



Volume 5	Issue 3	March (2026)	DOI: 10.47540/ijqr.v5i3.2542	Page: 297 – 308
----------	---------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------------

## Fighting Landlessness: Women Farmers' Resistance in an Exclusive Agrarian Structure

Syaifudin Suhri Kasim<sup>1</sup>, Aryuni Salpiana Jabar<sup>1</sup>, Ratna Supiyah<sup>1</sup>, Sarpin<sup>1</sup>, Rosdiana<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Sociology, Universitas Halu Oleo, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Department of Social Welfare, Universitas Halu Oleo, Indonesia

**Corresponding Author:** Syaifudin Suhri Kasim; Email: [syaifudinskasim@uho.ac.id](mailto:syaifudinskasim@uho.ac.id)

### ARTICLE INFO

*Keywords:* Agrarian Inequality, Everyday Resistance, Gender Agency, Landless Women Farmers, Rural Livelihoods.

*Received* : 20 January 2026

*Revised* : 16 March 2026

*Accepted* : 27 March 2026

### ABSTRACT

Gender-based agrarian inequality remains a structural constraint that limits women farmers' access to resources and recognition of their labor, particularly among landless women. This study examines how landless women farmers understand agrarian exclusion and develop resistance within unequal rural agrarian structures. Using a critical qualitative approach with an ethnographic–narrative case study design, the research involved ten landless women engaged in agricultural and rural livelihood activities. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participant observation, document analysis, and thematic analysis. The findings show that the absence of formal land ownership does not negate women's agency. Instead, women interpret agrarian inequality as a structural issue and respond through contextual, everyday resistance practices. These include strategic management of agrarian labor, mobilization of community-based social capital, use of local knowledge, and the rearticulation of identity from invisible farm laborers to household livelihood managers. This study contributes to feminist agrarian scholarship by foregrounding women's agency and challenges dominant narratives that frame landless women farmers as merely passive and vulnerable, underscoring the need for gender-responsive agrarian and rural development policies.

### INTRODUCTION

Exclusive agrarian structures constitute one of the most persistent forms of institutionalization of inequality in rural areas, where access to land resources is determined not only by economic relations but also by patriarchy, capital, and configurations of state power that have historically favored dominant groups (Johnston, 2025; Gallarotti, 2025; Jóhanna et al., 2025). In this configuration, women farmers occupy a paradoxical position: they play a substantial role in agrarian production and household food security, but at the same time often do not have direct control over the land they cultivate (Eriksen et al., 2021) (Susilowati, 2025). Various studies show that women farmers experience limited access to land, informal or legally unrecognized ownership, and limited space in agrarian decision-making, thus structurally weakening their bargaining position in

both formal and informal agrarian systems (Rutten et al., 2017; Herdiansyah & Mamola, 2025).

Recent literature also shows that access to land, even in the form of informal ownership, does not automatically translate to empowerment of women farmers. Recent research in World Development shows that land ownership can contribute to increased crop diversity and family food security, but does not always result in significant improvements in women's control over production, access to credit, or income (Schling, 2024; Titus & Damilola, 2024). This finding confirms that an approach that focuses solely on land rights is inadequate without a deeper structural transformation in agrarian power relations (Medisa et al., 2025; Harianti & Amri, 2024). This perspective is strengthened by intersectionality-based studies that emphasize that access, use, and control over land are shaped by complex interactions between social status, gender roles, and

family configurations, which often place women farmers in marginal positions under existing social structures (Akter et al., 2017; Yang et al., 2022).

However, although the gender agrarian literature has extensively discussed the inequality of land access and vulnerability of women farmers, there is a strong tendency to frame women primarily as objects of vulnerability (Mayrhofer & Mayrhofer, 2025). A number of studies still focus on technical and material aspects, such as food production or economic vulnerability, without adequately presenting women farmers as social subjects with the agentic capacity to negotiate, resist, and even challenge oppressive agrarian structures (Abeng et al., 2024; Fattarawati, 2025; Spanier, 2025). Critics of this approach assert that the dominant narrative of vulnerability has the potential to reproduce symbolic inequality, as it obscures the everyday resistance practices of women farmers as cultural and political actors. (Palosaari et al., 2024; Nguyen-trung et al., 2023; Susilowati, 2025).

This is where a significant research gap lies. First, there are still limited studies that explicitly analyze women farmers' resistance strategies to exclusionary agrarian structures, whether in the form of collective action, local negotiations, or the use of institutional support. Second, the literature tends to focus on women with formal or informal land rights, while the experiences of women farmers who are completely landless, and how they articulate socio-political resistance in conditions of agrarian dislocation, are still rarely examined in depth. Third, most studies are localized and contextual, thus failing to provide a comparative understanding across regions and cultures of the variations in women farmers' resistance to different agrarian systems. Fourth, there is limited literature that conceptually integrates critical agrarian political economy theory with studies of gender resistance, as much research still relies on descriptive or quantitative approaches.

Building on this gap, this study presents an original contribution by placing the resistance of women farmers at the center of its analysis. Rather than simply documenting inequality, it positions women farmers as social actors actively negotiating their living space through collective mobilization, the formation of social networks, the strengthening of cooperatives, and the development of alternative

economic strategies in the face of exclusionary agrarian structures. Theoretically, this study deliberately makes the condition of "landlessness" the primary focus of analysis to understand how women farmers, who are completely marginalized from both formal and informal agrarian rights, still develop meaningful forms of agency and resistance.

By combining the perspectives of agrarian political economy, gender empowerment theory, and agency theory, this study offers a multidimensional analytical framework that allows for a more comprehensive reading of power relations, resistance practices, and adaptive strategies of women farmers. Furthermore, this study fills an empirical gap by presenting new evidence on the dynamics of women farmers' resistance within the context of exclusive agrarian structures, particularly in rural areas of developing countries like Indonesia, while also opening up a space for dialogue with other global rural contexts. Thus, this study not only enriches the academic debate on gender-based agrarian inequality but also proposes an alternative perspective that positions women farmers as agents of socio-political change within the agrarian system, a position that remains relatively marginalized in contemporary gender agrarian literature.

## **METHODS**

This research uses a critical qualitative approach with an ethnographic-narrative case study design to deeply understand the lived experiences, daily practices, and adaptation and resistance strategies of landless women farmers in facing exclusive and unequal agrarian structures. The qualitative approach was chosen because the issue of gender-based agrarian inequality cannot be reduced to quantitative variables alone, but rather requires a contextual, historical, and relational reading of the power relations that shape access, control, and recognition of women's agrarian work (Natasya, 2025; Doss & Meinen-dick, 2020). The case study design allows for in-depth analysis of specific social contexts, while an ethnographic-narrative approach is used to explore how women farmers interpret, negotiate, and challenge agrarian inequality through everyday social practices and the personal and collective narratives they construct.

The research was conducted in a rural area characterized by an exclusive agrarian structure,

marked by concentrated land ownership, limited access for women to productive land, and strong patriarchal norms in agrarian decision-making. The research location, South Konawe Regency, was purposively selected, taking into account the presence of landless female farmers, the intensity of latent agrarian inequality, and the dynamics of an increasingly informalized rural economy. This context is deemed relevant for capturing how gender-based agrarian exclusion is reproduced and negotiated in daily livelihood practices.

The research subjects were 10 landless women farmers, namely women who are actively involved in agricultural work and agrarian livelihoods but do not have formal ownership or control rights over land. The selection of informants was carried out through purposive sampling and developed with snowball sampling, based on the following criteria: (1) direct involvement in agricultural activities or agrarian livelihoods; (2) do not have productive land formally or informally; (3) have experience facing structural restrictions related to land access; and (4) are involved in adaptation or resistance practices, both individually and collectively. The number of informants is flexible and is determined based on the principle of data saturation, namely when the information obtained has reached analytical saturation and no longer produces new substantive themes (Rahimi, 2024; Bouncken et al., 2025).

Data collection was conducted through in-depth semi-structured interviews, participant observation, and document study to ensure depth and richness. In-depth interviews were used to explore narratives of women farmers' experiences related to land access, gender relations, livelihood strategies, and forms of resistance to exclusionary agrarian structures. The narrative approach enabled informants to reconstruct their lived experiences reflectively, linking personal experiences to broader structural dynamics (Hartmann et al., 2023). Participatory observation was conducted to understand agrarian work practices, the gendered division of labor, social relations, and power dynamics that occur in the daily lives of women farmers. Field notes were systematically compiled to capture non-verbal dimensions, symbolic practices, and forms of resistance that are not always articulated verbally. Document study included analysis of agrarian policies, village

regulations, local archives, and civil society organization reports, which were used to explore the institutional and historical frameworks that shape gender-based agrarian exclusion.

Data analysis was conducted thematically and reflexively, following the stages developed by Braun and Clarke (2022), starting with data transcription and familiarization, open coding to identify initial themes, and then grouping themes related to forms of resistance, adaptation strategies, and agrarian power relations. The interpretation process utilized agrarian political economy, agency theory, and feminist agrarian studies frameworks to link empirical findings to broader structural dynamics. The analysis was iterative and reflective, enabling ongoing dialogue between field data and theoretical frameworks, resulting in contextual and critical interpretations.

Data validity was maintained through triangulation of sources and methods, member checking by confirming key findings with informants, and researcher reflexivity by consciously considering positionality, values, and potential bias throughout the research process (Baily, 2025). Through these strategies, the research sought to produce findings that were not only methodologically valid but also sensitive to the voices, experiences, and agency of landless women farmers in the context of persistent agrarian inequality.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section presents the main research findings obtained from in-depth interviews and participant observation of 10 landless female farmers who are actively involved in agrarian work and rural livelihoods. Data analysis was conducted thematically and reflexively to explore how women farmers interpret landlessness, negotiate agrarian power relations, and develop survival and resistance strategies in the context of exclusive and unequal agrarian structures.

The analysis shows that the lack of access to formal land ownership and control does not automatically eliminate the agency of women farmers. Rather, this condition creates a complex social landscape, where women are reflectively aware of their marginalized position while simultaneously developing contextual, layered, and often non-confrontational resistance practices. This

resistance is not always expressed in open conflict or formal political mobilization, but rather manifests through everyday practices that subtly yet strategically challenge agrarian domination.

Thematically, the research findings are organized into four main clusters. First, exclusive agrarian structures are understood by informants as the primary source of gender-based injustice, which is reproduced through the concentration of land ownership and local power relations. Second, women farmers develop various forms of everyday resistance, ranging from flexible work management to strategic silence and limited negotiation. Third, community-based social capital mobilization and utilization of local agrarian knowledge emerged as

key strategies for maintaining sustainable livelihoods in the absence of formal land access. Fourth, the findings show the rearticulation of the social identity of female farmers, from the unrecognized position of farm laborers to the subject of managing household livelihoods, which strengthens their legitimacy and bargaining position in social relations.

A summary of these empirical findings is presented systematically in Table 1, which maps the main themes, analytical subthemes, representative quotes, and initial interpretations from the interviews with the informants. The table serves as an empirical anchor for the analytical discussion developed in the next section.

Table 1. Summary of Interview Findings of Landless Female Farmers Based on Thematic–Reflexive Analysis

No	Main Theme	Subtheme / Analytical Code	Informant	Representative Quotes (summarized)	Analytical Interpretation
1	Exclusive agrarian structure	Concentration of land ownership	In-1, In-3, In-6	“The land here belongs to those people. We just come along to work”	The agrarian structure reproduces unequal access and places women in a subordinate position.
2	Exclusive agrarian structure	power relations	In-2, In-5, In-8	“If you're not close to the owner, you won't get a job”	Access to agrarian work is mediated by gender, social status, and patronage, not productive needs.
3	Structural awareness	Injustice as a systemic problem	In-4, In-7, In-9	“It's not that we're lazy, but the rules are unfair”	Women articulate marginalization as a product of structures, not individual failures.
4	Everyday resistance	Flexible work options	In-1, In-2, In-10	“I choose work that is not tied to just one person”	The strategy of reducing dependence on one landowner as a form of subtle resistance.
5	Everyday resistance	Working time settings	In-3, In-6, In-8	“I set my working hours so I can still look for other work”	Time management becomes a tool for negotiating autonomy within restrictive structures.

6	Symbolic resistance	Strategic silence	In-4, In-5, In-7	“Sometimes it is safer to remain silent than to fight directly”	Silence serves as a tactic to avoid social sanctions without fully submitting.
7	Limited open resistance	Wage negotiations and job refusal	In-6, In-9	“If the wages are too low, I say no”	Open resistance appears selectively when bargaining positions allow.
8	Social capital	Solidarity among women	In-2, In-5, In-10	“If one gets a job, the others are invited”	Social capital functions as a substitute for the lack of formal access.
9	Local knowledge	Diversification of livelihoods	In-1, In-3, In-8	“We process the produce from our small garden at home ourselves”	Local knowledge expands the space for survival beyond land ownership.
10	Reararticulation of identity	From laborer to livelihood manager	In-4, In-6, In-9	“I’m not just a worker, I’m the one who manages the family’s life”	Identity change strengthens women’s symbolic legitimacy and agency.

Source: Primary Data, 2025

**Exclusive Agrarian Structure and Awareness of Gender Injustice**

As summarized in Themes 1 and 2 (Table 1), all informants consistently described the local agrarian structure as an exclusive and unequal system, characterized by the concentration of land ownership and control among a handful of key actors, such as large landowners, village elites, and corporations with access to capital and institutional legitimacy. In this configuration, land functions not only as a productive asset but also as a source of symbolic power that determines an individual’s social position within the rural community. Landless women farmers are in the most vulnerable position in this hierarchy, because they have no formal access to ownership or decision-making rights over agrarian resources.

In everyday practice, this agrarian exclusion manifests itself through the restriction of women’s roles in agricultural work. Informants described how they are positioned as low-wage day laborers, temporary cultivators dependent on the mercy of landowners, or family workers whose contributions are considered “help” and not recognized as productive work. Access to agrarian work is not

solely determined by production needs or job competency, but is mediated by gender-based power relations, household social status, and personal closeness to landowners or local elites. This condition demonstrates that agrarian structures operate not only through economic mechanisms but also through social and cultural norms that normalize women’s subordination in the agrarian realm.

However, the key findings that emerged in Theme 3 (Table 1) indicate that women farmers did not interpret their subordinate position as an individual failure or a result of a lack of personal capacity. Instead, they reflectively articulate the experience of agrarian exclusion as part of a systemic, intergenerational structural injustice. This awareness is reflected in the informants’ narratives, which link limited access to land to customary rules, gender-biased inheritance practices, and agrarian policies that are insensitive to the position of landless women farmers. Thus, agrarian inequality is understood as the result of institutionalized power relations, not as a natural or inevitable condition.

This critical awareness of gender injustice has important implications for how women farmers negotiate their position within unequal agrarian structures. Rather than passively accepting these conditions, this structural understanding provides the initial foundation for the emergence of various forms of everyday resistance practices, both symbolic and material. At this stage, resistance is not always manifested in the form of open confrontation, but is present through subtle strategies such as choosing the type of work, managing flexible working hours, and forming informal solidarity among female farmers.

Thus, the shift from vulnerability awareness to structural awareness marks the transformation of women farmers' positions from mere "objects of inequality" to subjects with a critical understanding of the power relations that shape their lived experiences. This finding confirms that gender awareness in the agrarian context does not emerge automatically, but rather is formed through concrete experiences of repeated exclusion. This awareness then opens up space for the articulation of women farmers' agency in confronting and negotiating exclusive and unequal agrarian structures.

### **Everyday Resistance as a Contextual and Layered Practice**

Thematic analysis shows that landless women peasants' resistance is not primarily expressed through overt collective action or formal political mobilization, but rather operates in the form of subtle, situational, and layered everyday practices in Themes 4 to 6 (Table 1). In the context of a rural agrarian structure characterized by unequal land ownership, patron-client relations, and high economic dependency, women peasants reflectively develop resistance strategies tailored to the social and economic risks they face. Resistance, in this sense, is not understood as direct confrontation, but as an effort to maintain relative autonomy amid persistent structural limitations.

One of the dominant forms of resistance is the strategy of flexible agrarian work selection, including rearranging working hours, diversifying types of work, and mobility between landowners. Through this strategy, women farmers seek to reduce dependence on one dominant actor who has control over access to work and wages. Work flexibility is not merely interpreted as an economic adaptation, but rather as a hidden political practice

that allows women to maintain minimal bargaining power in asymmetrical work relations. Working time arrangements also serve as a mechanism to prevent over-exploitation, while also providing space for women to manage domestic responsibilities and other livelihood activities.

In addition, the practice of strategic silence emerged as a significant form of symbolic resistance. Silence, in this context, does not represent resignation, but rather a conscious choice to delay or avoid direct confrontation that could potentially trigger social sanctions, ostracism, or loss of job access. This practice allows women farmers to navigate power relations more safely, while still maintaining the boundaries of personal autonomy. Strategic silence also functions as a form of practical knowledge passed down informally between generations of female farmers, demonstrating how resistance is shaped through lived experiences and contextual understandings of local social structures.

In certain situations, as shown in Theme 7 (Table 1), resistance takes a more open form, although it remains limited and contextual. These forms include wage negotiations, refusal of work deemed too exploitative, and organizing informal collective work based on local social networks. These actions are not always interpreted by the perpetrators as political activities in the formal sense, but practically contribute to expanding women's autonomous space within an agrarian structure that limits their choices and mobility. Informal collective organizing, for example, allows women to share information, coordinate work hours, and build solidarity to face economic pressures together.

This finding broadens the understanding of agrarian resistance, which has tended to be associated with open conflict, collective protests, or formal social movements. The resistance of landless women farmers is present as everyday resistance practices that seem banal, unspectacular, and often escape policy attention, but cumulatively contribute to micro-shifts in relations of agrarian domination. Thus, resistance does not only occur in public spaces and formal political arenas, but is also embedded in the daily practices of women farmers who continuously negotiate the boundaries of power, dependence, and autonomy in rural life.

### **Mobilization of Social Capital and Local Knowledge**

As reflected in Themes 8 and 9 (Table 1), the resistance of landless women farmers does not occur individually and in isolation, but is strongly mediated through the mobilization of community-based social capital. In the context of systemic agrarian exclusion, kinship networks, neighborhood relationships, and solidarity among women form an alternative social infrastructure that allows women to access resources formally closed to them. These networks serve as primary channels for exchanging information on seasonal employment opportunities, access to raw materials, coping strategies for dealing with income fluctuations, and even mutual aid mechanisms in household crises. Thus, social capital serves as a crucial substitute mechanism for the lack of access to land, formal credit, and institutional protection.

More than just instrumental social relations, the social capital mobilized by women farmers is affective and normative. The solidarity built among women, particularly through informal groups such as arisan (social savings and credit associations), joint work groups, or household agricultural processing networks, provides a safe space for exchanging experiences, building collective awareness, and strengthening identities as often unrecognized agrarian workers. The emotional support generated from these relationships is crucial in maintaining the sustainability of everyday resistance practices, especially when women face social stigma, job uncertainty, and the dual pressures of productive and reproductive work.

In addition to mobilizing social capital, research findings indicate that local agrarian knowledge plays a central role in the survival strategies of landless women farmers. This knowledge includes skills in processing agricultural products on a household scale, diversifying food crops based on local crops, and utilizing marginal spaces, such as narrow yards, leftover land, or underutilized public spaces. These practices represent a form of creative adaptation to structural limitations, in which women maximize available resources through knowledge that is passed down intergenerationally and continuously modified according to changing economic and social contexts.

Furthermore, the utilization of local knowledge not only functions as an economic strategy but also as a symbolic practice that affirms women's position as productive subjects in the agrarian system. Through the processing and distribution of the fruits of their labor, whether in the form of processed food, homemade products, or contributions to household food security, women implicitly challenge the narrow definition of agrarian labor, which has traditionally been associated with land ownership and large-scale production activities. In other words, local knowledge-based practices enable women to rearticulate the meaning of productivity and agrarian labor from the perspective of their own experiences.

Theoretically, these findings confirm that the mobilization of social capital and local knowledge cannot be understood solely as an adaptive response to poverty, but rather as a form of agency situated in everyday practices. The resistance of landless women farmers operates through contextual, layered, and non-confrontational strategies, yet cumulatively they are capable of undermining the logic of agrarian exclusivity. Thus, this analysis strengthens the argument that the sustainability of rural livelihoods is determined not only by access to formal resources but also by the capacity of actors, particularly women, to mobilize social relations and local knowledge as strategic capital in addressing structural inequalities.

### **Rearticulation of Identity and Strengthening of Agency**

One of the most significant findings in this study is the rearticulation of women farmers' social identities, which serve as a crucial foundation for strengthening their agency within the unequal agrarian structure of Theme 10 (Table 1). The majority of informants no longer define themselves solely as "farm laborers", "additional workers", or "husband's helpers", as the dominant categories imposed by traditional gender relations and exclusive agrarian structures. Instead, they reflectively construct new identities as family livelihood managers, the primary actors coordinating work strategies, income generation, and household economic sustainability.

This change in identity does not emerge spontaneously, but is formed through women's daily experiences in facing livelihood uncertainty, limited access to land, and dual responsibilities in the

domestic and productive spheres. In a context where women's economic contributions are often not formally recognized, the rearticulation of identity becomes a symbolic mechanism for claiming recognition for previously hidden (invisible) labor. Informants began to talk about their work not as a "helping" activity, but as a form of active management of available resources, including family labor, social networks, and informal economic opportunities.

This rearticulation of identity functions as a source of symbolic legitimacy that strengthens women's bargaining position in social relations. In the domestic sphere, the identity of being a livelihood manager allows women to be more actively involved in decision-making regarding income allocation, family members' work strategies, and household consumption priorities. In the community sphere, this identity opens up space for women to participate in networks, informal groups, and mutual cooperation practices that were previously dominated by men or authoritative actors. Thus, identity does not merely reflect social position, but functions as a strategic instrument in everyday power negotiations.

These findings suggest that women farmers' resistance is not always manifested through overt or confrontational forms of resistance to agrarian structures. Instead, resistance more often operates at the symbolic and discursive level through redefining the meaning of women's work, economic contributions, and social roles. This rearticulation of identity becomes a practice of everyday resistance that allows women to maintain and expand their agency without having to directly challenge established gender norms.

Theoretically, these findings reinforce the agency-centered approach in feminist agrarian studies by emphasizing that women's agency is manifested not only through control over material resources but also through their ability to produce meaning, legitimacy, and social recognition. Identity, in this case, functions as a symbolic field through which women farmers negotiate their position within unequal agrarian structures. Thus, analyses of women farmers need to go beyond the dichotomy of domination and resistance and pay attention to how symbolic and discursive processes contribute to the reproduction and shifting of gender relations in rural livelihoods.

### **Resistance as Silent Politics in Everyday Life**

Overall, the integration of interview findings (Table 1) shows that the resistance of landless women farmers is a form of quiet politics that operates in the domestic sphere, community, and daily livelihoods. This resistance is not always manifested through overt collective action or formal demands for land rights, but rather through more subtle, layered, and contextual strategies. Within an exclusive and unequal agrarian structure, women farmers choose non-confrontational resistance as the most realistic way to survive, negotiate, and maintain the sustainability of their household livelihoods.

This silent politics is manifested in various flexible agrarian work management practices, such as choosing seasonal work, arranging work hours to suit domestic responsibilities, and diversifying income sources outside the formal agricultural sector. These practices cannot be understood solely as economic strategies, but rather as political actions aimed at reducing structural dependence on landowners and exploitative labor relations. By rearranging work patterns and livelihoods, women farmers implicitly negotiate their position in the agrarian hierarchy without having to directly confront dominant local powers.

In addition, silent resistance is also carried out through community-based social capital mobilization. The findings show that kinship networks, informal women's groups, and reciprocal relations between households are important arenas for the reproduction of women farmers' agency. Through practices of mutual aid, sharing work information, and emotional support, women build collective spaces that are relatively autonomous from the control of dominant agrarian actors. This space allows women to maintain a sense of social security and dignity, while also being a vital resource in the face of economic uncertainty and unequal access to land.

Local knowledge and life experiences also serve as a basis for symbolic resistance. Women farmers utilize knowledge about planting seasons, types of work, and survival strategies to assert their competence as livelihood actors, even though their formal status is often reduced to that of farm laborers or unskilled workers. This rearticulation of identity is important because it allows women to challenge dominant narratives that marginalize their

work contributions, while strengthening their bargaining position within the family and community.

Thus, the resistance of landless women farmers is not spectacular or revolutionary, but works gradually through seemingly ordinary everyday practices. This silent politics shows that agrarian inequality is not only faced through open conflict, but also through creative and reflective survival strategies. These findings broaden the understanding of agrarian politics by emphasizing that women farmers' agency operates across a broad spectrum, from pragmatic adaptation to symbolic resistance, all of which contribute to efforts to maintain autonomy, dignity, and livelihood sustainability under conditions of persistent structural injustice.

## CONCLUSION

This research concludes that landlessness does not automatically eliminate women farmers' agency, but rather creates a complex social terrain where resistance, negotiation, and livelihood innovation are reflectively conducted. Within an exclusive and unequal agrarian structure, landless women farmers are not simply vulnerable subjects but emerge as social actors who actively respond to injustice through everyday, silent, contextual, and layered practices of resistance.

The findings indicate that women farmers' resistance is primarily mediated through strategic agrarian labor management, community-based social capital mobilization, utilization of local knowledge, and the rearticulation of their identity from unrecognized farm laborers to household livelihood managers. These practices do not always challenge the agrarian structure head-on, but they are effective in reducing dependence on landowners, expanding the space for autonomy, and maintaining women's social dignity amidst unequal power relations.

Theoretically, this research expands feminist agrarian studies by emphasizing that women's peasant resistance needs to be understood as a relational process embedded in everyday practices, not merely as a formal collective movement or open conflict. By placing women's agency at the center of the analysis, these findings challenge dominant narratives that still position women peasants,

especially landless women, as policy objects or passively vulnerable groups.

Empirically, this research fills a gap in the literature by presenting evidence on the experiences of landless women farmers, a group relatively neglected in agrarian studies. These findings indicate that agrarian and rural development policies that focus solely on land redistribution or legalization, without considering gender dimensions, local power relations, and everyday resistance practices, risk reproducing the same exclusion. Therefore, the integration of a substantive gender perspective, recognition of women's agrarian work, and strengthening local institutions and spaces for participation are essential prerequisites for building a more just and inclusive agrarian system.

## REFERENCES

- Abeng, AT, Winoto, J., Soetarto, E., & Asnawi, YH (2024). The ongoing struggle for agrarian reform as an unfinished agenda? Lessons from Mekarsari Village. *BHUMI: Agrarian and Land Journal*, 9 (2).
- Abumuamar, M & Reinecke, J. (2025). Breaking barriers: Scaffolding social-symbolic work for women's economic empowerment. *Journal of Management Studies*. 1-32.
- Akter, S., Rutsaert, P., Luis, J., Me, N., Su, S., Raharjo, B., & Pustika, A. (2017). Women's empowerment and gender equity in agriculture: A different perspective from Southeast Asia. *Food Policy*, 69, 270–279.
- Erkan, A. Ç., & E. (2025). Asymmetric dependence and bargaining power in Sino-. 15 (November 2024), 247–262.
- Baily, A. (2025). Embracing temporality: Reflexive insights into positionality and relational dynamics in intercultural research. *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*, 4 (1), Article 100183.
- Barros, R. de, Resende, L.M., & Pontes, J. (2025). Exploring creativity and innovation in organizational contexts: A systematic review and bibliometric analysis of key models and emerging opportunities. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 11 (2), Article 100526.

- Bouncken, R.B., Czakon, W., & Schmitt, F. (2025). Purposeful sampling and saturation in qualitative research.
- Cepaluni, G., Civitarese, J., & Dorsch, M. T. (2026). Land invasions and contemporary slavery. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 93, Article 102807.
- Dabkienė, V. (2025). Gender, women's barriers and innovation in agriculture: A systemic literature review. *European Countryside*, 17 (1), 1–26.
- Doss, C., & Meinzen-Dick, R. (2020). Land tenure security for women: A conceptual framework. *Land Use Policy*, 99, Article 105080.
- Dunn, D., & Falk, R. (2015). Patterns and practices of everyday resistance: A view from below.
- Eriksen, S., Schipper, ELF, Scoville-Simonds, M., Vincent, K., Nicolai, H., Brooks, N., Harding, B., Khatri, D., Lenaerts, L., Liverman, D., Mills-Novoa, M., Mosberg, M., Movik, S., Muok, B., Nightingale, A., Ojha, H., Sygna, L., Taylor, M., Vogel, C., & Joy, J. (2021). Adaptation interventions and their effect on vulnerability in developing countries: Help, hindrance or irrelevance? *World Development*, 141, Article 105383.
- Fattarawati, F. (2025). Networked power and resistance in agrarian conflicts: A case study from Malin Deman, Indonesia. *Simulacra*, 8 (1), 141–157.
- Fitri Rahmadania, SA, Zuhairnawan, RI, Meisya Robiatul Adawiyah, & Hafidz, AN (2023). Women's economic empowerment and its implications for sustainable growth in Indonesia: A systematic review of scholarly works.
- Fruhen, L. S., & Parker, S. K. (2026). Home and away: Personal autonomy limitation in the liminal work context of fly-in-fly-out camps and psychological distress. *Community, Work & Family*, 29 (2), 215–236.
- Gallarotti, G. M. (2025). Power dynamics in times of crisis: An introduction. *Journal of Political Power*, 18 (1), 1–14.
- Goncalves, M., & Rhyne, E. (2026). The empowerment spiral: From constraints to transformation in rural Indonesian women's entrepreneurship. *Journal of Human Resources*.
- Harianti, I., & Amri, AI (2024). Indonesian agrarian reform in legal perspective: A critical analysis of Presidential Regulation No. 86/2018. *RGSA-Revista de Gestão Social e Ambiental*, 1–18.
- Hartmann, A., Kruijf, J.V., & Weesep, R. Van. (2023). Asking the right questions: The role of reflection for learning in and between projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 41 (5), Article 102494.
- Herdiansyah, H., & Mamola, R. (2025). Palm oil conflict and social transformation: Exploring the intersection of farmer autonomy and conflict resolution. *Trees, Forests and People*, 21.
- Honneth, A. (2022). Fields of recognition: A dialogue between Pierre Bourdieu. *Human Studies*, 45 (2), 311–339.
- Jóhanna Kristín Birnir, Okthariza, N., Agustyati, KN, & P. (2025). The patriarchy in the parties: Voters, parties and women's electoral fortunes in the 2024 legislative election in Indonesia. *Electoral Studies*, 95, Article 102938.
- Johnston, M. (2025). Morbid symptoms: A feminist dialectics of global patriarchy in crisis. *European Journal of International Relations*, 31 (3), 509–536.
- Kaliky, P.I., & Titaley, E. (2026). Social capital and network governance in local anti-poverty policy. *Journal of Communication Studies*, 10, 333–344.
- Laili Afita, TN (2023). The role of social support in promoting resilience and mental well-being. 3 (3).
- Loveday, L., Rivett, J., & Walters, R. (2023). Understanding girls' everyday acts of resistance: evidence from a longitudinal study in nine countries. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 25(2), 244–265.
- Lupu, L. (2019). The concept of social risk: A geographical approach. 38 (4).
- Mandrysz, W. (2020). Community-based social economy: Social capital and civic participation in social entrepreneurship and community development. 8, 81–93.
- Mayrhofer, M. (2025). The concept of vulnerability and its relation to the concepts of inequality and discrimination: A review article. *The*

- International Journal of Human Rights*, 1589–1618.
- McCarthy, J. F. (2010). Processes of inclusion and adverse incorporation: oil palm and agrarian change in Sumatra, Indonesia. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 37(4), 821–850.
- Medisa, R., Hardianti, H., Pranata, Y., & Niko, N. (2025). Defending land rights: A study of agrarian conflict in Pengudang Village, Bintan Regency, Riau Islands Province. *Journal of Religion and Social Transformation*, 3 (1), 1–10.
- Mikael, B., Lilja, M., Schulz, M., & Vinthagen, S. (2023). The ABC of resistance: Towards a new analytical framework. *Journal of Political Power*, 16 (1), 59–80.
- Natarajan, N., Newsham, A., Rigg, J., & Suhardiman, D. (2022). A sustainable livelihoods framework for the 21st century. *World Development*, 155, Article 105898.
- Natasya, B. (2025). Women's land ownership and decision-making power in West Sumatra. *Regional Science and Environmental Economics*, 1–15.
- Nguyen-Trung, K., Matthewman, S., Uekusa, S., & Bourdieu, P. (2023). Understanding risk-taking behaviors through the practice-oriented risk habitus and multiple-capital model (P-HAC): A case study of disaster-affected farmers. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 91, Article 103699.
- Nulhaqim, SA, Fedryansyah, M., Hidayat, EN, Astuti, D., & Nurhayati, W. (2020). Contemporary social problems: Agrarian conflict. *Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews*, 8 (3), 1189–1195.
- Palosaari, M., Autio, A., Mbinga, E., Pellikka, P., & Johansson, T. (2024). The biased narrative of vulnerable women: Gender analysis of smallholder farmers' contextual vulnerability to climate. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global Change*, 29 (6), 1–29.
- Parsons, M., Ko, H.H., Nursey-Bray, M., Gienger, A., May, G., & Makey, L. (2026). Gendered social capital and adaptive capacity: Exploring the role of women farmers in climate adaptation in Aotearoa New Zealand. *Local Environment*, 1–26.
- Qanti, S.R., Peralta, A., & Zeng, D. (2022). Social norms and perceptions drive women's participation in agricultural decisions in West Java, Indonesia. *Agriculture and Human Values*, 39 (2), 645–662.
- Rahimi, S. (2024). Saturation in qualitative research: An evolutionary concept analysis. *International Journal of Nursing Studies Advances*, 6, Article 100174.
- Roaldsnes, A. (2024). Social capital and the intergenerational transmission of cultural capital: How parents' social networks influence children's accumulation of cultural capital. *Poetics*, 102, Article 101873.
- Rutten, R., Bakker, L., Alano, M.L., Salerno, T., Laksmi, A., Shohibuddin, M., & Savitri, L.A. (2017). Smallholder bargaining power in large-scale land deals: A relational perspective. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 44 (4), 891–917.
- Sabar, W., Rahim, A., & Rahman, A. (2023). The role of women's agricultural workers and household economic resilience. *Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 12 (1), 52–59.
- Schling, M. (2024). Effective land ownership, female empowerment, and food security: Evidence from Peru. *World Development*, 181, Article 106680.
- Spanier, J. (2025). Radical rural place-making? Agricultural grassroots initiatives in the everyday negotiations of the European countryside. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 118, Article 103676.
- Susilowati, L. (2025). *The lived experiences of Javanese women in a context of rural transformation*.
- Swetha Kodali, RNR, JSLCSR (2025). *Beyond the farm: Women's role in the agricultural value chain*. 07 (11), 441–442.
- Taufik, F. (2025). Political communication and symbolic power in rural Indonesia: A Bourdieuan perspective from Bojonegoro. *Mediators*, 18, 270–281.
- Titus, A., & Damilola, A. (2024). Is there a linkage between credit access, land use, and crop diversification in achieving food security? Evidence from cocoa-producing households in Nigeria. *Heliyon*, 10 (16), Article e35844.
- Tohari, A. (2021). From confrontation to collaboration: Peasant negotiations in the

arena of decentralization. *Indonesian Journal of Political Studies*, 1 (2), 172–187.

Yang, C., He, X., Wang, X., & Nie, J. (2022). The influence of family social status on farmer entrepreneurship: Empirical analysis based on thousand villages survey in China. *Sustainability*.

Zondo, N.M. (2026). Dimensions of everyday resistance in rural artisanal mining communities in South Africa. *Resources Policy*, 112, Article 105798.