

Integrating Stakeholder Interests in Collaborative Land Conflict Management

Deny Alfiansyah¹, Adolf Bastian^{2*}, Richa Afriana Munthe³

¹Magister of Management, Graduate Scholl, Lancang Kuning University, Indonesia

²Magister of Management, Graduate Scholl, Lancang Kuning University, Indonesia

³Magister of Management, Graduate Scholl, Lancang Kuning University, Indonesia

Correspondence *:
adolfbastian@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the integration of stakeholder interests in collaborative land conflict management, focusing on a prolonged land dispute in Bangko Pusako, Rokan Hilir, Indonesia. The research aims to identify the root causes of conflict, stakeholder roles, collaborative mechanisms employed, and the challenges encountered in achieving inclusive resolution. Employing a qualitative, exploratory case study design, data were collected through in-depth interviews with seven purposively selected informants including community members, local officials, and company representatives complemented by document analysis and field observation. The findings reveal that the land conflict arose from overlapping claims, procedural exclusion, and power asymmetries between local farmers and a state-owned enterprise, PT Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR). While existing resolution forums such as *musyawarah* were initiated, they proved ineffective due to the absence of neutral facilitation, participatory mapping, and follow-up mechanisms. However, the study also identifies latent opportunities for conflict transformation through inclusive dialogue, recognition of customary tenure, and shared-benefit models. This research contributes to the literature on collaborative governance by offering a stakeholder-centered framework that integrates legal, historical, and social claims in agrarian conflict resolution. It differs from prior studies by providing a localized and grounded empirical perspective from a structurally unequal context. In terms of practical and policy implications, the study suggests that governments must mandate participatory mapping and social consultation in land licensing processes, while corporations should adopt engagement-oriented approaches rooted in community partnership. Civil society institutions are encouraged to play facilitative roles to reduce mistrust and rebalance power asymmetries.

Keywords : Agrarian Conflict, Collaborative Governance, Land Dispute, Participatory Mapping, Stakeholder Integration

I. Introduction

Land conflict remains one of the most persistent and complex socio-political challenges in Indonesia, deeply rooted in structural inequalities, overlapping claims, and governance deficits. In regions with high economic interest such as Rokan Hilir, Riau Province, conflicts between local communities and corporations particularly in the plantation and extractive industries have intensified over the past decades. The case of land disputes in Bangko Pusako Subdistrict exemplifies the intricate intersection of agrarian injustice, weak institutional coordination, and power asymmetries among stakeholders. Here, grassroots communities, having cultivated lands since 2015, confront formal claims from state-backed enterprises such as PT Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR), backed by government-issued concessions. Despite compensation offers, the affected communities reject the process due to its opacity and disregard for customary land histories.

The urgency of addressing land conflicts through inclusive and sustainable strategies is not only a matter of justice but also a prerequisite for social stability and equitable development. Statistics from the Agrarian Reform Consortium (KPA, 2022) report over 200 agrarian conflicts annually in Indonesia, affecting more than half a million hectares. Such disputes typically emerge in contexts where formal land tenure systems fail to accommodate traditional, communal, or informal rights. Yet, government-led resolutions often rely on top-down, administrative approaches that do not engage the affected parties substantively. As Rachman (2021) argues, policy frameworks that prioritize investment at the expense of distributive justice exacerbate existing tensions. Although legal-formal mechanisms exist, they frequently fall short in addressing the multidimensional causes of conflict, which include historical marginalization, lack of transparency, and absent participatory forums.

While much literature has explored the causes and consequences of land disputes, there remains a critical research gap regarding the practical application and effectiveness of collaborative conflict resolution frameworks in localized agrarian settings. Most studies focus on either legal dimensions or macro-policy implications, leaving limited attention to how bottom-up, participatory mechanisms perform on the ground. There is also a scarcity of research documenting the lived experiences of stakeholders and the dynamics of power-sharing in mediated conflict environments, particularly in regions such as Bangko Pusako where economic interests clash directly with community livelihoods. This research attempts to fill that void by analyzing how collaborative frameworks are implemented, and how they can be refined to accommodate pluralistic interests.

The novelty of this study lies in its integrative lens that situates stakeholder interests legal, economic, historical, and social within a structured model of collaborative land conflict management. Unlike conventional conflict studies that prioritize juridical or procedural perspectives, this research adopts a stakeholder-centered approach, recognizing the legitimacy of grassroots claims, the political authority of the state, and the operational imperatives of corporate actors. By synthesizing theoretical constructs from collaborative governance, conflict transformation, and participatory planning, the article contributes to a more nuanced understanding of multi-actor engagement in resolving agrarian disputes. It also brings empirical insights from the field, which are essential to advancing theoretical and practical frameworks in land governance scholarship.

Accordingly, the article sets out to achieve several interrelated objectives. First, it identifies the underlying drivers of land conflict in Bangko Pusako, including the historical context of land use, competing legal frameworks, and stakeholder interests. Second, it examines how collaborative approaches are being used to mediate these disputes what mechanisms are employed, who participates, and to what extent power asymmetries are addressed. Third, the research assesses the effectiveness of these approaches in producing socially legitimate and sustainable solutions. Fourth, it interrogates the barriers that hinder meaningful collaboration, such as lack of trust, legal uncertainty, and bureaucratic rigidity. Finally, it offers practical recommendations for enhancing stakeholder integration in land conflict resolution. The core research questions that guide this inquiry include:

1. What are the key factors that trigger and perpetuate land conflicts in Bangko Pusako?
2. Who are the main stakeholders involved, and how do their interests conflict or align?
3. How is collaborative conflict management implemented in this context, and through what mechanisms?
4. What challenges hinder stakeholder collaboration in practice?
5. What strategies can be employed to ensure inclusive and sustainable resolution outcomes?

This research adopts a qualitative, exploratory case study methodology, drawing data from in-depth interviews with seven key stakeholders, including community members, local government officials, and company representatives. The purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure that informants had direct involvement or significant knowledge of the conflict under investigation. Data sources include official documents, government reports, and community records, triangulated to enhance validity. The study site, Bangko Pusako Subdistrict, was selected based on its long-standing land conflicts involving overlapping claims between community farmers and PT Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR). A combination of narrative analysis and thematic coding was used to identify core patterns, stakeholder perspectives, and conflict dynamics.

The remainder of this article is organized into five main sections. Following this introduction, the literature review presents key theoretical insights into land conflict, collaborative governance, and stakeholder integration.

It draws from recent studies on conflict mediation, participatory planning, and indigenous rights. The third section details the research methodology, elaborating on site selection, data collection procedures, and analytical frameworks. The fourth section presents the findings, organized around thematic clusters such as conflict chronology, stakeholder roles, and mechanisms of collaboration. It includes perspectives from the field, demonstrating how institutional constraints, legal ambiguities, and relational dynamics shape the conflict resolution process. The fifth and final section discusses the implications of these findings for both theory and practice, offering critical reflections and policy-oriented recommendations. Together, these sections aim to deepen our understanding of how multi-stakeholder collaboration can be structured and operationalized in contexts of contested land governance.

2. Literature Review and Hypotheses Development

Land conflict is a persistent and multifaceted issue in Indonesia, often rooted in overlapping land claims, legal uncertainty, and the asymmetry of power relations among stakeholders. Numerous studies have explored the dynamics of land disputes, revealing both structural and procedural shortcomings in land governance systems. This literature review discusses prior research on land conflict, identifies the evolution of collaborative conflict resolution approaches, and situates the present study within existing scholarly discourse.

The concept of land conflict is extensively discussed in academic literature as a result of conflicting claims over land tenure, especially between local communities and corporate entities (Damania et al., 2015). These conflicts are exacerbated by weak institutional arrangements, lack of community participation in land-use planning, and the prioritization of investment over equitable land distribution (Rachman, 2021). In the Indonesian context, Situmorang (2020) highlighted that land conflicts often involve customary communities whose ancestral rights are systematically neglected by formal legal frameworks. Similarly, Bimantara (2025) emphasized that land disputes are not merely technical issues of boundary delineation but stem from historical injustices and socio-political exclusion.

Empirical data supports these claims. The Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning (2022) recorded over 1,000 active land disputes in Indonesia, with more than half involving indigenous and rural communities. The problem is most pronounced in resource-rich regions, such as Riau Province, where aggressive plantation and mining expansions often collide with existing community land use (KPA, 2023). Scholars have stressed that such conflicts demand resolution strategies that move beyond top-down legalism and instead embrace context-specific, inclusive, and participatory mechanisms (Pamungkas & Hutauruk, 2025).

Building on these insights, the present study follows a growing trend in literature that explores collaborative approaches to land conflict management. A collaborative approach, as defined by Nindyatmoko et al. (2022), entails inclusive dialogue among all relevant stakeholders, including state actors, companies, civil society, and local communities. This model challenges the dominant legal-formal paradigm by foregrounding mutual trust, transparency, and locally grounded consensus-building. Such approaches have proven effective in several contexts. For instance, Puri (2023) documented a successful multistakeholder process in West Sumatra that integrated customary land claims into local development planning through sustained dialogue between indigenous leaders, village governments, and academic facilitators.

Despite the growing advocacy for collaborative models, literature on their implementation in structurally unequal settings remains limited. Kusnadi (2023) noted that while collaborative forums are widely endorsed, their effectiveness is often undermined by power asymmetries and the absence of neutral facilitators. Hastuti (2022) emphasized the role of community empowerment—particularly the inclusion of women and traditional leaders—in sustaining conflict resolution processes. Likewise, Rahman (2025) argued that local social networks are vital in managing tensions and enabling communication across divides, particularly in rural and semi-rural settings.

Nevertheless, critical gaps remain. Many existing studies are concentrated in regions with strong local institutions or long-standing traditions of adat governance. They often overlook regions like Bangko Pusako, where rapid industrialization has disrupted traditional land tenure systems and marginalized grassroots voices. Furthermore, while the literature recognizes the importance of multistakeholder dialogue, it rarely interrogates the specific mechanisms through which stakeholder interests are reconciled or the challenges that arise in implementing such frameworks.

The current study addresses this gap by focusing on land conflict in Bangko Pusako, Rokan Hilir, where a prolonged dispute has emerged between local farmers and a state-owned enterprise, PT. Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR). The conflict stems from overlapping land claims, wherein farmers have cultivated land since 2015 without formal titles, only to be later confronted by corporate claims backed by government-issued concessions. While compensation schemes have been offered, communities perceive them as lacking legitimacy, transparency, and cultural sensitivity—illustrating the inadequacy of purely formal-legal solutions.

This case underscores the need for a nuanced, stakeholder-sensitive approach that not only addresses the immediate dispute but also incorporates long-term sustainability and social legitimacy. Drawing on insights from previous literature, the present research investigates how a collaborative framework can be operationalized in a context marked by weak institutional trust, limited legal awareness among farmers, and entrenched corporate-state alliances.

Several theoretical frameworks inform this research. Galtung's (1969) structural theory of conflict provides a useful lens to understand land disputes as embedded in systemic inequalities. His model delineates conflict into structural, cultural, and behavioral dimensions, all of which are evident in the Bangko Pusako case. On a structural level, access to land and legal recognition is unequally distributed; culturally, the narratives of land belonging differ between formal state institutions and local communities; behaviorally, the lack of open communication and trust impedes conflict de-escalation.

Another influential perspective is the collaborative governance theory (Ansell & Gash, 2008), which emphasizes the interdependence of stakeholders in solving complex public problems. This theory posits that successful collaboration requires (1) face-to-face dialogue, (2) trust-building, (3) shared understanding, and (4) intermediate outcomes that reinforce commitment. These principles resonate strongly with the empirical realities in Bangko Pusako, where the absence of inclusive dialogue and perceived injustices hinder conflict resolution.

The existing literature also stresses the role of facilitators or mediators in fostering collaboration. Hidayat (2022) emphasized that neutral third-party mediation is crucial in building bridges among conflicting parties. Nindyatmoko et al. (2022) similarly found that in conflict-ridden areas, facilitators help balance power asymmetries and ensure that marginalized voices are not sidelined. In the Bangko Pusako case, the absence of a trusted third-party facilitator has contributed to the stagnation of conflict resolution processes, reinforcing the need for institutionally anchored yet community-sensitive mediatory mechanisms.

Despite the growing volume of literature on collaborative conflict resolution, differences exist in how scholars conceptualize "stakeholder integration." Some, such as Prasetyo (2020), argue for procedural integration through shared forums and policy frameworks, while others, like Damayanti and Fauzi (2020), stress distributive integration ensuring that the outcomes of negotiations materially benefit weaker parties. The present study aligns more closely with the latter perspective, advocating for integration that is not only procedural but also transformative in terms of justice and livelihood outcomes.

In positioning itself within the extant literature, this research contributes in several key ways. First, it expands the empirical base of collaborative land conflict management by focusing on a relatively underexplored geographic area Bangko Pusako, Riau. Second, it offers a grounded understanding of how stakeholder interests can be reconciled in contexts where formal legal recognition is lacking. Third, it identifies specific barriers to collaborative implementation, such as asymmetrical legal power, limited facilitation, and the mistrust between state and society.

Taken together, the review of prior studies illustrates that while the principles of collaborative conflict resolution are well established, their practical application remains fraught with challenges particularly in regions marked by legal ambiguity and socio-political inequality. This study contributes to filling that gap by empirically examining how stakeholder interests can be integrated into a shared, legitimate framework for resolving land disputes. Through a qualitative exploration of strategies, actors, and negotiation dynamics, the study aims to build an actionable framework for collaborative governance in land conflict management.

3. Method

This research employed a descriptive qualitative approach aimed at thoroughly examining the strategies implemented in managing land conflicts through a collaborative and sustainable resolution framework. The qualitative design was chosen to enable an in-depth exploration of stakeholders' perspectives, social dynamics, and the contextual nuances that shape conflict resolution processes. This approach is particularly appropriate for understanding complex, multi-actor conflicts that cannot be captured through purely quantitative analysis.

The study was conducted in Bangko Pusako Subdistrict, Rokan Hilir Regency, Riau Provincian area with a longstanding history of agrarian conflict involving local communities and state-owned enterprises, notably PT. Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR). The selection of this site was intentional due to the ongoing, unresolved disputes over overlapping land claims and the significance of the area as a representative case of structural agrarian conflict.

The data collection was carried out during July 2025. Informants were selected using purposive sampling, targeting individuals with direct involvement, substantial experience, and strategic relevance to the land conflict issue. The criteria for inclusion encompassed representatives from local government (e.g., subdistrict and village officials), community members who actively manage or claim the disputed land, and corporate representatives

from PT. PHR. In total, seven key informants were interviewed, including village heads, land cultivators, and managerial personnel from the oil and gas company.

Primary data were obtained through in-depth semi-structured interviews, allowing flexibility for probing context-specific insights while maintaining consistency across key themes. Observational data and field notes were also collected to complement interview findings. Secondary data sources included government documents, local media reports, meeting records, academic literature, and official conflict documentation from agencies such as the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and the Consortium for Agrarian Reform.

The study focused on several analytical parameters, including: (1) the root causes of land conflict; (2) the forms and escalation patterns of disputes; (3) the roles and interactions of various stakeholders; (4) the mechanisms and effectiveness of collaborative approaches employed; and (5) the challenges faced in formulating sustainable, inclusive conflict resolution strategies.

Variables analyzed in this study were not operationalized as in quantitative research, but rather treated as thematic constructs emerging from empirical data. These included structural causes of conflict (e.g., overlapping land claims, weak legal recognition of customary rights), procedural barriers (e.g., exclusion from decision-making processes), and mediating factors such as local leadership and the presence or absence of neutral facilitators.

Data analysis was conducted inductively using thematic analysis techniques. This involved coding transcripts, identifying recurrent patterns, and synthesizing findings into conceptual categories aligned with the research objectives. The analysis emphasized both the process and outcome dimensions of conflict resolution, recognizing that collaborative governance in agrarian disputes requires more than legal compliance; it demands mutual understanding, recognition of local agency, and equitable dialogue structures.

To ensure research validity, triangulation was applied across data sources, including interviews, observations, and document analysis. Ethical considerations were strictly observed; all participants were briefed on the purpose of the research and consented to their involvement. Anonymity was preserved where required, and data were used solely for academic purposes.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1 Nature and Dynamics of the Conflict

The land conflict in Bangko Pusako emerged as a result of overlapping land claims between local communities and PT Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR), a state-owned enterprise operating under formal government permits. Based on the testimonies of informants, local farmers began cultivating unused land in the area as early as 2015–2016. These lands, primarily used for oil palm cultivation, became productive and integral to community livelihoods.

However, in subsequent years, PHR asserted that these lands were part of their official concession area for oil and gas exploration. The absence of early socialization, participatory mapping, or formal notification led the local farmers to perceive the company's actions as abrupt and dismissive of historical and moral claims. The conflict was marked by community resistance, formal letters of complaint, and emotional appeals during *musyawarah* forums, although no physical violence was reported.

This finding aligns with previous research by Rachman (2021), who emphasized that land disputes in Indonesia often originate from top-down licensing policies that disregard community tenure. In this case, the conflict is not merely territorial but reflective of structural injustices in agrarian governance.

4.2 Key Stakeholders and Their Positions

The study identifies three primary stakeholder groups: local farmers (*penggarap*), local government (village and sub-district officials), and PHR management. Each party holds divergent perspectives on legitimacy and authority over the land.

Local farmers, such as Mukhtar and Paska Simanjuntak, view their presence on the land as justified based on continuous and productive use over nearly a decade. While they do not oppose PHR's national role, they demand recognition through limited land legalization or inclusive partnership schemes. In contrast, PHR management (Zulkarnaen Dani and Dwi Budi Fitrianto) maintains a strict legalist approach, asserting their concession is backed by national regulations and that any community use of the land without permit constitutes trespassing.

The government, represented by Adlin (Camat) and Kodrat (village official), acknowledges both the legal authority of PHR and the community's historical presence. Their role has been limited to mediating forums without significant enforcement powers or access to alternative solutions.

This triangular configuration of interests echoes Pamungkas and Hutauruk (2025), who stressed that effective conflict management requires equal bargaining positions among stakeholders, something that remains elusive in Bangko Pusako due to legal asymmetries.

4.3 Root Causes and Structural Tensions

The research reveals that the root causes of the conflict include five interrelated issues: (1) overlapping land claims, (2) absence of participatory land mapping, (3) weak community legal documentation, (4) rigid legal-formal approaches by PHR, and (5) asymmetric access to information.

Informants emphasized that when they began cultivating the land, no signage or legal warnings were in place. Furthermore, no consultation occurred before PHR initiated exploration, reinforcing perceptions of exclusion. This procedural gap contributed to the erosion of trust and the rise of contestation.

These findings confirm Situmorang (2020) and Kusnadi (2023), who argue that land disputes in Indonesia frequently stem from administrative opacity and weak institutional coordination. Without spatial data transparency and inclusive governance, land policies risk delegitimizing both formal actors and local customary tenure.

4.4 Social and Economic Impacts of the Conflict

The conflict has had multidimensional effects. For local farmers, the primary consequences have been legal insecurity, restricted access to agricultural inputs, and declining income. Several informants indicated they no longer felt safe investing in fertilizers or hiring labor due to the constant fear of eviction. Additionally, crops have been left unharvested at times due to disputes over ownership.

For PHR, the conflict has disrupted operational security, led to reputational risks, and necessitated additional resources for legal defense and community engagement. Meanwhile, local authorities find themselves in a governance limbo sympathetic to community concerns but bound by legal constraints.

This socio-economic toll resonates with Damayanti and Fauzi (2020), who observed that unresolved land disputes can undermine regional stability and economic productivity. It also parallels Wulandari (2020), who emphasized the psychological and economic stress borne by farmers in land-conflict zones.

4.5 Role and Limitations of Collaborative Forums

While multiple forums (*musyawarah*) have been organized to address the dispute, the research shows that they remain largely symbolic and ineffectual. The forums lack a neutral facilitator, are dominated by corporate narratives, and fail to incorporate community-based evidence or traditional knowledge systems.

Although the government facilitated these sessions, the absence of follow-up mechanisms and legally binding resolutions renders them more procedural than transformative. For example, despite verbal agreements to explore partnerships or temporary permits, no formal schemes have materialized.

These limitations highlight the necessity of third-party facilitation, as recommended by Hidayat (2022). Without a credible intermediary, power imbalances persist, and collaborative platforms risk reproducing the very exclusions they aim to resolve.

4.6 Emerging Opportunities for Resolution

Despite the challenges, the research uncovers latent opportunities for a collaborative solution. Informants from all groups expressed a willingness to engage in constructive dialogue under fair conditions. Notably, PHR indicated openness to limited land use under CSR or co-management schemes, while community leaders showed interest in legal recognition or partnership arrangements. To capitalize on this convergence, several conditions must be met:

- a) Participatory Land Mapping: Engage all stakeholders in joint land demarcation to clarify boundaries.
- b) Recognition of Local Tenure: Provide limited legal protection for long-term land users through temporary permits or cooperative agreements.
- c) Independent Mediation: Involve neutral parties such as NGOs or academic institutions to facilitate dialogue.
- d) Shared Benefit Models: Design CSR initiatives that include livelihood support and shared economic benefits.

Such measures reflect the collaborative success observed by Nindyatmoko et al. (2022) in Lombok, where an inclusive multi-stakeholder forum significantly reduced tensions and institutionalized long-term land-sharing arrangements.

4.7 Theoretical Implications

The findings reinforce conflict theories that emphasize the interplay of structural inequality, procedural exclusion, and normative legitimacy (Anggraini & Husain, 2025). The Bangko Pusako case exemplifies how legal authority does not automatically translate into social legitimacy. Conversely, grassroots claims often derive their strength from customary norms, historical attachment, and moral justification, even when lacking formal documentation.

Thus, this research contributes to the literature on collaborative conflict management by showcasing the need to integrate formal land governance with bottom-up claims. It also supports the notion that justice in

land conflicts must encompass both distributive justice (who gets what) and procedural justice (how decisions are made), as emphasized by Sari and Supriyadi (2021).

4.8 Practical Recommendations for Stakeholders

To move from impasse to innovation, the research recommends the following:

1. For Government: Revise land concession frameworks to include mandatory social consultation before licensing, and empower local governments with mediation tools and land certification mechanisms.
2. For PHR: Shift from a purely legalistic stance to a community engagement model that acknowledges historical use and supports alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.
3. For Communities: Strengthen internal organization, gather historical evidence of land use, and advocate through alliances with civil society organizations.
4. For Mediators: Universities, NGOs, and religious institutions should initiate trust-building processes and facilitate consensus-based decision-making grounded in local values.

These recommendations are consistent with the sustainable conflict resolution model proposed by Hastuti (2022), which integrates empowerment, institutional reform, and community capacity-building.

5. Conclusion

This study provides a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics, challenges, and potential pathways for resolving land conflicts through a collaborative, multi-stakeholder approach, with a particular focus on the case of Bangko Pusako, Rokan Hilir. The findings reveal that land conflicts in the region are rooted in overlapping claims, procedural exclusion, legal ambiguity, and power asymmetries between local communities and state-backed enterprises. While local farmers rely on moral and historical claims based on long-term land cultivation, PT Pertamina Hulu Rokan (PHR) asserts formal ownership through government concessions. The limited effectiveness of musyawarah forums, lack of participatory mapping, and absence of neutral mediation have further exacerbated tensions, resulting in legal insecurity and economic instability for affected communities.

Despite these challenges, the research identifies emerging opportunities for conflict transformation. Stakeholders expressed a general openness to engage in inclusive dialogues under fair conditions. This indicates that while structural obstacles persist, there remains social capital that can be harnessed for collaborative resolution provided that the process is inclusive, transparent, and supported by legitimate facilitation. The study confirms that land conflict resolution cannot rely solely on formal legalistic mechanisms but must instead adopt a holistic approach that integrates historical claims, participatory decision-making, and equitable benefit-sharing. These insights contribute to the growing body of literature on collaborative governance and offer a localized, empirically grounded model for stakeholder integration in conflict contexts.

In terms of practical implications, this research offers actionable recommendations for multiple actors. For policymakers, there is an urgent need to revise regulatory frameworks to require mandatory social consultations and participatory land-use mapping before granting land concessions, especially in areas with existing informal or customary claims. Local governments must be empowered with conflict mediation tools, legal authority, and institutional support to facilitate negotiated outcomes. For corporate actors such as PHR, a shift from a compliance-driven to an engagement-oriented model is essential one that recognizes the value of local knowledge, supports community partnerships, and upholds social legitimacy. Civil society organizations, including NGOs and universities, should serve as neutral facilitators to bridge communication gaps, balance power asymmetries, and foster trust among conflicting parties. Communities, in turn, should enhance their organizational capacity and document land use histories to advocate for recognition through peaceful and constructive channels.

Nonetheless, this study is not without limitations. First, the research relies on a qualitative case study approach with a limited number of key informants, which, while rich in depth, may constrain the generalizability of the findings to other regions with different socio-political and institutional settings. Second, the absence of corporate counter-narratives beyond formal interviews may have limited the scope for deeper insight into internal corporate deliberations. Third, the temporal focus of the research captures a specific phase in the conflict, and therefore does not fully assess longer-term outcomes of ongoing negotiation efforts. Future studies would benefit from a longitudinal approach that traces the evolution of collaborative mechanisms and their impact on stakeholder relationships over time. Additionally, quantitative or mixed-method studies involving broader stakeholder groups could provide comparative insights across different regions and corporate contexts.

For future research, scholars should consider exploring the role of customary law (adat) institutions in formalizing collaborative agreements, as well as the psychological dimensions of trust-building in prolonged conflicts. There is also a pressing need to study the digitalization of land governance particularly how technologies like GIS-based participatory mapping and online grievance mechanisms can empower marginalized stakeholders and enhance transparency in land negotiations. Moreover, comparative case studies across regions facing similar

extractive-industry-induced conflicts could help refine collaborative frameworks into scalable models adaptable to diverse governance environments.

In conclusion, this study reinforces the premise that resolving agrarian conflicts in contemporary Indonesia requires not only legal reform but also relational transformation. By centering stakeholder interests, recognizing historical claims, and facilitating inclusive dialogue, collaborative land conflict management can become a viable pathway toward sustainable and socially just land governance. The insights from Bangko Pusako offer a microcosmic yet instructive case that can inform broader national efforts in agrarian conflict transformation and participatory land policy innovation.

References

- Agrarian Reform Consortium (KPA). (2022). *Annual Report on Agrarian Conflicts*. Jakarta: KPA.
- Anggraini, R., & Husain, S. (2025). *Structural inequality and agrarian reform in Indonesia*. *Journal of Agrarian Studies*, 31(2), 45–59.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571.
- Damania, R., Desbureaux, S., Rodella, A. S., Russ, J., & Zaveri, E. (2015). *Uncharted Waters: The New Economics of Water Scarcity and Variability*. World Bank.
- Damayanti, L., & Fauzi, M. (2020). *Local government and agrarian conflict management: A case study in Lebak*. *Indonesian Journal of Governance*, 8(1), 22–34.
- Hidayat, M. (2022). Mediasi konflik batas lahan: Analisis efektivitas pendekatan netral dalam penyelesaian agraria. *Jurnal Agraria Nusantara*, 13(2), 233–250.
- Kusnadi, A. (2023). Top-down vs. bottom-up: Evaluasi kebijakan tata ruang dalam konflik agraria. *Jurnal Planologi Indonesia*, 18(1), 71–84.
- Nindyatmoko, A., Prasetya, M., & Raharjo, B. (2022). Collaborative Forums for Customary Land Disputes: A Case from Lombok. *Indonesian Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 9(3), 209–225.
- Pamungkas, A., & Hutauruk, R. (2025). *Power asymmetry and participatory governance in agrarian conflict*. *Governance and Society*, 40(1), 78–95.
- Prasetyo, A. (2020). Policy failure in land tenure reform: A Kalimantan case. *Indonesian Journal of Land Studies*, 5(3), 134–150.
- Puri, D. (2023). The Role of Customary Institutions in Managing Land Tenure Conflicts. *Journal of Regional Planning*, 21(1), 33–48.
- Rachman, H. (2021). *Power and Land: Agrarian Struggles in Post-Reform Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Agrarian Reform Institute.
- Rahman, D. (2025). The role of social networks in rural land conflict resolution. *Jurnal Komunitas dan Pembangunan*, 11(1), 55–72.
- Sari, D., & Supriyadi, B. (2021). *Participatory spatial planning as conflict prevention*. *Regional Planning Journal*, 14(2), 120–134.
- Situmorang, H. (2020). Customary land and corporate expansion in Kalimantan. *The Journal of Social Justice in Southeast Asia*, 14(2), 97–113.
- Wulandari, T. (2020). *The social impact of land disputes on rural farmers*. *Socio-Economic Review*, 13(3), 33–47.