

Navigating Resistance: The Minangkabau Indigenous Community's Opposition to the Land Certification Program in West Sumatra, Indonesia

Resistance of the Minangkabau Indigenous Community to the Land Certificate Program in West Sumatra, Indonesia

Susi Fitria Dewi¹, Febri Yulika², Nor Lisa Sulaiman³, Kahirol Mohd Salleh⁴, Evelynd⁵

Abstract

The customary land certification program, launched in 2016 by Indonesia's National Land Agency, continues to encounter resistance from certain indigenous communities. This study aims to explore the forms of resistance, the underlying drivers of this opposition, and strategies to address these challenges. Adopting a qualitative descriptive research design and employing a case study methodology, data were collected through in-depth interviews with thirteen informants, field observations, and analysis of relevant documents. The findings highlight three key insights. First, indigenous communities resist the program by refraining from participating, driven by concerns over the privatization of communal land. Second, this resistance is exacerbated by violations of customary practices, particularly the buying and selling of communal land following the issuance of ownership certificates. Third, mitigating this resistance requires a strategic revision of regulations governing the issuance of customary land certificates. The active involvement of local authorities and the integration of indigenous cultural values are critical for ensuring the program's success and fostering broader acceptance of land administration policies. This study underscores the importance of culturally sensitive policy frameworks and collaborative governance in addressing indigenous land rights, contributing to the broader discourse on sustainable land administration in multicultural societies. The customary land certification program, initiated in 2016 by Indonesia's National Land Agency continues to face resistance from certain some indigenous communities. This paper seeks to examine the forms of resistance, the underlying factors driving this opposition and strategies to address it. Employing a descriptive qualitative approach, the study involved in-depth interviews with thirteen informants, field observations and the analysis of relevant documents. The findings reveal three key insight; First, indigenous communities show the resistance by not participating in customary land certification programs because they are prejudiced against the privatization of communal land. Second, this resistance is fuelled by numerous instances of customary violations, particularly the buying and selling of communal land following the issuance of ownership certificates. Third, to mitigate this resistance, a strategic revision of regulations governing the issuance of customary land certificates is necessary. Involving local authorities and integrating the cultural values upheld by indigenous communities are essential for the success of the program and for fostering greater acceptance of land administration policies.

Keywords: Resistance, Indigenous Community, Customary Land Certificates, Case Study.

Introduction

The land certificate program, which has been considered by the government as a solution to orderly land administration, has actually caused problems at the indigenous community level. The National Land Agency (BPN) of Agam Regency, for example, reported that out of 1,000 land certificate issuance targets, only 30% were achieved. This data was then followed by the rampant customary disputes reported by the Nagari Customary Council (KAN) due to the sale and purchase of customary land. There was even a lawsuit by customary leaders against the BPN because of the issuance of land certificates on the customary land of the community. The BPN itself regretted the attitude of customary leaders because they were considered not to understand the essence of issuing land certificates on customary land. The Ministry of Agrarian Affairs, Indonesia explained the land certificate program as an effort to provide legal certainty regarding the status of land ownership, including customary land. The government offers various conveniences,

¹ Department of Pancasila and Citizenship Education, Universitas Negeri Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia, Email: susifd@fis.unp.ac.id

² Department of Cultural Anthropology, Institut Seni Indonesia Padang Ppanjang, West Sumatra, Indonesia, Email: febriyulika@isi-padangpanjang.ac.id

³ Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Parit Raja, Malaysia, Email: norlisa@uthm.edu.my

⁴ Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education, Universiti Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia, Parit Raja, Malaysia, Email: kahirol@uthm.edu.my

⁵ Department of Sociology, Universitas Negeri Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia, Email: evelynd@fis.unp.ac.id

including free land certificate processing fees, but indigenous communities have their own rationality in responding to the land certification program on customary land.

Existing research on indigenous communities and government-initiated programs has predominantly focused on three key aspects. First, studies have examined state protection of customary law through regional regulations governing the use of customary land (Arisaputra & Mardiah, 2019; Firmansyah et al., 2008; Samiran et al., 2023; Tegnan, 2015). Second, research has explored the factors that trigger social conflicts arising from disputes over customary land ownership (Putra, 2017; Zaiyardam, 2010). Third, attention has been given to the utilization of customary land by third parties, including the state, private investors, and other communities (Pangestu et al., 2018). These studies underscore the centrality of customary land as a critical issue, highlighting the need for further exploration from legal, social, and cultural perspectives. This gap calls for a more comprehensive approach to understanding the complexities surrounding indigenous land rights and governance.

This study builds on the premise that the land certification program aims to provide legal certainty to landowners. However, it argues that the National Land Agency (BPN) must introduce innovative measures in issuing land certificates for customary land. Such innovations should address both the form and content of certificates to better align with the unique needs of indigenous communities. This adjustment is critical given the resistance observed among some indigenous communities and customary leaders, who oppose the standardization of processes and mechanisms for land certification that are uniformly applied to all types of land. Additionally, there are instances where individuals who have successfully certified their customary land are tempted to engage in land transactions that contradict customary laws, such as the sale and purchase of customary land. To address these challenges, this study recommends that the government establish special provisions for the issuance of land certificates specific to customary land. Furthermore, the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs is encouraged to offer alternative forms of protection for indigenous property rights, such as notarial deeds, joint ownership agreements, and the registration of jointly owned land. These measures aim to safeguard the integrity of customary land rights while respecting the cultural and legal frameworks of indigenous communities.

Thus, this study aims to complement the limitations of previous studies by carefully mapping the resistance of indigenous community to the land certification program. This study attempts to explain the causes behind this resistance and its implications for the existence of Minangkabau customary law. Specifically, the problem is formulated into three questions: First, what is the form of resistance of indigenous community to the land certification program? Second, what are the factors causing this resistance? Third, what strategies can be carried out so that resistance can be transformed into acceptance? The results of this study are expected to provide a deep and broad understanding of the interaction and relationship of indigenous community to government programs

Indigenous Communities' Resistance to the Land Certificate Program

Land is a source of life for humans, because it not only has economic value, but is also related to social, political, cultural, defence, and security issues. Based on this assumption, the Indonesian government has begun to pay great attention to the development of Agrarian Law, especially in the issue of land rights and their guarantees. This can be seen in Article 19 of the Law on Agrarian Principles (UUPA) number 5 of 1960 that in order to guarantee the rights and legal certainty of land acquisition, the government organizes land registration (Bola, 2017). Land registration includes measurement, mapping, registration of land rights, transfer of rights to other parties, and land certification (A. R. Hidayat et al., 2015). In addition, (Bola, 2017) said that land certification is a guarantee provided by law that clarifies the condition, location, area, and boundaries of the land. Thus, everyone who has registered their land obtains legal protection against possible disputes in the future. Furthermore, customary land ownership rights are also regulated in Article 33 paragraph 3 of the 1945 Constitution and UUPA Number 5 of 1960 concerning UUPA (Marta et al., 2019). The policy of recognizing customary land also applies at the international level, known as the convention. The convention recognizes the rights of indigenous community, which are implemented by the International Labor Organization (ILO). This organization formed the Indigenous Community Convention which on June 27, 1989 came into force on September 5, 1991 in Geneva (Marta et al., 2019).

Customary land is land owned by customary law communities or better known as customary rights or seignorial rights. According to (Budiman et al., 2020), customary rights are a term given by legal and legislative experts, which means a legal relationship between the local community and a certain area, which functions as a "*lebensraum*" (habitat) for the community throughout time. According to Indonesian customary law, customary land plays an important role and is believed to be a gift of supernatural powers or inheritance from ancestors that must be protected with their own lives (Kaban & Sitepu, 2017). For indigenous community, customary land is considered the main reason for social, cultural, spiritual, economic, and political life (Agustina, 2018). This gives indigenous community the right to control land, utilize land, harvest crops, and hunt animals (Erwin & Khudzaifah, 2019). Customary land in this context does not only refer to physical land, but also includes forests, ponds, rivers, lakes, and even the sea. Regarding the relationship between customary law communities and customary land, (Murray Li, 2020) states that customary law communities have rights to their land and are allowed to exercise these rights inside and outside the land. Exercising their rights outside the land means that customary law communities are responsible for maintaining their customary land and have the right to reject or accept outsiders who want to enjoy their land based on certain agreements.

Furthermore, (Maria, 2018) stated that there are several conditions to determine whether a customary law community has customary rights to customary land: (1) there is still a group of people as members of a particular customary law community; (2) there is still an area of customary land of the customary law community based on the land owned by the community; (3) there is still a customary ruler who is clearly recognized by the customary law community as the executor of customary rights. Then according to (Wangi et al., 2023) there are six rights of customary law communities in relation to customary land: (1) individual rights are protected by all rights of customary law community leaders; (2) customary law community leaders are the determinants for their community in the use of certain land areas, and are also mandated to take care of the interests of the general public; (3) foreigners who wish to take the results/results/land must ask the harvest; (4) customary law community leaders are responsible for everything that happens on customary land; (6) customary law community leaders prohibit anyone from using customary land for personal gain (Napoh, 2015). Leaders or members of customary law communities are not allowed to make absolute decisions unilaterally, so that unilateral authority over land will be revoked (Napoh, 2015). The use of customary land varies in each region, depending on the creativity of the community in cultivating the land. In Juhar, Karo Regency, North Sumatra Province for example, customary land in the form of ponds will be harvested once a year and enjoyed by all members of the community (Setiawan, 2022). The variations in the use of customary land partly arise from contextual and historical factors.

The policy regarding the issuance of certificates on customary land has encountered quite complex problems because it involves state law and customary law. Tolo (2018) argues that this problem arises because there is no clarity regarding whether customary land must be certified. Customary law has also never regulated certificates on customary land owned by heirs. This is in line with Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 that customary rights cannot be registered because customary rights are not included in the object of land registration. However, this becomes contradictory when the government socializes the need for legal certainty in the land sector to indigenous community with written legal instruments, namely land certificates (Haryanti & Suharto, 2021). In addition, (Jaya et al., 2021) said that customary land or customary forests that have been certified are often sold by certain individuals to be utilized by the government or used as production land by investors. This is the dilemma for indigenous community and the government, namely the friction between legal, cultural and economic interests.

Resistance is defined as the resistance and rejection of subordinate groups against claims, ideas or ideas of dominant groups because they are considered inconsistent with the values they believe in or are considered detrimental (Scott, 2016). Resistance by indigenous community to land certification programs on customary land usually occurs because of the incompatibility between the traditional values adopted by indigenous community and formal government policies, especially regarding the management and recognition of land rights. Some of the main reasons why indigenous community show resistance to land certification programs on customary land are stated by (Leiwakabessya et al., 2021) as differences in the concept of land ownership. Indigenous community often consider customary land as the common property of the community that

cannot be separated or sold. Meanwhile, land certification tends to lead to the concept of private ownership which is contrary to the principle of customary collectively.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative descriptive research design, specifically adopting a case study methodology, to explore the intricate interplay of social, cultural, and value systems within indigenous communities. The case study approach is particularly well-suited to this research due to its ability to provide an in-depth examination of complex, context-specific phenomena. By focusing on the unique dynamics of these communities, this methodology enables a nuanced understanding of the factors shaping their lived experiences. As highlighted by Salleh et al. (2023), the scientific process in research provides a structured framework that guides the researcher in breaking down the research project into specific tasks to effectively meet the study's objectives, especially within a case study context. The research was conducted among the Minangkabau indigenous community in the Nagari Sungai Batang area, located in the Agam Regency of West Sumatra, Indonesia. This area spans approximately 17.38 km² and has a population of 3,754 people. The district is subdivided into seven subdistricts: Batu Ajang, Batu Panjang, Kampung Dadok, Kubu, Labuah, Nagari, and Tanjung Sani. Two defining characteristics of this indigenous community are their strong adherence to Islamic religious norms and their unwavering commitment to Minangkabau customary traditions, which are led by nine customary leaders. Indigenous communities, such as the one studied, differ significantly from the general populace. Their deep connection to and knowledge of their environment are passed down orally across generations, preserving their cultural heritage and worldview (Dewi, 2010). This case study allowed for an in-depth exploration of the unique cultural and social dynamics within the Minangkabau community, offering a comprehensive understanding of the indigenous practices, values, and resistance observed in this specific geographical and cultural setting.

Data collection for this study involved in-depth interviews with thirteen key informants, including traditional leaders, village officials, and customary landowners. The in-depth interviews were chosen for two main reasons: a) they provided an opportunity to gather detailed responses to complex questions that could not be answered simply, and b) they allowed the interviewer to observe nonverbal behavior, offering insights into participants' feelings about the issues discussed (Salleh et al., 2016). Additionally, observations of the community's daily activities were conducted, and relevant documents were gathered to support the research. The study was guided by three central questions: First, what forms of resistance do indigenous communities exhibit toward the land certification program? Second, what are the underlying factors driving this resistance? And third, what strategies can be implemented to balance the preservation of customary law with the government's objectives regarding the issuance of land certificates?. This research is grounded in three key considerations: First, the issuance of customary land certificates remains a pivotal issue that has not been comprehensively addressed in prior studies. Second, the response of indigenous communities to government initiatives is a critical matter that influences Indonesia's legal framework. Third, the resistance expressed by these communities can be interpreted as an effort to safeguard their customary norms, highlighting the importance of reflecting on these dynamics to ensure a balanced approach to land administration.

The data analysis in this study follows the approach outlined by Miles and Huberman (2014) which involves three key processes. First, data reduction was conducted to organize the collected data systematically, classifying it according to form, factors, and implications. This step helped streamline the information for easier interpretation. Second, the data verification process was employed to draw thematic conclusions from the reduced data, ensuring its accuracy and consistency with the study's objectives. Third, the data presentation phase involved displaying the verified data in tables, which included relevant quotes from interviews, illustrating key findings aligned with the discussion. Following these three processes, the analysis proceeded inductively to form the basis for interpreting the data. Interpretation was conducted through the restatement and reflection of the data in relation to the ideas, patterns, and socio-cultural contexts represented by the findings. This systematic approach allowed the research to derive significant insights into the forms, underlying factors, and implications of indigenous resistance to the customary land certification program, offering a thorough understanding of the issue within its socio-cultural context. The

use of a descriptive design further enhanced the study by enabling the researchers to gather detailed information, deepen their understanding, and effectively address the research questions (Salleh et al., 2016). This methodology proved instrumental in exploring the complexities of indigenous resistance and in providing well-rounded answers to the challenges posed by the land certification process.

Result and Discussion

The findings in this study show that the resistance shown by indigenous community is influenced by the perception of the impact of the land certificate program. There are two patterns of resistance from two different groups, namely indigenous leaders and indigenous community. Indigenous leaders show active and aggressive resistance while indigenous community show more passive resistance. The differences in the forms and motives of resistance and strategies to overcome them can be seen through three important findings in this study

Forms of indigenous communities resistance to the issuance of customary land certificates

The resistance shown by indigenous peoples to the land certificate program varies in form, it can be open or hidden (hidden transcript) (Scott, 2016). Table 1 shows that there are variations in the form of resistance shown by traditional leaders and indigenous communities regarding the customary land certificate program. As the classification of resistance stated (Coetsee, 1993), in Table 1 it can be seen that the resistance of traditional leaders tends to show aggressive, apathetic and active resistance because they consider issuance of customary land certificate in the name of a person as something wrong. Meanwhile, indigenous communities only show passive resistance, starting from delaying applications, avoiding and waiting for the right time to take care of certificates on customary land. Although the customary land certificate program is not something that is threatening and dysfunctional or pathological if not carried out (Lapointe & Rivard, 2005), this data indicates an unequal interaction between customary law and state law.

Table 1. Forms of Indigenous Communities Resistance to the Customary Land Certificate Program

Coding	Identity	Statement
Resistance	Traditional leaders	We protest to the National Land Agency (BPN) over the issuance of a certificate on customary land. We also reprimand the community who makes an application for the issuance of customary land certificates in the name of a person, Informant 1, Sungai Batang, 2024
Rejection	Traditional leaders	As customary leaders, we have agreed to prohibit the certification of customary land. This has been the decision of all traditional leaders. In our opinion, customary land certificates in the name of individuals are considered a source of family conflict and an example of violation of customary law (Informant 2, Sungai Batang, 2024)
	Indigenous community	For now we choose not to adopt the land certificate program. But we may change our mind someday (Informant 3, Sungai Batang, 2024).
Uncooperative	Traditional leaders	Once again, we emphasize, traditional leaders are doubtful to serve applications for customary land certificates on behalf of individuals (Informant 4, Sungai Batang, 2024)
Apathetic	Traditional leaders	Maybe we will not attend the socialization on the customary land certificate program held by the government because the it is trivial (Informant 5, Sungai Batang, 2024)

Source: informant interview

Resistance to the customary land certification program occurs due to the continuity of government effort to issue the certificates in private names, even though customary land is a cultural symbol and a place of economic dependence for indigenous peoples. This resistance arises because of the encouragement of indigenous peoples to protect ownership of customary land through a hereditary inheritance system and protection from customary leaders (Kaban & Sitepu, 2017). Meanwhile, the state assumes that this program aims to protect ownership of customary land through a customary land certification program that makes its location, area, and boundaries clearly known (H. Hidayat et al., 2018). In addition, indigenous communities keep resisting the land certification since it is thought to provide opportunities for customary violations.

Resistance that is left without renegotiation efforts with indigenous communities risks the state's efforts to manage land administration in the future (Erwin & Khudzaifah, 2019; Leiwakabessya et al., 2021). The experience of indigenous communities with several incidents of customary violations through the misuse of customary certificates or customary land by one of its members is sufficient reason for their resistance to the customary land certification program (Erwin & Khudzaifah, 2019). The only reason for resistance is the interest of customary leaders to maintain customary law and the authority that arises due to changes in the customary order from communality to privatization. The state's negligence of the occurrence of customary law violations can become a boomerang that leads to the segregation of indigenous peoples and even spurs conflicts from the community to state institutions. (Leiwakabessya et al., 2021)

Factors Underlying Indigenous Communities Resistance to Customary Land Certificates

Every resistance shown by traditional leaders and traditional communities has reasons and factors that influence it. The reasons and factors of resistance are objects of resistance that must be identified (Jermier et al., 1994). In this study, two objects of resistance were found; first, traditional leaders rejected the process of applying for the issuance of customary land certificates without going through deliberation and approval from traditional leaders. Second, traditional leaders rejected the misuse of customary land certificates for personal interests.

Table 2 shows that there are three factors behind the resistance to the customary land certificate program. First, the issue of injustice. This issue stems from the fact that customary land certificates only list one name as the owner of the customary land. The National Land Agency has never issued a certificate in a joint name. This raises suspicions of privatization of customary land for personal interests. Second, the issue of loss of power and respect for customary law. This issue is felt by customary leaders when the customary community has certified their customary land on behalf of a person. Customary leaders assume that the certified land no longer has cultural value but only has legal and economic value. Land certificates are believed to change the structure of social relations of customary communities which are territorial genealogical hierarchies. Customary leaders will not be able to control the use of customary land certificates whether they will be mortgaged to the Bank or there will be customary land sale and purchase transactions. Third, the issue of the threat of the imposition of customary sanctions. Customary leaders have firmly stated that they will not allow applications to issue customary land certificates on behalf of an individual. Customary sanctions will be imposed to individuals who take care of customary land certificates without the knowledge of customary leaders, because they have the opportunity to pawn and sell customary land. The sanctions given are in the form of ostracization and no longer being recognized as part of the customary community.

Table 2. Factors Underlying Resistance to Customary Land Certificates

Coding	Identity	Statement
Injustice	Indigenous community	We are suspicious of someone's desire to take care of customary land certificates as an effort to transfer communal land ownership rights to private property. Usually this suspicion leads to family conflicts because

		it has the potential to create injustice (Informant 6, Sungai Batang, 2024).
Loss of power of traditional leaders	Traditional leaders	We think that with the emergence of land certificates, customary leaders will lose power. They cannot control whether the land certificate will be mortgaged to the Bank or the transaction of buying and selling customary land. We found that there are individuals who take care of customary land certificates without the approval of customary leaders (Informant 7, Sungai Batang, 2024).
Threat of customary sanctions	Indigenous community	We choose to comply with the instructions of the traditional leaders not to apply for customary land certificates. We see that several families who have already had customary land certificates in their personal names have been reprimanded and threatened not to pawn, let alone sell customary land (Informant 8, Sungai Batang, 2024).

Source: Informant interview

A detailed analysis presented in Table 2 highlights three key factors contributing to resistance against the customary land certification program. First, the issue of injustice. This issue stems from the fact that customary land certificates only list one name as the owner of the customary land. The National Land Agency has never issued a certificate in a joint name. This raises suspicions of privatization of customary land for personal interests. Second, the issue of loss of power and respect for customary law. This issue is felt by customary leaders when the customary community has certified their customary land on behalf of a person. Customary leaders assume that the certified land no longer has cultural value but only has legal and economic value. Land certificates are believed to change the structure of social relations of customary communities which are territorial genealogical hierarchies. Customary leaders will not be able to control the use of customary land certificates whether they will be mortgaged to the Bank or there will be customary land sale and purchase transactions. Third, the issue of the threat of the imposition of customary sanctions. Customary leaders have firmly stated that they will not allow applications to issue customary land certificates on behalf of an individual. Customary sanctions will be imposed to individuals who take care of customary land certificates without the knowledge of customary leaders, because they have the opportunity to pawn and sell customary land. The sanctions given are in the form of ostracization and no longer being recognized as part of the customary community.

The three factors, namely injustice, loss of power and respect for traditional leaders and the threat of implementing traditional sanctions are urgent matters for the Minangkabau traditional community (Dewi et al., 2024). This is the reason why the resistance shown by customary leaders is in the form of active and aggressive resistance (Laumer & Eckhardt, 2012). In addition (Katila et al., 2020) argue that the reason for injustice is strong enough to cause community resistance to the certification program on customary land. (Hauser-Schäublin, 2013) and (Siscawati et al., 2017) also stated that the inequality of customary law and national law is also a reason for the emergence of resistance from indigenous peoples. Although Indonesia recognizes the rights of indigenous peoples in the 1945 Constitution, the application of customary law in the formal legal system is often inconsistent. Indigenous peoples are concerned that by issuing certificates on behalf of a person, their customary rights will be ignored or obscured by national legal regulations.

Furthermore, (Erwin & Khudzaifah, 2019) and (Katila et al., 2020) also stated that requests for the issuance of land certificates on customary land without adequate consultation with customary leaders have resulted in aggressive resistance from customary leaders. This situation is considered disrespectful of applicable customary law. As stated by (Erwin & Khudzaifah, 2019) there are at least three things that must be consulted with customary leaders regarding customary land. First, written consent from all families and

leaders that the land will be certified. Second, the existence of a family tree document declaring the heirs to the customary land. Third, a written document regarding the boundaries of the customary land area. This situation encourages customary leaders to supervise every individual who applies for a customary land certificate. Horizontal conflicts can occur if the applicant ignores the consent of the entire family and pedigree as one of the conditions for the issuance of customary land certificates. This resistance also shows that the Minangkabau people have a tendency to maintain local values in accepting renewal (Lewin, 1947).

Strategies To Turn Resistance into Acceptance

The resistance shown by traditional leaders and the community can be transformed into acceptance of the customary land certificate program. The transformation is made possible by creating a multidimensional strategy against three elements: cognitivity, affection, and behavior/intention (Oreg, 2006; Piderit, 2000). This means that acceptance of the customary land certificate program can be created by focusing on three issues, namely the lack of knowledge regarding the mechanism of issuing customary land certificates (cognitivity), the prejudice against the government's impartiality towards indigenous peoples (affection), and the concern of traditional leaders about the rampant customary violations in the form of buying and selling customary land (behavior/intention).

Based on interviews with the head of the National Land Agency, there are four strategies to overcome this. *First*, the government provides guarantees of legal certainty by accommodating the values believed by indigenous peoples. *Second*, collaboration between the government and traditional leaders in the management of customary land administration. *Third*, strengthening customary law related to the use of customary land in indigenous peoples. *Fourth*, socialization of the convenience and usefulness of managing the customary land certificate.

Table 3 shows that resistance can be overcome through the following four strategies; First, the government provides guarantees of legal certainty by accommodating the values believed by indigenous peoples. The values include the obligation of the applicant to attach the consent of the family and customary leaders in the process of applying for customary land certificates. This strategy fulfils the value of deliberation and consensus that is upheld by the Minangkabau indigenous people (Dewi et al., 2024). The results of the agreement were stated in a statement of ownership and control of customary land, with the inclusion of a ranji (family tree) document. Ranji is a territorial genealogical structure of customary land ownership from five to seven generations (Dewi & Azmi, 2016).

Table 3. Strategies To Turn Resistance into Acceptance

Coding	Identity	Statement	Impact
Certainty Accommodation	Government	We will require applicants to attach the consent of their families and customary leaders in the process of applying for customary land certificates (Informan 9, Sungai Batang, 2024)	Addressing the issue of injustice in the form of privatization of communal land
Government Traditional Collaboration	Government and traditional leaders	In our opinion, there needs to be a division of authority, responsibility, and funding within the management of customary land certificates between the government and customary leaders (Informant 10, Sungai Batang, 2024)	Overcoming the issues of the overlapping tasks, conspiracy and corruption within the management of customary land certificates.

Certificates Prevention	Misuse	Government	We will be more active in socializing the various conveniences and benefits of managing customary land certificates (Informant 12 dan 13, Sungai Batang, 2024).	Anticipating the issue of complexity and expensive management of customary land certificates
------------------------------------	---------------	------------	---	--

Source: Interview with informant

The second strategy is carried out through collaboration between the government and traditional leaders in the management of customary land administration. This collaboration is in the form of the division of authority where there are clear boundaries between the responsibilities of traditional leaders and those of the government. The government must develop a deeper understanding of the customs, cultures, and languages of traditional leaders to foster more effective engagement and collaboration in policy implementation and governance (Salleh & Sulaiman, 2016). Traditional leaders have the responsibility to ensure that the parties have agreed on the boundaries of customary land. The government is accountable for measuring the land area until the issuance of customary land certificates. On the other hand, the applicant is liable for providing land boundary markers made of wood, iron pipes or paralon pipes and pay the registered land tax. With the distribution of responsibilities, the issuance of customary land certificates meets the interests of indigenous peoples and the government.

The third strategy is to strengthen customary law related to the use of customary land after the issuance of customary land certificates. This is important so that the prejudice on customary law violation can be anticipated. The *Nagari* (regional) Government and the Nagari Customary Council (KAN) can make joint regulations on how to use the certified customary land. The certified customary land provides a guarantee of legal certainty to the indigenous community because it possesses valid physical and juridical data. This makes the land more valuable and economical. Afterwards, it is entirely up to the interests of the indigenous people as owners whether it will be rented, mortgaged or sold.

The fourth strategy is that the government must maximize socialization activities related to the convenience and usefulness of managing customary land certificates. Indigenous communities do not need to hesitate in terms of measuring and mapping land plots, because they have used photogrammetric methods. This is supported by the procurement of high resolution aerial photographs, with a level of accuracy and precision that meets the technical standards for land parcel measurement. For the government, the customary land registration program is part of the national program, namely " Indonesian Map", which aims at legal certainty, information, orderly land administration and welfare and prosperity.

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, it is concluded that resistance to the customary land certificate program stems from administrative factors and cultural implications that are inherent after the issuance of customary land certificates. These administrative factors ignore the authority of traditional leaders and ignore the mechanisms that have been implemented by indigenous communities. To overcome this, the National Land Agency needs to evaluate these administrative requirements so that the customary land certificates issued do not contain the risk of buying and selling customary land which is considered to have damaged the Minangkabau customary legal order.

The concept of Resistance used in this study allows for the discovery of space for an explanation of how the customary land certification program is not only an effort to regulate land administration, but also protects the values of indigenous peoples that have been practiced so far. As stated by (Marta et al., 2019), the state should be able to protect communal rights, not create a dilemma for indigenous peoples whether to follow government programs or obey customary rules.

This study is limited to the perspective of the Minangkabau customary law community and has not integrated perspectives from other customary areas. By integrating the BPN perspective with the perspective of the customary law community more broadly, it will enable a comprehensive understanding and the government's success in implementing its various programs. The strategy offered in this study allows for the discovery of solutions for a more solution-based land administration process in the future. In line with that, further research is expected to involve more perspectives from other customary communities by accommodating the experiences and problems faced by the customary law community together with the government. Thus, a more comprehensive problem solving can be found.

Ethics Statement

There are no conflicts of interest that could affect the results of this study, and all authors involved have approved this manuscript before submission.

References

- Agustina, E. (2018). The social function of land rights in Indonesia: The basic Agrarian Law and customary rights by the state. *J. Legal Ethical & Regul. Issues*, 21, 1.
- Arisaputra, M. I., & Mardiah, S. W. A. (2019). Kedudukan Hukum Tanah Adat dalam Pengembangan Administrasi Pertanahan di Indonesia: Studi Komparatif. *Amanna Gappa*, 67–87.
- Bola, M. (2017). Legal standing of customary land in Indonesia: a comparative study of land administration systems. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 3(2), 175–190.
- Budiman, I., Fujiwara, T., Sato, N., & Pamungkas, D. (2020). Another law in Indonesia: Customary land tenure system coexisting with state order in Mutis Forest. *Jurnal Manajemen Hutan Tropika*, 26(3), 244.
- Coetsee, L. (1993). A practical model for the management of resistance to change: An analysis of political resistance in South Africa. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 16(11), 1815–1837.
- Dewi, S. F. (2010). Oral tradition in the study of ulayat land disputes in West Sumatra. *Wacana: Journal of the Humanities of Indonesia*, 12(1), 70–84.
- Dewi, S. F., & Azmi, A. (2016). Genealogis Teritorial pada Masyarakat Adat di Nagari Sumatera Barat. *Seminar Nasional Ilmu Sosial Politik Universitas Andalas*, 1–12.
- Dewi, S. F., Febriani, R., Azmi, A., & Yulika, F. (2024). Interethnic Collaboration: A Case Study of Nias and Minangkabau Ethnic Groups in West Sumatera, Indonesia. *International Journal of Asia Pacific Studies*, 20(2), 33–59. <https://doi.org/10.21315/ijaps2024.20.2.2>
- Erwin, Y., & Khudzaifah, D. (2019). Conflict and Settlement of Paer's Customary Land Tenure in Central Lombok Indonesia. *Journal of Adv Research in Dynamical & Control Systems*, (2019), 11, 1328–1333.
- Firmansyah, N., Arizona, Y., HuMa, P., & Qbar, P. (2008). Pemanfaatan tanpa jaminan perlindungan: kajian atas Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Sumatera Barat no. 6/2008 Tentang Tanah Ulayat dan Pemanfaatannya. *Perkumpulan HuMa dan Perkumpulan Qbar Padang*.
- Haryanti, I., & Suharto, R. B. (2021). The Juridical Overview Of Customary Land Registration. *Law Development Journal*, 3(2), 272. <https://doi.org/10.30659/ldj.3.2.272-282>
- Hauser-Schäublin, B. (2013). Adat and indigeneity in Indonesia-culture and entitlements between Heteronomy and self-asciption. *Universitätsverlag Göttingen*.
- Hidayat, A. R., Alwi, A., & Susanti, G. (2015). Model Jaringan Kebijakan Publik (Perumusan Kebijakan Masyarakat Adat Ammatoa Kajang Di Kabupaten Bulukumba). *JAKPP (Jurnal Analisis Kebijakan & Pelayanan Publik)*, 209–218.
- Hidayat, H., Yogaswara, H., Herawati, T., Blazey, P., Wyatt, S., & Howitt, R. (2018). Forests, law and customary rights in Indonesia: Implications of a decision of the Indonesian Constitutional Court in 2012. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 59(3), 293–308.
- Jaya, D. J., Hidayah, R., Akmal, D. U., & Kamiasi, A. Y. (2021). The Categorization of Solutions for Indigenous People in Customary Land-Use Conflicts in Indonesia. *Journal Sampurasun: Interdisciplinary Studies for Cultural Heritage*, 7(1), 1–16.
- Jermier, J. M., Knights, D. E., & Nord, W. R. (1994). *Resistance and power in organizations*. Taylor & Frances/Routledge.
- Kaban, M., & Sitepu, R. (2017). The efforts of inheritance dispute resolution for customary land on indigenous peoples in Karo, North Sumatra, Indonesia. *International Journal of Private Law*, 8(3–4), 281–298.
- Katila, P., McDermott, C., Larson, A., Aggarwal, S., & Giessen, L. (2020). Forest tenure and the sustainable development goals—a critical view. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 120, 102294.
- Lapointe, L., & Rivard, S. (2005). A multilevel model of resistance to information technology implementation. *MIS Quarterly*, 461–491.
- Laumer, S., & Eckhardt, A. (2012). Why do people reject technologies: a review of user resistance theories. *Information Systems Theory: Explaining and Predicting Our Digital Society*, Vol. 1, 63–86.

- Leiwakabessya, J. E. M., Kasnawi, M. T., & Agustang, A. (2021). The reality of the conflict of customary lands between the land of laha and the air force in ambon city (case study customary land in the land of laha). *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(9).
- Lewin, K. (1947). Group decision and social change. *Readings in Social Psychology*, 3(1), 197–211.
- Maria. (2018). Local wisdom of indigenous society in managing their customary land: a comparative study on tribes in Indonesia. *E3S Web of Conferences*, 52, 23.
- Marta, A. D., Suwaryo, U., Sulaeman, A., & Agustino, L. (2019). Dilemma of customary land policy in Indonesia Dilema kebijakan tanah ulayat di Indonesia. *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 32(2), 134–143.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (J. Saldana (ed.); 3rd ed.). SAGE Publication.
- Murray Li, T. (2020). Epilogue: customary land rights and politics, 25 years on. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 21(1), 77–84.
- Napoh, D. B. (2015). Recognition of the customary land law in the constitution of indonesia and malaysia. *Brawijaya Law Journal*, 2(2), 1.
- Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context, and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 15(1), 73–101.
- Pangestu, D., Yoesoef, A., & Abidin, Z. (2018). Konflik Tanah Antara PT Fajar Baizury dengan Masyarakat Desa Cot Rambong Kecamatan Kuala Pesisir Kabupaten Nagan Raya (1996-2015). *JIM: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Sejarah*, 3(3).
- Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783–794.
- Putra, W. I. (2017). Peran Lembaga Adat Paser dalam pelestarian nilai-nilai sosial budaya lokal di Kabupaten Paser Kalimantan timur. *Pascasarjana*.
- Salleh, K. M., Subhi, N. I., Sulaiman, N. L., & Latif, A. A. (2016). Generic skills of technical undergraduates and industrial employers perceptions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 14(14), 907–919.
- Salleh, K. M. & Sulaiman, N. L. (2016). Competencies among human resource development practitioners according to discipline and levels in Malaysian organizations. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*, 14(10), 6567-6578.
- Salleh, K. M., Sulaiman, N. L., & Gloeckner, G. (2023). Exploring Test Concept and Measurement Through Validity and Reliability Process in TVET Research: Guideline for The Novice Researcher. *Journal of Technical Education and Training*, 15(1), 257–264.
- Samiran, F., Helfi, H., Hendri, H., & Noor, A. Y. M. (2023). Religious Values in The Funeral Procession on The Datuk Wisdom. *KARSA: Jurnal Sosial Dan Budaya Keislaman (Journal of Social and Islamic Culture)*, 31(1), 1–27.
- Scott, J. C. (2016). Everyday forms of resistance. In *Everyday forms of peasant resistance* (pp. 3–33). Routledge.
- Setiawan, I. K. O. (2022). Rechtsverwerking Concept of Customary Rights in Land Registration. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 9(5), 226–233.
- Siscawati, M., Banjade, M. R., Liswanti, N., Herawati, T., Mwangi, E., Wulandari, C., Tjoa, M., & Silaya, T. (2017). Overview of forest tenure reforms in Indonesia (Vol. 223). CIFOR.
- Tegnan, H. (2015). Legal pluralism and land administration in West Sumatra: the implementation of the regulations of both local and nagari governments on communal land tenure. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 47(2), 312–323.
- Tolo, E. Y. S. (2018). Collective land certification policy as an alternative to land conflict resolution and rural development in Flores, Indonesia. *BISNIS & BIROKRASI: Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi Dan Organisasi*, 23(2), 3.
- Wangi, N. K. P. S. S., Dantes, K. F., & Sudiatnaka, K. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Hak Ulayat Terhadap Kepemilikan Tanah Adat Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960 Tentang Peraturan Dasar Pokok-Pokok Agraria. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Sui Generis*, 3(3), 112–121.
- Zaiyardam, Z. (2010). *Budaya konflik dan jaringan kekerasan: Pendekatan penyelesaian berdasarkan kearifan lokal Minangkabau*. InsistPress.