play a role important in aggregate mechanism access that is reciprocal relational and structural useful in control or guard access to land maintained. Influential market access to structure agrarian before done land redistribution interlocked with access land. Market access concerns connection manifest exchange benefit will access land. So that enhancement profit from market access can the more conserve ability in access land. According to Ribot and Peluso (2013) market access as ability individual or group for get, control, or maintain enter to in connection exchange. The market also shapes access to benefit from various things on a different scale and with far way more smooth and not straight away. Besides that from information found mechanism land diversion already occur before implementation of land redistribution program.

*“ Before that OTL chief he originally had money because sell village land and buy on medium land fought for because price more cheap, he search results the production. The OTL chairman is also a pioneer, that 's why many people join occupation, Mekarsari village at first he that first. Also use the name first person 's name before redis because he convinced struggle will could land ” BC, 45 years old*

For view capital or influential access to structure agrarian before implementation land redistribution could seen in the regression test table multiple as presented in table 7 below this.

**Table 7.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results modal variables and access (simultaneous) to structure agrarian before land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		T	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Beta		
(Constant)	5.785		7,288	.000
Capital*	.012	.075	1.043	.298 <sub>tn</sub>
Access *	.018	.184	2,547	.011

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 274) = 1.968660$ , \* level 95% confidence

Refer to table 7, simultaneous test showing variable access take effect to structure agrarian before implementation redistribution land . This thing because respondents at that time limited have ability for reach benefit from something thing . It means at the stage this respondent not yet have real capital could owned or materialize until transformed . This thing according to with definition draft Capital by (Bourdieu, 1996) that is bunch source true strength and power could used. here seen the role of capital yet significant take effect as the power that has been owned for could transformed Becomes another power . here could concluded working power then in Thing access not yet to capital.

### Capital and Access Moment Land Redistribution

In skeleton analyze influential type of capital to structure agrarian at the moment implementation land redistribution through multiple linear regression test as served the results are in table 8 below this .

**Table 8.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results capital variable against structure agrarian at the moment of land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Beta		
(Constant)	9.209		8.377	.000
Economic Capital*	.241	.216	3.123	.002
Social Capital *	-.121	-.137	-1.567	.118 <sub>tn</sub>
Cultural Capital *	-.195	-.153	-1.941	.053 <sub>mr</sub>
Symbolic Capital *	.299	.303	3,703	.000
Human Capital *	.069	.058	.822	.412 <sub>mr</sub>
Institutional Capital *	.077	.097	1.093	.275 <sub>mr</sub>
Moral Capital*	.118	.065	.891	.374 <sub>mr</sub>

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 269) = 1.968822$ , \* level 95% confidence

Referring to table 8 there are influence real on the variables of economic capital and symbolic capital to structure agrarian moment implementation redistribution land. N beta is worth positive on economic capital and symbolic capital , meaning the two capitals take effect by positive t against structure agrarian moment redistribution land. Related with analysis variable influential access to structure agrarian moment implementation land redistribution could see through regression test multiple as served the results are in Table 9. Refer to the table 9 there are influence on access employment and access knowledge to structure agrarian moment redistribution land. Then for see direction influence negative or positive could see beta values in the table above . There is positive beta value on access employment so that showing influence positive to structure agrarian moment implementation redistribution land . Whereas for access knowledge negative beta value (-0.178) then access knowledge take effect negative to structure agrarian moment implementation redistribution land.

Referring the test results, can concluded that there is influence access to structure agrarian moment redistribution land . At that moment distribution work and ability increase type profession has formed from there are social processes economy in the period of mastery and workmanship land during occupation on land plantation . Relationship pattern social the first agrarian worker farmer , cultivator in the land no owned by alone and then work above occupied land as well as appearance power work family signify already formation distribution work, opportunities work and opportunities work . Even there is the tradition of gotong royong working on medium soil planted or harvested or liluran . Moment this besides practice liuran also found mechanism distribution wages with results harvest or wages in the form of money and payback service.



**Table 9.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results variable access to structure agrarian moment land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Beta		
(Constant)	10,755		10,601	.000
Land Access *	.076	.082	1.096	.274 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Technology *	.107	.132	1,662	.098 <sub>mr</sub>
Access to Economic Capital*	.129	.127	1.495	.136 <sub>mr</sub>
Market Access *	-.113	-.123	-1.511	.132 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Employment *	.194	.184	2.182	.030
Access to Authority *	.002	.003	.036	.972 <sub>mr</sub>
Access negotiate *	.085	.153	1,855	.065 <sub>tn</sub>
Access Knowledge *	-.178	-.247	-2,679	.008

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 268) = 1.968855$ , \* level 95% confidence

Access knowledge take effect negative to structure agrarian moment implementation redistribution land. This thing suspected because by dominant farmers in Pasawahan who have level formal education, have expertise, skills as well as those who can access government program information tend put activity agriculture no as eye livelihood tree. Those who are educated formally through formal education and training through non-formal education activities main as traders, middlemen or the allocated one time work no dominated in the sector processing cultivation agriculture. If you see from characteristics partial respondents big no go to school and not finished elementary school then could confirmed at the time occupation or struggle occupation that also determines position access to land-they currently no exposed access formal knowledge and training skill certain or more allocate time to things that are physique like occupation land, felling wood, action demonstrations, meetings

*"S school right new there is now-now just after redistribution, first can you? land that a lot Yes, lots of parents no access school. There are young people who are required to have ID cards, not all can, yes how many applicant from a family that already has an ID card and that 's the young one no many"* IK, 34 years.

For view capital or influential access to structure agrarian moment implementation land redistribution could seen in the t test table as presented in table 10.

**Table 10.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results modal variables and access (simultaneous) to structure agrarian at the moment of land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		T	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Beta		
(Constant)	7,799		7.668	.000
CAPITAL*	.071	.358	4.450	.000
ACCESS*	-.007	-.051	-.637	.525 <sub>tn</sub>

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 274) = 1.968660$ , \* level 95% confidence

Refer to table 10 simultaneous tests showing influential capital variable to structure agrarian moment implementation redistribution land. That thing because at that moment farmer has capable have capital or has have power or true power could used for reach position in structure agrarian. At stage this respondent already have really influential capital could owned or manifest. That thing according to with definition draft Capital by (Bourdieu, 1996) that is bunch source true strength and power could used. Access no again have influence on this momentum because has transform be capital. Ability get benefit has could succeed changed Becomes true power \_ owned and used for aggregate structure agrarian.

### Capital and Access Post Land Redistribution



In skeleton analyze influential type of capital to structure agrarian post land redistribution could seen in the multiple linear regression test table as served the results are in table 11 below this .

**Table 11.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results capital variable against structure agrarian after land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Standardized Coefficients Beta		
(Constant)	8,323		7.175	.000
Economic Capital*	.344	.311	4,583	.000
Social Capital *	-.039	-.041	-.485	.628 <sub>tn</sub>
Cultural Capital *	-.201	-.145	-1,910	.057 <sub>mr</sub>
Symbolic Capital *	.273	.253	3,141	.002
Human Capital *	.048	.038	.551	.582 <sub>mr</sub>
Institutional Capital *	.016	.019	.217	.829 <sub>mr</sub>
Moral Capital*	.131	.067	.939	.349 <sub>mr</sub>

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 269) = 1.968822$ , \* level 95% confidence

Referring to table 11 there are influence on economic and symbolic capital variables to structure agrarian after implementation redistribution land . Beta value on economic capital and symbolic capital worth positive , meaning the two capitals take effect positive t against structure agrarian moment redistribution land . From the test results above , it can be concluded that there is effect of capital on structure agrarian after implementation redistribution land. Related with analysis influence variable influential access \_ to structure agrarian after implementation of land redistribution could seen in the multiple linear regression test table as served the results are in table 12.

**Table 12.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results variable access to structure agrarian after land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		t	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Standardized Coefficients Beta		
(Constant)	10,057		9.566	.000
Access To Land*	.119	.123	1.618	.107 <sub>tn</sub>
Access Technology *	.149	.176	2.189	.029
Access to Economic Capital*	.103	.096	1.091	.276 <sub>mr</sub>
Market Access *	-.086	-.087	-1.057	.292 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Employment *	.192	.174	1,934	.054 <sub>mr</sub>
Access to Authority *	.039	.063	.731	.466 <sub>mr</sub>
Access negotiate *	.056	.091	1.105	.270 <sub>mr</sub>
Access Knowledge *	-.198	-.251	-2,670	.008

Source : primary data, 2022. The formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 268) = 1.968855$  with level 95% confidence .

Referring to table 12 there are influence on access technology and knowledge to structure agrarian after implementation redistribution land . Then for see direction influence negative or positive could see the beta value in the table above , namely positive beta value on access technology . It means access technology take effect by positive to structure agrarian after redistribution land . Whereas for access knowledge negative beta value (-0.198) then access knowledge take effect negative to structure agrarian after implementation redistribution land . From the test results above , it can be concluded there is influence access to structure agrarian after redistribution land. Access technology play a role make it easy processing land so that open opportunity to acquisition of economic capital . Access technology facilitate by no direct increase range to source power and opportunity accumulate surplus compared those who access the technology less.

Access knowledge take effect negative to structure agrarian after implementation redistribution land . This thing suspected because by dominant farmers in Pasawahan who have level formal education, have expertise, skills as well as those who can access government program information tend put activity agriculture no as eye livelihood tree. Those who are educated formally through formal education and training through non-formal education activities main as traders , middlemen or the allocated one time work no dominated in the sector processing cultivation agriculture . If you see from characteristics partial respondents big is no school and not

finished elementary school then could confirmed at the time occupation or struggle occupation that also determines position access to land they currently no exposed by access formal knowledge and training skill certain. Or more allocate time to things that are physique compared allocate time to magnifying activity ability for access knowledge .

For view capital or influential access to structure agrarian after implementation land redistribution could seen in the t test table as presented in table 13 below this .

**Table 13.** Coefficients h multiple linear regression test results capital and access variables to structure agrarian after land redistribution

Model	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>		T	Sig.
	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients		
	B	Beta		
1 (Constant)	7.030		6,500	.000
CAPITAL*	.076	.354	4.368	.000
ACCESS*	.001	.005	.057	.955 <sub>m</sub>

Source : primary data, 2022. Formula t table =  $t(\alpha/2; nk-1) = t(0.025; 274) = 1.968660$ , \* level 95% confidence

Refer to table 13 simultaneous test showing influential capital variable to structure agrarian after implementation redistribution land . It means at that moment fixed capital variable take effect significant like when implementation redistribution land . existence of capital as strength for maintain structure agrarian has truly owned by the respondents. This thing according to with definition the concept of Capital by (Bourdieu, 1996) that is bunch source true strength and power could used . Variable access no again have influence moment tested by simultaneously at this moment because access has transform be capital. Ability get benefit or access has could succeed changed become capital or true power owned and used for aggregate structure agrarian.

#### Revisiting the Concept of Capital in Dynamics Structure agrarian

Through the concept of capital from (Bourdieu, 1996) our could analyze accumulation various types of capital that are not be measured from relationships production only . Power in Public relate close with the capital owned, as well as composition and accumulation . The value of a capital is different depending on the social arena as well as position social owner (Mardimin, 2016) . In context According to Bourdieu, the concept of capital is used for pointing whole source power or owned quality individual or position social who has influence or score social. According to Bourdieu, the more big source the power you have , good from aspect composition nor amount (differentiation and distribution), then will the more great power you have someone. With so, in community social, actors social will occupy each position is determined by the amount of capital and the composition of capital owned by each actor social.

Capital according to thinking (Bourdieu, 1996) is source strength or true power could used . The concept of capital is used as explanation relationships power in Public (Bonnewitz, 1998) . Structure seen agrarian from influence of capital in research this is for actualize Bourdieu's conception of in study agrarian. Economic and symbolic capital by consistent always influence structure agrarian. This thing show that economic and symbolic capital has materialize like that appearance from dynamics and transformation access.

Economic capital used in tool analysis study this related with ownership riches material or source economy that can utilized by actors which include how much big the power of economic capital in operate activity work, area land, amount useful assets, savings and investments for determination and reproduction positions social . According to (Bourdieu, 1996) in *the forms of capital* : economic capital is root from all other types of capital:

*"...So it has to be posited simultaneously that economic capital is at the root of all the other types of capital and that these transformed....., (Bonnewitz, 1998) "*

Symbolic capital come true from prestige , status, authority and honor social . Symbolic capital in study this consist from indicator including authority , influence , position \_ or position in community and achievement . Symbolic capital is form confession social owned. In Outline of A Theory of Practice (1977), Bourdieu describes *symbolic capital* as

*"a transformed and thereby disguised form of physical economic capital, produces its proper effect inasmuch, and only inasmuch, as conceals the fact that it originates in material forms of capital wick are also, in the last analysis, the source of its effects. "*

Symbolic capital is whole source power whose existence behind the physical " strength " (*hexis*) as well as behind useful economic capital in determination and reproduction positions social . Symbolic capital no miss from power symbolic, that is enabling power for get equal position with what do you get through power physical and economic as consequence special something mobilization.

### Cost Covered people farmer Pasawahan

Degrees participation movement tall farmer related close with implementation of the redistribution program land on research site this. Sustainability of the Peasant Movement in the Reformation Period in Pasawahan join donate heroism Where is the reform movement? according to (Salim, 2018) at the time the reform was created relation Among movement farmer not land and community movements in urban areas and groups class middle class who fights fate farmer. OTL Pasawahan II has an aggregating power base happening change structure agrarian on land used plantation PT. Cipicung. Election location redistribution land by government this no is at in room nothing happened so course. However there is consideration factor organizing struggle strong farmers in locations land redistribution as power push. Country catch easy opportunity the success of the program in a well - organized location so that could take sympathy public more big because there is accompanying amplifier campaign the goodness of the country in run a redistribution program land. Mutual transfer of benefits this could our look in the village Pasawahan whose inhabitants far before implementation of the program has arrange herself alone in occupy land , divide lots occupation and determine quantity as well as position location land occupation member until it happens confirmation or legalized by the state into a redistribution program land in 2016.

From empirical seen from history occupation, processes and state policies in give away certificate right owned by on land to farmer pasawahan - community has by existing dominate and dominate land used plantation PT. Cipicung far before the land redistribution program launched. Land certification for Public is profit reach legal legitimacy over land that has long been controlled and cultivated for support economy family so that there is freedom and certainty in manage the land (Waryanta, 2016) .

In case similar in other locations , namely conflict occupation land in Rejang Lebong , where There are economic motives and limitations land ownership agriculture inhabitant so that inhabitant to do cultivation on HGU land (R. & Salim, 2018) . However in context Pasawahan gift right on land in form certificate right owned by character confirmation to what already championed by farmers Before implementation of the redistribution program land, class owner big land in Thing this is PT. Cipicung by de facto has lost access and control to the land consequence occupation land by farmers Pasawahan. So could means a program run by the state with diction redistribution Becomes weak meaning, because the state only confirm what already organized and controlled by the community since plantation occupied and then controlled by society.

Besides that policy government in arrange access post reform no carried out in the village Pasawahan . *"Post Redistribution no there is anything from the country, isn't it special country policies , there are the budget , that no there is , except there is network individual between activist course. From Social Service new 2021 \_ just know if this before used land redistribution because there is a BLK in Pasawahan"* SM , 45 years old. Aspect investation public by the state to land redistribution program recipient no seen, for example in the aspect allocation budget . Not there is allocation budgets, programs and activities for infrastructure, credit, Education and training as well as accompaniment in one whole platform. *"If" from government mah no there is help what what. Never mind talk capital assistance , no training once there is ."* OYN, 62 years.

Broadly speaking, a special program that guarantees continuity transformation social economy from the land redistribution program no found. Likewise the protection of the poor for prevent lost tilled land by programmatic no found on location redistribution land. So that pattern Land reform a redistributive alternative (Jr. & McKinley, 2006) very weak elements on location research. In Thing this we can too pick lesson from study (Martini et al., 2019) in Banjarnegara in case cultivator land plantation private showing that absence understanding implementation reform agrarian cause destination solution conflict agrarian make farmers feel satisfied and not reach satisfaction in part right manage on land.

However thereby from description history occupation above ground - there is role initiative strong people so that push government for operate land distribution used plantation PT. Cipicung in Pasawahan. because of that, more appropriate type policy land this categorized as as Distributive Reform with no negate movement initiative people in occupy land former PT. Cipicung . According to (Jr. & Franco, 2008) in many place , type of distribution reform affirm and protect access land that has been there is previously from the place poor farmer whose ownership have no guarantee. Type Distributive Reform by general possible no conflictual like type redistributive. This thing because avoid take land from classes grounded (Fox 1993:10) in (Jr. & Franco, 2008).

Strong pattern pragmatism from movement based agrarian position and position as well as calculation gait struggle in occupation land and achievement of land redistribution programs shown by statistical test continuity of symbolic capital and economic capital in locations research. Announcement and confirmation for position and position OTL administrators get land more many from member other find the confirmation. Penalty the hidden economy in penalty social mirrored with no get land or his name just only borrowed. Movement internal load farmer local found in forms dues which external used for continuity actions demonstration, but in fact fare

that used for smooth the “acceleration of the redistribution program” charged land to people farmers in Pasawahan. by critical Thing this positioning the peasant movement organized used for expedite consolidation fare and avoid potential horizontal conflicts. Peasant movement local has get role in canalize regularity and consolidation fare at a time embellish claim the smell implementation of the redistribution program land by the good of the state.

## Conclusions

In study this draft access and capital can used as grounded theory in analyze change structure agrarian. Application in study this for measure structure agrarian could seen influence influencing access structure agrarian before implementation land redistribution so that identified which part is inside community in need intervention to happen equality access, so implementation land redistribution could give equality structure agrarian before land redistribution carried out on location land redistribution. There is effect of capital on structure agrarian at the moment and post implementation redistribution land . The concept of capital initiated by Piere Bourdieu can be used for map structure agrarian in the current and post- moment implementation redistribution land , so that identified which part is inside community in need intervention to happen equity equity, so that structure agrarian Becomes more small potency the gap post redistribution land. Before redistribution land of economic capital and symbolic capital as well as access land and market access influence positive to structure agrarian . by simultaneous Access take effect positive to structure agrarian. Moment implementation redistribution land of economic capital and symbolic capital as well as access employment take effect positive to structure agrarian at the moment of land redistribution whereas access knowledge take effect negative. by Simultaneous Capital influential positive to structure agrarian. After redistribution land , economic capital and symbolic capital as well as access technology take effect positive to structure agrarian after land redistribution whereas access knowledge take effect negative . by Simultaneous Capital influential positive to structure agrarian after redistribution land.

## References

- Afriliyeni, Sihaholo, M., & Sita, R. (2021). The Relationship between Agrarian Reform and Improving the Welfare of Farmer Households. *Journal of Communication Science and Community Development [JSKPM]* , 5 (3), 433–449. <https://doi.org/10.29244/JSKPM.V5I3.834>
- Bonnewitz, P. (1998). *Premieres lecons sur la sociologie de Pierre Bourdieu* . Presses Universitaires de Franc.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. "Outline of a Theory or Practice." *Trans. Richard Nice. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989)* (1977). <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO97805111812507>
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). *Distinction: A Social Critique of The Judgment of Taste* . Harvard University Press.
- Corbetta, P. (2003). *Social research: Theory, methods and techniques* . SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Creswell, J. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approach, Third Edition* . SAGE Publications, California.
- Herdiana, A., Darwanto, DH, & Mulyo, JH (2014). Household Food Security in Ciamis Regency. *SEPA* , 11 (1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.20961/sepa.v11i1.42247>
- Ibnudin, MU (2016). Determining Factors of Transfer of Land Certificates from the Redistribution Program (The Case of Farmers in Karossa Village, Tassoko District, Mamuju Regency, West Sulawesi). *sociohumanities*, 18 (3), 240–246.
- Jr., SMB, & Franco, JC (2008). *How Land Policies Impact Land-based Wealth and Power Transfer* (No. 1).
- Jr., SMB, & McKinley, T. (2006). *The Unresolved Land Reform Debate: Beyond State-Led or Market-Led Models* (No. 2).
- Junita, R. (2011). *Impact of People-Based Agrarian Reform on Community Tenurial Security in Dangiand Local Farmers Organization* . Bogor Agricultural Institute.
- Luthfi, AN (2018). Institutional Reform in Agrarian Reform Policies in the Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla Era. *Bhumi: Agrarian and Land* , 4 (2), 140–163. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v4i2.276>
- Mardimin, J. (2016). *Student Political Resistance* . Satya Wacana University Press, Salatiga.
- Martini, S., Ash-Shafikh, MH, & Afif, NC (2019). Implementation of agrarian reform to fulfill the expectations of the people who have land disputes'. *Bhumi, Journal of Agrarian and Land Affairs* , 5 (2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v5i2.367>
- Munawar, CA (2010). *Institutional changes and farmers' welfare after reclaiming (Case of Local Farmers Organization Pasawahan II, Pasawahan Village, Banjarsari District, Ciamis Regency, West Java Province* . Bogor Agricultural University.
- Nurdin, I. (2018). Realizing an Agrarian Reform Advanced Village. *BHUMI: Journal of Agrarian and Land Affairs* , 3 (1), 82–97. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v3i1.228>

- 
- Peluso, NL, & Ribot, J. (2020). A Theory of Access Revisited, Society & Natural Resources. *Society and Natural Resources an International Journal* , 33 (2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1080/08941920.2019.1709929>
- R., RD, & Salim, MN (2018). Rezky Dellah R. Ministry of ATR/BPN M Nazir Salim High School Pe. *BHUMI: Journal of Agrarian and Land Affairs* , 3 (1), 17–34. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v3i1.224>
- Ribot, JC, & Peluso, NL (2003). A theory of Access. *Rural Sociology* , 68 (2), 153–181. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1549-0831.2003.tb00133.x>
- Safitri, MA (2010). *Peripheral legal reform: tenure security and community forestry in Lampung*” in Myrna A. Safitri and Tristram Moeliono (eds). *Agrarian Law and society in Indonesia* . HuMa, Jakarta.
- Salim, MN (2018). Reading the Characteristics and Maps of the Indonesian Agrarian Movement. *BHUMI: Journal of Agrarian and Land Affairs* , 1 (39), 405–426. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v1i39.181>
- Singarimbun, I, M., S, E., D, A., C, M., Kasto, P, H., & Sucipto, I. (2017). *Survey Research Methods* . LP3ES, Jakarta.
- Sirait, MT (2017). *Inclusion, exclusion and agrarian change: redistribution of land in forest areas in Indonesia* . STPN Press, Sleman.
- Sokoastri, V., & Soetarto, E. (2012). Impact of Agrarian Reform from the Bottom on Community Welfare in Garongan Village, Special Region of Yogyakarta. *Sodality: Journal of Rural Sociology* , 6 (3). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22500/sodality.v6i3.8023>
- Tuma, EH (1965). *Twenty-Six Centuries of Agrarian Reform, A Comparative Analysis* . University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Waryanta. (2016). Agrarian Reform: Momentum to Realize Economic Independence of Small Communities in Supporting Food Security No Title. *BHUMI: Journal of Agrarian and Land Affairs* , 2 (2), 179–193. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31292/jb.v2i2.69>
- Wiradi, G. (1984). *Patterns of Land Tenure and Agrarian Reform in Tjondronegoro, Junior High School and Gunawan Wiradi (Eds), Two Centuries of Land Tenure* . Gramedia, Jakarta.