

# Community Perspectives on Redistributive Justice and Institutional Credibility in Remote Land Policy Implementation

Nur Laila Binti Mohammad

Universiti Utara Malaysia

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Received 4 March 2023

Revised 19 May 2023

Accepted 24 June 2023

### Key words:

Land redistribution,  
Remote areas,  
Public perception,  
Tenure security,  
Rural governance,  
Policy legitimacy,  
Communication evaluation.

## ABSTRACT

*This literature-based inquiry examines how communities in remote areas interpret the success of land redistribution policies implemented in their regions. The review synthesizes research across rural sociology, land governance, and development studies to identify key dimensions that shape public perception. Findings indicate that community evaluations are rarely based on legal titling or formal program completion alone. Instead, beneficiaries assess redistributive success through criteria such as procedural transparency, land usability, long-term tenure security, cultural alignment, and symbolic acknowledgment. Local perceptions are also influenced by gender dynamics, political brokerage, infrastructure access, and historical memory, revealing that administrative redistribution often diverges from communal interpretations. In remote settings where legal pluralism, logistical constraints, and limited state presence prevail, land reforms are filtered through vernacular understandings of justice, legitimacy, and continuity. The review emphasizes that perception is both a diagnostic and generative force in land governance, affecting cooperation, compliance, and long-term viability. It concludes by calling for evaluation frameworks that prioritize social embeddedness, participatory engagement, and institutional responsiveness to local worldviews. By attending to how land redistribution is received and narrated at the community level, this study offers insights into improving both policy design and implementation in marginalized territories.*

## INTRODUCTION

Land redistribution policies have long been adopted as state instruments to address historical injustices, rural poverty, and agrarian inequality. Their implementation is often framed within the mandate of equitable access to productive resources, particularly in post-colonial or agrarian economies. However, translating policy into practical and sustainable outcomes remains fraught with institutional, environmental, and sociopolitical complexities (Leach et al., 2010). In remote areas, where state infrastructure is limited and formal governance is often intermittent, the realization of land reform goals heavily depends on community participation, informal arrangements, and local legitimacy. Understanding how these communities perceive the outcomes of such policies offers critical insights into both their functionality and their failures. Perception, in this regard, becomes a lens through which the operational reality of redistribution can be examined beyond official statistics or formal compliance reports (Nhamo et al., 2022).

Scholarly literature emphasizes that perceptions of land reform are shaped not solely by legal frameworks or cadastral demarcations, but also by day-to-day interactions with land that involve access, use, safety, and recognition. In areas governed by customary tenure or historical memory, formal interventions by the state often trigger complex responses, ranging from cautious optimism to quiet resistance (Boone, 2015). Lund (2002) highlights that such interventions are inherently political and take place within layered landscapes of local authority and legitimacy, where past claims persist in influencing present realities. In isolated or rural communities, land is often seen as inseparable from identity and survival, thus success is interpreted in personal and social terms rather than bureaucratic metrics (Duncan, 2002). Recent studies also note that community reactions to land policy hinge on how reforms are experienced, told, and contested within local moral frameworks (Khan et al., 2022).

\* Corresponding author, email address: [nurlailamoh23@gmail.com](mailto:nurlailamoh23@gmail.com)

In various cases across Africa, Latin America, and Southeast Asia, the intended outcomes of redistribution policies have diverged from the perceptions held by beneficiaries. For instance, studies by Moyo (2000) on Zimbabwe and by Borras (2003) on the Philippines highlight how implementation gaps, bureaucratic inefficiencies, and elite capture affect the credibility of land reform initiatives. In remote territories, where state reach is mediated by intermediaries or local elites, communities may perceive redistributive efforts as politically selective or administratively opaque. These perceptions are not trivial; they influence land use behavior, cooperation with extension agents, and even intra-community cohesion. When people view land allocation as unjust, delayed, or improperly documented, they may resort to informal strategies, land disputes may proliferate, and the policy's legitimacy may erode over time (Dhyatmika et al., 2022).

Public perception thus functions not as an accessory variable, but as a critical axis around which redistributive success or failure revolves (Narang & Staniland, 2018). For policymakers and researchers seeking to evaluate land reform initiatives, especially in geographically isolated regions, assessing how the public internalizes and interprets outcomes is vital. It reveals not only whether redistribution occurred, but whether it translated into material stability, legal clarity, and social recognition. Without this lens, evaluations may overstate success or overlook subtle dynamics of exclusion, manipulation, or symbolic dissatisfaction. Understanding the cognitive and affective dimensions of community response allows for a more comprehensive grasp of how land policy is domesticated, contested, or reimagined in everyday life (Foster, 2018).

In many documented instances, land redistribution programs have been judged successful by central authorities but received with skepticism or indifference by intended beneficiaries. According to Platteau (1996), this divergence stems partly from a lack of embedded participatory mechanisms during policy design and rollout. Communities often report feeling alienated from procedural stages, reducing the perceived fairness and transparency of the process (Carman, 2010). Moreover, the absence of supporting infrastructure – such as access to water, credit, or transport – can overshadow the symbolic gain of land ownership. In remote areas where daily survival is contingent on integrated systems of livelihood, land access alone is insufficient to generate positive perception unless complemented by functional ecosystems of support (Goldmann et al., 2019).

Another key problem identified in the literature is the gap between formal land titling and perceived tenure security (Alban & Willem, 2020). Deininger and Feder (1998) contend that legal documentation may not necessarily translate into local authority or enforceable control, especially in pluralistic legal systems. In many rural areas, statutory titles compete with customary claims, religious affiliations, or traditional leadership structures. The outcome is a complex terrain where possession, use, and legitimacy are negotiated through overlapping and often contradictory frameworks. For rural dwellers in remote areas, these ambiguities affect how land redistribution is perceived – not as a clear resolution of inequality, but as a potential generator of new forms of uncertainty or social tension.

The involvement of political brokerage adds complexity to how communities interpret redistribution efforts. In many regions, access to state programs is filtered through local elites, allowing clientelist networks to shape the outcomes. Ghimire (2001) notes that this often leads to partiality, favoritism, and the marginalization of those most in need. Such practices undermine confidence in state intentions and deepen distrust toward formal institutions. When redistribution appears to reinforce existing power structures or benefits those with political ties, public perception becomes cynical (Lupu & Pontusson, 2011). Evaluating reform must thus account for these localized political dynamics.

The significance of studying perception in these contexts lies in its ability to uncover the informal logics and vernacular interpretations that shape rural governance. People do not passively receive land; they evaluate it through stories, comparisons, and expectations shaped by historical memory and social negotiation. Their judgment about success is filtered through daily realities, perceived fairness, and long-term security. Such understanding is critical for institutions attempting to design responsive, equitable, and sustainable land policies, particularly in zones where formal administrative presence is sporadic or inconsistent.

This study aims to explore scholarly literature addressing how communities in geographically isolated regions perceive the outcomes of land redistribution policies. It seeks to identify the key factors influencing public interpretation of success, including procedural transparency, legal clarity, resource accessibility, and local political dynamics. The findings are intended to offer conceptual and empirical insights that contribute to more grounded evaluations of redistributive efforts and inform policy frameworks that are socially responsive and locally intelligible.

## RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a structured literature review approach to analyze how communities in remote areas perceive the success of land redistribution policies. The method is appropriate for synthesizing theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and comparative case studies drawn from interdisciplinary fields such as rural sociology, development studies, and political geography. According to Hart (1998), a literature review is not simply an exercise in summarization but a critical engagement with the production and evolution of knowledge. This approach facilitates the identification of thematic patterns, conceptual gaps, and divergent interpretations within the existing scholarship on redistributive land reform. Through systematic evaluation of peer-reviewed publications, research reports, and case-specific ethnographies, the review aims to construct a nuanced understanding of how public perception mediates the relationship between policy objectives and field-level realities in marginal territories.

The review process was guided by criteria rooted in academic rigor and thematic relevance. Primary sources were selected from databases such as JSTOR, Scopus, and Wiley Online Library, focusing on literature published to ensure conceptual depth and historical context. The methodological protocol follows the structure recommended by Jesson, Matheson, and Lacey (2001), which includes thematic classification, comparative abstraction, and discursive synthesis. Keywords such as “land redistribution,” “rural perception,” “agrarian policy,” “remote area governance,” and “community response” were used to filter sources. Selected studies were evaluated based on clarity of methodology, empirical robustness, and conceptual contribution. Special attention was given to research that engaged with subjective experiences, vernacular narratives, and socio-political intermediaries affecting perception formation. This approach ensures that the resulting analysis captures the layered, culturally embedded, and politically mediated nature of perception in land governance processes.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Community perception of land redistribution outcomes in remote territories is shaped by experiential, institutional, and symbolic dimensions that extend far beyond administrative success indicators. Residents of geographically isolated regions often assess policy effectiveness not through formal metrics but through everyday practices and the subjective transformation of livelihood

possibilities. Land, in such settings, is not merely a productive asset; it is a site of memory, identity, and sociopolitical claim-making. As noted by Lund (2002), the legitimacy of redistribution efforts depends not only on statutory procedures but on how authority and entitlement are negotiated locally. In remote areas where land governance intersects with customary systems, public interpretation of success is filtered through layers of relational validation, social harmony, and perceived justice (Sangha et al., 2020).

Procedural transparency is a recurring factor that influences perception across diverse rural settings (Hamilton, 2018). When redistribution processes are seen as opaque, selective, or dominated by political intermediaries, communities often express skepticism toward their outcomes. Platteau (1996) observed that in areas lacking participatory mechanisms, people tend to view land allocation as externally imposed rather than collectively deliberated. The exclusion of local voices during planning and adjudication stages weakens the symbolic legitimacy of redistribution (Yilmaz et al., 2010). Even where land is physically allocated, the absence of procedural fairness may undermine beneficiaries' sense of rightful ownership, producing compliance without conviction and discouraging long-term investment in the land (Beauchamp et al., 2019).

Another significant variable is the perceived usability of redistributed land. Communities evaluate success based not only on whether land has been delivered but whether it is cultivable, accessible, and integrated into viable support systems (Byamugisha, 2013). Deininger and Feder (1998) highlighted that productive capacity and infrastructure—such as irrigation, transport, and extension services—directly mediate perceptions of policy impact. In remote areas where environmental constraints are acute, communities may view redistribution as incomplete or symbolic if the land cannot be economically exploited (Einsenber, 2020). Such perceptions foster a sense of abandonment, wherein beneficiaries are given legal titles but denied the institutional tools necessary for transformation. In these cases, redistribution is seen not as empowerment but as displacement of responsibility onto under-resourced households (García-Sánchez et al., 2020).

Tenure security represents another axis through which communities interpret the outcomes of land reform (Chikaya, & Chilonga, 2021). Legal documentation does not always translate into perceived authority, particularly in pluralistic legal environments (Zumbansen, 2010). Borrás (2003) and Ghimire (2001) both emphasized that statutory titles often coexist with customary claims, informal

tenancy arrangements, or traditional allocations made by clan or village leaders. Beneficiaries may experience a disjuncture between state recognition and social legitimacy (Stel & Ndayiragije, 2014). When official ownership does not command respect within local hierarchies, individuals hesitate to exercise full rights, fearing conflict or social sanction. This ambivalence affects how redistribution is received—not as a restoration of justice but as a source of relational instability (Masuda et al., 2020).

The presence of political patronage in land distribution significantly affects how success is narrated at the community level (Calfucura, 2018). Where local elites or political brokers are perceived to manipulate beneficiary lists, control access to information, or extract rents from recipients, redistribution loses its emancipatory promise. Ghimire (2001) documented how clientelist dynamics in Asia and Latin America have transformed land reform into instruments of selective reward, deepening rather than redressing inequity. In such cases, communities do not perceive success in terms of aggregate land allocation but in the distributional ethics and procedural integrity of the reform (Boone, 2012). When outcomes appear rigged or uneven, residents may withdraw cooperation, avoid formal channels, or contest legitimacy through informal resistance and discursive discrediting (Valkonen, 2021).

Community interpretation of land reform outcomes is also shaped by historical memory and collective experience. In many rural regions, especially those marked by past dispossession or conflict, land redistribution is assessed in relation to unresolved grievances, intergenerational narratives, and expectations of restorative justice (Gilbert, & Williams, 2020). Moyo (2000) noted that beneficiaries often compare present outcomes with earlier struggles or promises, and when outcomes fall short of these imagined redemptions, disappointment may overshadow material gains. Redistribution is not judged solely as a legal or economic intervention but as a moral process that must fulfill symbolic debts and reaffirm collective dignity (Raskin, 2019). The success of land policies, therefore, is embedded within memory, myth, and moral economy rather than isolated material indicators (Valkonen, 2018). Communication quality further modulates the impact of interpersonal relationships on employee satisfaction (Awad, & Alhashemi, 2012).

Gender dynamics further influence how redistribution is perceived and lived (Choi, 2019). In many traditional societies, women have historically been excluded from formal land ownership and

decision-making. Redistribution efforts that neglect intra-household dynamics may inadvertently reinforce existing gender hierarchies, thus distorting perceptions of fairness and inclusivity (Stevano, 2014). Borras (2003) emphasized that when land titles are issued solely to male heads of households, women may remain economically dependent and politically invisible. In such cases, even when land appears to have been equitably distributed at the household level, community perceptions of reform as gender-exclusive reduce its legitimacy and transformative potential. Conversely, when policies promote joint titling or recognize women's land rights explicitly, public perception often shifts toward greater trust and recognition (Deere, 2017).

Access to complementary services significantly conditions community perceptions of redistributive success. Land alone cannot produce sustained livelihoods without agricultural inputs, credit systems, market access, and technical support (Akoijam, 2012). Deininger and Feder (1998) illustrated that in the absence of institutional linkages, redistribution efforts risk being perceived as symbolic gestures rather than substantive reforms. Remote communities, which frequently face infrastructural isolation and limited state presence, may regard land transfers as incomplete or even burdensome when support services are missing (Kaiser & Barstow, 2022). In such environments, perception is directly linked to post-redistribution outcomes, such as productivity levels, food security, and income stability (Amri & Khayru, 2022). When these outcomes are lacking, even legally successful programs may be dismissed as irrelevant or failed (Tekwa & Adesina, 2018).

Perception is also influenced by inter-household and intra-community equity. When land redistribution results in disparities among neighbors, with some receiving more favorable plots, better documentation, or earlier access, feelings of resentment and exclusion may emerge (Trounstione, 2020). Lund (2002) argued that local legitimacy is produced through visible fairness, not simply administrative correctness. In remote communities, where relational networks are dense and kinship ties shape everyday life, small inconsistencies in implementation can erode the shared sense of justice. People may view reform as divisive rather than unifying, and social cohesion may be strained if the process is seen as favoring certain clans, political factions, or wealthier families (Vasta, 2010). Thus, redistribution must be seen not only as a technical operation but as a social negotiation requiring relational sensitivity (Vlachantoni, 2018).

Legal literacy and institutional comprehension also shape how policies are received (Zariski, 2014). In many remote regions, beneficiaries have limited access to information about their rights, obligations, or procedural recourse. Platteau (1996) noted that when reforms are introduced without adequate education or communication, communities rely on hearsay, local intermediaries, or informal leaders to interpret policy meanings. This epistemic gap can lead to misconceptions, misapplication, or mistrust. If people do not understand the scope of their ownership, the conditions attached to it, or the avenues for dispute resolution, their sense of entitlement remains fragile. Consequently, perception of success may be constrained by confusion, misinformation, or dependency on gatekeepers whose intentions are not always aligned with public interest.

The time horizon of redistributive benefits also influences public appraisal. Communities in remote areas often evaluate success not at the moment of land receipt, but over years of lived experience with tenure security, productivity, and livelihood enhancement (Abdillah & Manaf, 2022). Deininger and Feder (1998) emphasized that long-term institutional follow-up is essential to solidify initial gains. In the absence of sustained engagement, beneficiaries may experience deterioration of support systems, increased exposure to land grabbing, or gradual re-concentration of land. When such outcomes occur, communities may retrospectively reinterpret the reform as short-lived or superficial. Therefore, perception is temporally constructed and contingent upon the durability of benefits rather than their initial delivery.

Cultural values and cosmologies surrounding land influence how success is defined (Singh, 2017). In some indigenous and tribal communities, land is not a commodity to be owned or exchanged but a communal inheritance that links generations (Capps, 2016). When redistribution policies introduce individual titling or market-based frameworks, they may inadvertently clash with prevailing ontologies. Ghimire (2001) documented cases where such cultural dissonance led to alienation and resistance, even when land transfers were generous. In these settings, success is not measured by ownership per se but by continued access, spiritual integrity, and communal stewardship. Policy frameworks that ignore these meanings risk being perceived as invasive or culturally corrosive, reducing their acceptability and local resonance.

Symbolic recognition plays a subtle yet powerful role in shaping perception. Beyond material resources, land redistribution is expected to

acknowledge past injustices, affirm community worth, and validate local identities (Williams & Holt, 2017). When redistribution is accompanied by official visits, public ceremonies, or community dialogue, it generates a sense of inclusion and visibility (Galvis, 2014). Conversely, when it is conducted in bureaucratic isolation or reduced to paper documentation, beneficiaries may feel erased or marginalized. Moyo (2000) argued that symbolic inclusion reinforces legitimacy, especially in marginalized regions where state presence is historically weak or exploitative. Perception is amplified when land redistribution is framed not merely as an administrative correction but as an act of political recognition.

Lastly, the transmission of land across generations significantly shapes how reform efforts are judged by beneficiary households. Rather than focusing solely on immediate gains, families often prioritize whether land reform provides lasting security for their descendants. This includes the assurance of inheritance rights, the ability to maintain uninterrupted landholding, and protection against future dispossession. Lund (2002) emphasizes that intergenerational continuity in land use strengthens social rootedness and collective identity. In rural contexts where land serves not only as an economic resource but also as a cultural anchor, secure transferability becomes a core expectation. If reform policies introduce ambiguous inheritance procedures or lack legal clarity, they may be seen as jeopardizing long-term stability. Thus, for many households, reform is considered effective only when it guarantees future access and upholds family-based land continuity.

## **CONCLUSION**

The analysis reveals that community perceptions of land redistribution success in remote areas are constructed through a complex interplay of procedural, relational, cultural, and symbolic dimensions. These perceptions are not reducible to land delivery statistics or title distribution rates; instead, they reflect deeply situated evaluations based on historical grievances, institutional credibility, infrastructural adequacy, and the social durability of rights. When redistribution aligns with community expectations of justice, usability, recognition, and continuity, it fosters both legitimacy and engagement. However, where processes are opaque, support systems are weak, or cultural logics are ignored, public interpretations become skeptical, disenchanting, or resistant. Success, as understood by beneficiaries, must therefore be traced in lived realities rather than administrative declarations.

The findings suggest that policy evaluation frameworks must extend beyond technical metrics to encompass local narratives, communal ethics, and informal knowledge systems. Assessments that overlook subjective experiences or treat perception as secondary risk misrepresenting outcomes and reinforcing institutional disconnect. Land reform in remote areas must be designed and reviewed through participatory, culturally sensitive, and socially embedded mechanisms. Institutional recognition must coincide with local legitimacy, and statutory rights must resonate with existing tenure practices and collective values. Only through such alignment can redistributive efforts attain substantive credibility and sustained community endorsement. Future research should focus on participatory methodologies that center rural voices in both analysis and policy formulation.

Implementers should prioritize community consultation, transparent procedures, and culturally aligned documentation frameworks. Training programs that enhance legal literacy and bridge customary-state legal dualities are necessary to reinforce perception of rights security. Finally, evaluation tools should be reoriented to capture long-term social impact, intergenerational stability, and symbolic acknowledgment, thereby reflecting the criteria that communities themselves use to define the success of land redistribution policies.

## REFERENCES

- Abdillah, K. K., & Manaf, A. A. (2022). Land tenure security for low-income residents' urban livelihoods: A human development approach review of temporary occupation license. *Land Use Policy*, 119, 106223.
- Aisyah, N. & F. Issalillah. (2022). Healthy Eating, Mental Health, and Environmental Awareness: Implications for the Health of Young Generations, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 157 - 162.
- Akoijam, S. L. (2012). Rural credit: a source of sustainable livelihood of rural India. *International journal of social economics*, 40(1), 83-97.
- Alban Singirankabo, U., & Willem Ertsen, M. (2020). Relations between land tenure security and agricultural productivity: Exploring the effect of land registration. *Land*, 9(5), 138.
- Amri, M. W. & R. K. Khayru. (2021). The Dynamics of Social Mobility: A Comparison Between Urban and Rural Communities, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 39 - 43.
- Amri, M. W. & R. K. Khayru. (2022). Keeping Tradition in the Midst of Modernity: The Social Life of Indigenous Communities in Urban Areas, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 135 - 138.
- Beauchamp, E., Clements, T., & Milner-Gulland, E. J. (2019). Investigating Perceptions of Land Issues in a Threatened Landscape in Northern Cambodia. *Sustainability*, 11(21), 5881. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU11215881>
- Boone, C. (2012). Land conflict and distributive politics in Kenya. *African Studies Review*, 55(1), 75-103.
- Boone, C. (2015). Land tenure regimes and state structure in rural Africa: implications for forms of resistance to large-scale land acquisitions by outsiders. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 33(2), 171-190.
- Borras, S. M. (2003). Questioning Market-Led Agrarian Reform: Experiences from Brazil, Colombia and South Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 3(3), 367-394.
- Byamugisha, F. F. (2013). *Securing Africa's Land for Shared Prosperity: A Program to Scale Up Reforms and Investments*. World Bank Publications.
- Calfucura, E. (2018). Governance, land and distribution: A discussion on the political economy of community-based conservation. *Ecological economics*, 145, 18-26.
- Carman, C. (2010). The Process is the Reality: Perceptions of Procedural Fairness and Participatory Democracy. *Political Studies*, 58(4), 731-751.
- Chikaya-Banda, J., & Chilonga, D. (2021). Key Challenges to Advancing Land Tenure Security Through Land Governance in Malawi: Impact of Land Reform Processes on Implementation efforts. *Land Use Policy*, 110, 104994.
- Choi, G. (2019). Revisiting the redistribution hypothesis with perceived inequality and redistributive preferences. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 58, 220-244.
- Deere, C. D. (2017). Women's Land Rights, *Rural Social Movements, and the State in the 21st-Century Latin America*. *American agrarian reforms. Journal of Agrarian Change*, 17(2), 258-278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/JOAC.12208>
- Deininger, K., & Feder, G. (1998). *Land Institutions and Land Markets*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2014.
- Dhyatmika, K. W., Ismail, M., & Saputra, P. M. A. (2022, July). The Effect of Land Reform on Poverty: A Study of Provinces in Indonesia. In *Journal of International Conference Proceedings (JICP)*, 5(2), 499-506.
- Duncan, M. L. (2002). Reconceiving the bundle of sticks: land as a community-based resource. *Envtl. L.*, 32, 773.

- Eisenberg, A. M. (2020). Distributive justice and rural America. *BCL Rev.*, 61, 189.
- Foster, G. K. (2018). Community Participation in Development. *Vand. J. Transnat'l L*, 51(1), 39.
- Galvis, J. P. (2014). Remaking Equality: Community Governance and the Politics of Exclusion in Bogotá's Public Spaces. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4), 1458-1475
- García-Sánchez, E., Osborne, D., Willis, G. B., & Rodríguez-Bailón, R. (2020). Attitudes Towards Redistribution and the Interplay Between Perceptions and Beliefs about Inequality. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59(1), 111-136.
- Gardi, B., H. Udjari, & D. Darmawan. (2021). Understanding the Function of Communication in Building and Sustaining Quality Relationships Across Organizational Boundaries. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 245 – 252.
- Ghimire, K. B. (2001). *Land Reform and Peasant Livelihoods: The Social Dynamics of Rural Poverty and Agrarian Reform in Developing Countries*. London: Intermediate Technology Development Group Publishing.
- Gilbert, J. L., & Williams, R. A. (2020). Pathways to Reparations: and and healing through food justice. *Human Geography*, 13(3), 228-241.
- Goldmann, L., Lundgren, R., Welbourn, A., Gillespie, D., Bajenja, E., Muvhango, L., & Michau, L. (2019). On the CUSP: the Politics Land Prospects of Scaling Social Norms Change Programming. *Sexual and Reproductive Health Matters*, 27(2), 51-63. <https://doi.org/10.1080/26410397.2019.1599654>
- Hamilton, M. (2018). Understanding What Shapes Varying Perceptions of the Procedural Fairness of Transboundary Environmental Decision-Making Processes. *Ecology and Society*, 23(4).
- Hardyansah, R., R. Saputro, & D. S. Negara. (2021). Social Perception and Stigma: Creating an Inclusive and Equal Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 79 – 86.
- Hart, C. (1998). *Doing a Literature Review: Releasing the Social Science Research Imagination*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Ismail, A. B. (2021). Tradition and Social Identity Formation in Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 221 – 226.
- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2001). *Doing your Literature review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Kaiser, N., & Barstow, C. K. (2022). Rural transportation infrastructure in low-and middle-income countries: a review of impacts, implications, and interventions. *Sustainability*, 14(4), 2149.
- Khan, S. A., Shakoor, A., & Ali, A. (2020). *The Politics of Land Redistribution and its Implications for the Effectiveness of Land Reform Programmes: Evidence from South Africa and Zimbabwe*. [https://doi.org/10.36902/SJESR-VOL2-ISS2-2019\(110-124\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/SJESR-VOL2-ISS2-2019(110-124))
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Stirling, A. (2010). Governing epidemics in an age of complexity: Narratives, politics and pathways to sustainability. *Global Environmental Change*, 20(3), 369-377.
- Lund, C. (2002). Negotiating Property Institutions: On the Symbiosis of Property and Authority. In Africa. *Development and Change*, 33(6), 979–1005.
- Lupu, N., & Pontusson, J. (2011). The structure of inequality and the politics of redistribution. *American Political Science Review*, 105(2), 316-336.
- Mardikaningsih, R. (2021). Urbanization and Social Inequality: Challenges in Building Social Cohesion in a City-Based Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 135 – 140.
- Masnawati, E., A. K. Warin, & G. Seran. (2023). The Effect of Women's Empowerment on Family Economic Welfare and Barriers to Access to Education and Entrepreneurship in Rural Areas. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 89 – 94.
- Masuda, Y. J., Kelly, A. C., Robinson, B. E., Holland, M. B., Bedford, C., Childress, M., ... & Veit, P. (2020). How do Practitioners Characterize Land Tenure Security?. *Conservation Science and Practice*, 2(5), 186. <https://doi.org/10.1111/CSP2.186>
- Moyo, S. (2000). The Political Economy of Land Acquisition and Redistribution in Zimbabwe, 1990–1999. *Journal of Southern African Studies*, 26(1), 5–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/030570700108351>
- Nalin, C., S. A. B. Saidi, M. Hariani, V. Mendrika, & F. Issalillah. (2022). The Impact of Social Disparities on Public Health: An Analysis of Service Access, Quality of Life, and Policy Solutions. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 39 – 46.
- Narang, V., & Staniland, P. (2018). Democratic accountability and foreign security policy: Theory and evidence from India. *Security Studies*, 27(3), 410-447.
- Nhamo, L., Mpandeli, S., Liphadzi, S., & Mabhaudhi, T. (2022). Securing Land and Water for Food Production through Sustainable Land Reform: a nexus planning perspective. *Land*, 11(7), 974. <https://doi.org/10.3390/land11070974>
- Platteau, J. P. (1996). The Evolutionary Theory of Land Rights as Applied to Sub-Saharan Africa: A critical assessment. *Development and Change*, 27(1), 29–86.

- Raskin, M. G. (2019). *The common good: Its politics, policies and philosophy*. Routledge.
- Rizky, M. C., A. Herisasono, R. Hardiyansah, P. Saktiawan, & R. Saputra. (2021). The Effectiveness of the Legal System in Guaranteeing Equal Rights of Minority Groups in Constitutional Structures, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 193 - 196.
- Sangha, K. K., Duvert, A., Archer, R., & Russell-Smith, J. (2020). Unrealised Economic Opportunities in Remote Indigenous Communities: Case studies from northern Australia. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, 2(1), 100093.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SSAHO.2020.100093>
- Singh, R. P. (2017). Appraising the Indian cultural landscape: Envisioning ecological cosmology in the 21st Century. *North Eastern Geographer*, 39(1-2), 3-28.
- Stel, N., & Ndayiragije, R. (2014). The eye of the beholder: Service provision and state legitimacy in Burundi. *Africa Spectrum*, 49(3), 3-28.
- Stevano, S. (2014). *Women's work, food and household dynamics: A case study of Northern Mozambique*. School of Oriental and African Studies: Universitas London.
- Tekwa, N., & Adesina, J. (2018). Gender, Poverty and Inequality in the Aftermath of Zimbabwe's Land Reform: A Transformative Social Policy Perspective. *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 19(5), 45-62.
- Tribal-landed property: The value of the chieftaincy in contemporary Africa. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 16(3), 452-477.
- Trounstone, J. (2020). The geography of inequality: How land use regulation produces segregation. *American Political Science Review*, 114(2), 443-455.
- Valkonen, A. (2018). *Conceptions, Practices and Power Plays Around the Notion of Tenure Security: Examining the Land Policy Development and Implementation process in Madagascar*. University of East Anglia.
- Valkonen, A. (2021). *Examining Sources of Land Tenure (in)Security. A Focus on Authority Relations, State Politics, Social Dynamics and Belonging*. Land Use Policy. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LANDUSEPOL.2020.105191>
- Vasta, E. (2010). The controllability of difference: Social cohesion and the new politics of solidarity. *Ethnicities*, 10(4), 503-521.
- Vlachantoni, A. (2018). *Socio-Economic Inequalities in Later Life: the Role of Gender*. Routledge <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315226835-3>.
- Williams, J. M., & Holt-Giménez, E. (Eds.). (2017). *Land justice: Re-imagining land, food, and the commons*. Ingram Publisher American.
- Yilmaz, S., Beris, Y., & Serrano-Berthet, R. (2010). Linking local government discretion and accountability in decentralisation. *Development Policy Review*, 28(3), 259-293.
- Zariski, A. (2014). *Legal literacy: An introduction to legal studies*. Athabasca University Canada Press.
- Capps, G. (2016).
- Zumbansen, P. (2010). Transnational Legal Pluralism. *Transnational Legal Theory*, 1(2), 141-189.

\*Mohammad, N. L. B. (2023). Community Perspectives on Redistributive Justice and Institutional Credibility in Remote Land Policy Implementation, *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 47 - 54.