

## Livelihood Diversification Based On Strengthening Social Cohesion To Empower Landless Peasants

---

Dumasari Dumasari<sup>1\*</sup>, Budi Dharmawan<sup>2</sup>, Imam Santosa<sup>3</sup>, Wayan Darmawan<sup>4</sup>, Dinda Dewi Aisyah<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Agriculture, Muhammadiyah Purwokerto University, Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia,

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Agriculture, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia,

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto, Central Java, Indonesia,

<sup>4</sup>Faculty of Forestry, Bogor Agricultural University, Bogor, West Java, Indonesia,

<sup>5</sup>Postgraduate student in Agricultural Economics, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, Indonesia,

Email: <sup>1\*</sup>dumasarilumongga@indo.net.id, <sup>2</sup>b\_dharmawan@yahoo.com,

<sup>3</sup>Scokronegoro@yahoo.com, <sup>4</sup>wayandar@indo.net.id, <sup>5</sup>dindadew16@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** *Landless peasants experience problems such as difficulty earning livelihoods, low income, economic marginalization, and poverty. Therefore, this study explored diversification of livelihoods and strengthening social cohesion among landless peasants. It focused on the villages of Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan, Central Java Province, Indonesia, using an intrinsic case study method. The results revealed that landless peasants were experiencing social differentiation, which weakened social cohesion and made cooperation, social networks, solidarity, and collectivity tenuous. Landless peasants classified into: tenants, tenant cultivators, sharecroppers, and farm laborers. Sharecroppers and farm laborers suffered the most from weakening social cohesion and had minimal access to economic opportunities on or off farms. Farm laborers were marginalized by low wages and difficulty finding employment. Overall, the study found the need for landless peasants to diversify their livelihoods, and suggest that strengthening social cohesion is important for sharecroppers and farm laborers to achieve guaranteed livelihoods and economic security.*

**Key words:** *landless peasant, livelihood diversification, social cohesion, poverty, categories of peasants*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The condition of landless peasants who are affected by the scarcity of arable land is a complex problem related to agricultural development in agrarian countries. Conversion of cultivable land from agricultural to non-agricultural uses is ongoing in many rural areas, as land is increasingly being used for industrialization, settlement, tourism, and urban development. This has resulted in increased numbers of landless peasants, and government policies to compensate them for land acquisition and job security have been unable to provide social protection enabling landless peasants to have decent lives (Liang, Lu, and Wu, 2014).

Scarcity of fertile agricultural land leads to the loss of livelihoods, declining incomes, and poverty among landless peasants (Keji and Liping, 2014). These individuals not only lose ownership of agricultural land but also lose a range of rights and job opportunities in agriculture, worsening their quality of life and health (Liang and Li, 2014). Landless peasants have little access to advances in agricultural technology, so their yields are low and they are also excluded from agricultural extension services (Ofuoku and Ekorhi-Robinson, 2018). These conditions are increasingly marginalizing landless peasants socially, economically, technologically, and in terms of quality of life. Shortage of arable land and poverty are closely related (Memon *et al.*, 2019). Landless peasants face intense competition for local agricultural work, and the scarcity of agricultural land encourages peasants to change their livelihoods (Tong *et al.*, 2019).

Landless peasants tend to experience social differentiation, and their communities are compartmentalized based on socioeconomic differences. Certain rights regarding agricultural land tend to lead to the urbanization of landless peasants, and separate landless peasants who have the right to rent land, rent and cultivate land, or cultivate only. These differences in the ownership of agricultural resources, especially land, leads to social differentiation (Borrego and Skutsch, 2019). Due to loss of ownership of agricultural land, the social groups of landless peasants are becoming increasingly heterogeneous. Therefore, many landless peasants are becoming individualized and seek to re-identify themselves (Heger, 2020).

Social differentiation reduces cohesiveness in landless peasant communities, making social relations, solidarity, and collectivity tenuous, especially in terms of economic activities. Social interactions are being reduced due to increases in distance separating landless peasants and consequent reductions in social integration. Communication among landless peasants is rare, and the values and norms of togetherness are being eroded among landless peasants as community sentiment fades. Consequently, the social cohesion of the landless peasant community is weakened.

As social cohesion continues to weaken, compartmentalized landless peasants have difficulty accessing employment opportunities on or off farm. The effects of this weakened social cohesion have been reported previously among landless peasants in Banyumas and Purbalingga, Central Java Province, Indonesia (Dumasari *et al.*, 2019). The most vulnerable landless peasants socioeconomically are farm laborers and sharecroppers. The shared inheritance system in rural Indonesia is problematic: shared inheritance leads to reductions in the size of holdings and reduces yields and incomes. This encourages peasants to sell agricultural land and become farm laborers instead of smallholder peasants.

To address the increasing numbers of landless peasants and their poor quality of life, it is vital that governments, academic institutions, and other interested parties develop and implement effective solutions. One solution is to diversify the livelihoods of landless peasants by strengthening social cohesion, and this will be particularly important among sharecroppers and farm laborers. Previous research has demonstrated that diversified livelihoods can empower landless peasants (VanWey and Vithayathil, 2013; Han, Bao, and Peng, 2017; Jilito *et al.*, 2018; Dumasari *et al.*, 2020). Diversification can increase possible sources of income and thereby serve as a safety net to allow peasants to avoid economic hardship and poverty.

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

The study used a purposive sampling area technique in Baturaden District in Banyumas Regency and Purbalingga Wetan District in Purbalingga Regency, Central Java Province, Indonesia. These two sub-districts were selected because the majorities of both communities are landless peasants who are farm laborers or sharecroppers. The average monthly income of these peasants is low (IDR 900,000 or 62.64 USD). Landless peasants in these sub-districts are engaging in participatory empowerment to develop diversified livelihoods at a slow pace, which is closely related to their weakened social cohesion.

The study population included all landless peasants living in the Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan areas. The technique of determining the research respondents used purposive sampling. Criteria for selecting respondent are: having the status of landless peasants, having low participation in an empowerment program, hold an economic orientation in developing diversified livelihoods and weak social cohesion. After the selected respondents are categorized based on the status of the acquisition of agricultural land. The categories of respondents are seen in Table 1.

Table 1: Respondent Category

No	Landless Peasants Categories	Controlled Agricultural Land Status	Respondent Percentage (%)		Respondent Amount (%)
			Baturaden	Purbalingga Wetan	
1.	Tenant peasants	Rent	3	5	8
2.	Tenant and cultivators peasants	Rent and cultivate	5	6	11
3.	Sharecroppers	Cultivating land during the growing season until harvested. The arable land remains in one plot of land	11	8	19
4.	Farm laborers	Working on agricultural land in certain activities. Land	32	30	62

		under cultivation moves from one owner to another			
Total			51	49	100

Other primary data sources are key informants. The sources determination technique is implemented by using snowballing sampling. Key informants came from innovator peasants, large landowner peasants, peasant group leaders, community leaders and agricultural extension laborers.

The type of data collected includes primary and secondary data. Primary data that are qualitative and quantitative are collected by in-depth interview techniques, participatory observation and focus group discussions. The secondary data is obtained by utilizing documentation analysis techniques in the form of exploration and examination of theories, concepts and research results that have been published by previous experts. Documentation analysis is done while maintaining consistency between secondary data material and content of research themes.

All data collected then processed quantitatively and qualitatively. Qualitative data were analyzed using the Interactive Analysis Model (Miles and Huberman, 1991). Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive statistics specifically percentage values, scoring, average values, frequency distribution and tabulation. Data that has been analyzed are then interpreted logically. The results of the interpretation are presented in a systematic descriptive description. Triangulation and Reflection Tests are carried out to assess the validity and theoretical feasibility of the formulation of a model for developing livelihood diversification based on strengthening social cohesion for landless peasants. Both tests are guided by a complementary ethic and emic approach.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Being a landless peasant is not a major obstacle to continued farming. Being landless actually triggered study respondents to behave in an adaptive manner; they diligently applied survival strategies based on farming as the basic source of livelihood. Some also obtained economic opportunities on a farm after obtaining tenancy and land cultivation rights from the landowner. These rights may be granted when landowners trust peasants who rent or work their land. Landless peasants in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan are socially differentiated by their rental and work status; this is similar to conditions in the northern highlands of Ecuador, where peasants who lose ownership of agricultural land experience socio-economic differentiation in terms of work in off-farm employment or family farming (Martínez Valle and Martínez Godoy, 2019).

Based on social differentiation, respondents in the current study were grouped into four categories with specific characteristics: tenant peasants (T1), tenant cultivator peasants (T2), sharecroppers (T3), and farm laborers (T4). These groups differed in terms of economic opportunities, access to off-farm work, income levels, togetherness within their community, and access to arable land.

Social cohesion was weakened in all four types of respondents, but the degree of weakening differed among the categories. Social cohesion is important and affects several aspects of human behavior (Kalolo *et al.*, 2019). It can bring together individual peasants in cooperative relationships, leading to solidarity and collectivity. It also reduces conflict, and some previous research has demonstrated the need to strengthen social cohesion among peasants in rural Central Java (Sari *et al.*, 2014). However, the process of social differentiation occurring in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan means that it is difficult to prevent the weakening of social cohesion within all categories of landless peasants.

T1 respondents were peasants who rented agricultural land. They had more potential for higher socioeconomic standing than the other three types and tended to have a strong entrepreneurial spirit. They had the highest income, earning an average of IDR 4,285,000 per month (298 USD). This income came from on- and off-farm work; all T1 participants diversified their livelihoods and allocated a portion of their income to the cost of renting land. They were motivated to rent agricultural land because they had once owned, inherited, or purchased agricultural land and wanted to grow crops. The leased land was chosen because it was fertile and easy to reach. The average lease period was three years, after which the lease could be renewed, although the landowner could increase the rent. The leased land was actually cultivated by sharecroppers or farm laborers because the T1 respondents were busy pursuing other work. These tenant peasants comprise only 8% of the total number of landless peasants in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan. All T1 participants earned on- and off-farm income.

T2 respondents were tenant cultivator peasants with a socioeconomic status intermediate between T1 respondents and T3 and T4 respondents; they also had intermediate entrepreneurial ability. All T2 respondents obtained income from monoculture or polyculture farming systems, and 50% of them also earned off-farm income. Their average income was IDR 3,800,000 per month (264 USD), mainly from farm earnings. The land was rented from owners who lived outside the village, and T2 respondents were fully responsible for farm management. They adopted various technologies to increase their yields. They grew food crops (rice and corn) and vegetables (long beans, beans, choy sum, tomatoes, and chilies). Mixed farming with a variety of crops reduces the risk of monoculture crop failure. T2 respondents comprised 11% of the landless peasants in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan.

T3 respondents were sharecroppers. Both T2 and T3 respondents had low socioeconomic status, and low levels of entrepreneurial spirit and ability. They used farming to survive and meet the needs of family life. T3 respondents had gained the trust of the owner or tenant peasants, who hired them to cultivate agricultural land during the growing season. They exhibited high levels of obedience and loyalty toward landowners, who trusted them to cultivate the same land repeatedly. T3 respondents comprised 19% of the landless peasants in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan and had a low average monthly average income (IDR 2,555,000 or 178 USD). They tended to cultivate monocultures including rice and corn, and risked income loss if the harvest failed. They lacked capital to diversify their livelihoods and had less access to off-farm employment; no T3 respondents had developed diverse livelihoods and they continued to work on the same farm land.

Most of the landless peasants (64%) in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan were classified as T4. These farm laborers had the lowest socioeconomic status, with little formal education. Most had only attended primary and junior high school and took part in few non-formal education activities such as counseling or training in on- and off-farm techniques. They had little entrepreneurial spirit or ability and their only source of income was as a hired agricultural worker on someone else's land on a daily or weekly basis. T4 respondents often lost their jobs after the harvest period, and 92% depended on income from a single agricultural job. Their average monthly income from farming was low (IDR 975,000 or 68 USD), so they had no money to spare for alternative business capital.

T4 respondents faced many obstacles to diversifying their livelihoods. Only 23% of them had attempted to engage in on- and off-farm work; some ran micro-handicraft businesses using agricultural waste in their free time. This group of respondents was limited by the problem of weak technology adoption. In Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan, these landless peasants are referred to as casual laborers. Landowners and tenant peasants are very selective when choosing skilled farm laborers to work on agricultural land, hiring honest, skilled, and obedient workers. Although respondents in both T3 and T4 had long working relationships with landowners and tenant peasants, T4 workers are hired only for short periods and are not permanent laborers as T3 respondents are.

The condition of landless peasants is prone to being trapped in the problem of economic urgency and poverty. The scarcity of land results in landless peasant, especially those including T4 and T3 respondents who are vulnerable to experiencing a weak bargaining position in every on-farm work transaction. The categories of respondents in the four types and conditions of developing livelihood diversification in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan are listed in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Categories of respondents with diversity livelihood conditions

The indolence of respondents T3, T4 and T2 undertaking livelihood diversification became an important issue in increasing the income of landless peasant. Some of the factors causing these are lack of venture capital, minimal off-farm and non-farm work skills, lack of access to productive employment information, limited access to information on production technology and minimal entrepreneurship skill. Weakening social cohesion is dominantly resulting in degradation of social relationships and the spirit of togetherness. this condition has spread among the four types of respondents.

Social interaction which economic motivated rarely takes place between respondents T1 and T2, T3 and T4. T2 respondents most rarely communicate and interact with other peasants. T2 respondents has the highest independence in farm management. Cooperation in terms of economic activity between T2 respondents and other landless peasant is low. The perseverance of T2 respondents managing the farms on leased land is relatively high so that it can increase income from time to time even though it is still in small amounts. Conversely, the slowest increase in income experienced by respondents T4.

During an interval of three years (2017-2020), T4 respondents were only able to raise income in small amounts. The increase in income of T4 respondents every year averaged around Rp 63,333. Farm laborers find it difficult to increase the income because they only depends on the wages of the landowners and tenants. However, T4 respondent services remain loyal and are willing to be hired to do farming or gardening work.

The income of respondents T1 and T3 increased higher than T1 with an average of Rp 113,333 and Rp 175,000 per year. The highest increase in income was obtained by respondents T2, which was an average of 252,483 per year. T2 respondent peasant received the highest increase in income due to a sense of ownership and a high level of responsibility for farm management in order to make the maximum use. The burden of land rental costs requires respondent T2 to try optimally to increase production through adjusting crop types to market trends. Fertilization is done in a timely and correct dosage. T2 respondents control disease pests early on. Irrigation and weeding arrangements are carried out regularly by T2 respondents assisted by family members. Some types of production technology are also used by T2 respondents, especially when processing land using a rented hand tractor. T2 respondents used grain thresher machines during the harvest season thereby reducing expenses for labor costs.

T2 respondents had the highest response and accessibility to information on prices and markets for harvested products. T2 and T1 respondents have high awareness and sensitivity to market potential. Both types of landless peasants are directly market their crops to traders or to the nearest market. Respondents T2 and T1 have subscription traders who are ready to buy crops at reasonable prices. There are also several T2 respondents who market their crops directly to consumers and the nearest village market.

During an interval of three years (2017-2020), T4 respondents were only able to raise income in small amounts. The increase in income of T4 respondents every year averaged around Rp 63,333. Farm laborers find it difficult to increase the income because they only depends on the wages of the landowners and tenants. However, T4 respondent services remain loyal and are willing to be hired to do farming or gardening work.

The income of respondents T2 and T3 increased higher than T1 with an average of Rp 252,483 and Rp 175,000 per year. The highest increase in income was obtained by respondents T2, which was an average of 252,483 per year. T2 respondent peasant received the highest increase in income due to a sense of ownership and a high level of responsibility for farm management in order to make the maximum use. The burden of land rental costs requires respondent T2 to try optimally to increase production through adjusting crop types to market trends. Fertilization is done in a timely and correct dosage. T2 respondents control disease pests early on. Irrigation and weeding arrangements are carried out regularly by T2

respondents assisted by family members. Some types of production technology are also used by T2 respondents, especially when processing land using a rented hand tractor. T2 respondents used grain thresher machines during the harvest season thereby reducing expenses for labor costs.

T2 respondents had the highest response and accessibility to information on prices and markets for harvested products. T2 and T1 respondents have high awareness and sensitivity to market potential. Both types of landless peasants are directly market their crops to traders or to the nearest market. Respondents T2 and T1 have subscription traders who are ready to buy crops at reasonable prices. There are also several T2 respondents who market their crops directly to consumers and the nearest village market.

Contradictory conditions occur for all respondents T4 and the majority of T3 who are not involved in marketing the harvest. Both types of landless peasant only receive wages or part of the harvest. Such conditions result in a decrease in the responsibility of T4 respondents towards the management of farming as a whole. The responsibility of the respondent T4 is limited to certain activities according to the instructions of the landowners or tenant peasants. Variations in the increase in income of the four types of landless peasant respondents in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan over the 2017-2020 time span are observed in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Variation of the average income increasement of four types of respondent in 2017-2020

Variation in income among peasants is due to the ability in accessing different economic opportunities. The economic orientation of the four types of landless peasants is also not the same. Respondents T1 and T2 have an economic orientation to pursue and make a profit. Achieving profits is done through the management of farming with appropriate technology with low-cost production. Plant seeds are chosen by themselves from those available in their villages. Land is processed by hiring land tractor services. Organic fertilizer is used in the initial stages of land management. Weeding is done conventionally and by using herbicides. Irrigation that uses technical services that are regulated and maintained by farm laborers who are trusted. Harvesting is done by renting a rice thresher machine. Respondents T1 and T2 chose economic capacity to adopt a variety of production technologies, which were believed to increase yields.

Sharecroppers and farm laborers have an economic orientation that is prioritized only to meet earning income. Both types of landless peasants are not yet profit-oriented. Income is used to meet basic family needs. Cultivator peasants and farm laborers are very close to the moral economic conditions that hold the principle of ethical subsistence. For farm laborers, work is for getting some food. Farm laborers are hired without work safety guarantees. While



working on farming activities, most of them must obey and act on the orders of the landlords and tenants. Compliance and obedience are some values that most of farm laborers choose regarding the decisions to use the types of production technology and farming techniques. Only a few sharecroppers have the freedom to set production technologies and farming techniques as what they desired. Farm laborers are the ones who get more distressed because they do not have the right to decide about the type of production technology and farming techniques. The farm laborers only have an outpouring of energy and time to be hired by the owner's peasants and tenant peasants to work according to orders and orders. Cultivator peasants and farm laborers do not have authority over the arable land. Both of them ultimately do not have the freedom of adoption in production technology and farming techniques independently.

Socio-cultural conditions shown by weaken social cohesion in the four types of landless peasants show a real estrangement. The most severe weakening of social cohesion occurs in farm laborers group. They feel left out on the socio-economic relations of villagers in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan. Some elements of social cohesion that experienced the most severe weakness occurred in farm laborers include: the interests of agricultural technology, activeness in peasant groups, attendance at group meetings, economic interests, mutual trust and cooperation.

Despite being invited, farm laborers rarely go to peasant group meetings to attend counseling and training on rice mina and mix farming. Farm laborers find it futile to attend this group meetings because those who have the right to make decisions about the type of technology adopted in farm management are landowners or tenant peasants. Farm laborers feel that their presence and activeness in this groups is less socially and economically beneficial. The role of farm laborers in every peasant group meeting is only as a listener or audience. Recognition of the existence of a farm laborer is very poor. The economic and technological interests of them are different from those of the other three types of peasants. Farm laborers work to meet the basic needs of the family. Peasants working on farming work to meet food needs, children's education costs and obedience to land owners or tenants.

The severe weakened elements of social cohesion in the type of farm laborers are community sentiments, social closeness and cohesiveness along with compliance in paying group dues. The weakened community sentiments especially in equality of identity as a landless peasants also occur in tenants, tenant cultivator peasants and sharecroppers. The element of social cohesion that appear in all type of landless peasants are the similarity of values and norms and mutual help. The range of weakening of social cohesion elements in landless peasants is detailed in Figure 3.




Figure 3: Range of weakening social cohesion elements in landless peasants

Weak social cohesion among landless peasant, especially the farm laborers in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan has resulted in a slowdown in participatory empowerment. The empowerment program delivered by extension agents and agents of change through peasant groups is not in accordance with the conditions, problems and needs of farm laborers (T4). The condition of farm laborers who do not have authority in the management of farming causes a sense of lack of ownership of the farming production process. The status of farm laborers is more emphasized on the completion of the type of work according to the request of the landowner or land tenant. T3 and T4 respondents are only laborers, not farm managers. The duties of farm laborers depend on the orders of the owner or tenant peasant. After the task was completed, the farm laborers moved working in another farm. Meanwhile, sharecroppers (T3) are relatively comfortable working on only one plot of land for a long time.

The indolence of farm laborers (T4) and sharecroppers (T3) developing livelihood diversification is inseparable from the problem of some weakening elements of social cohesion. The function of social cohesion is not able to encourage social relations and cooperation networks in driving the participation of respondents T3 and T4 in productive, creative and innovative economic activities. The interaction between the four types of landless peasant in Batutaden and Purbalingga Wetan is relatively low. Meetings on farm management, production technology and other economic activities between T1, T2, T3 and T4 are rarely held. Small business communication between the four landless peasants is also rarely held together. Solidarity and collectivity of landless peasants also weakened so that the social level that took place was relatively high. Although the status is the same as landless, farm laborers and sharecroppers remain in lower socioeconomic status. The social distance between T1, T2 with T3 and T4 is far.

The widening gap between the four types of landless peasant ultimately results in a lack of support and an invitation to share experiences in the context of increasing performance productivity. T3 and T4 respondents have low entrepreneurial spirit and abilities. Problems experienced by farm labor respondents and sharecroppers are also due to weak social entrepreneurship. This problem can be understood when it is connected with the results of previous studies which prove that the social entrepreneurship approach has the potential to be used to develop environmentally friendly agriculture and in accordance with the social life of

peasants in rural areas (Hudcová, et al., 2018). Social entrepreneurship with real socio-economic economic conditions is a driving force for strengthening the social cohesion of peasants, including those experiencing transition and status of landless (Jerumeh and Omonona 2018; Lanfranchi et al. 2015; Dumasari, et al., 2019). All the problems that cause the slowness of farm laborers and sharecroppers to develop a livelihood diversification in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan are interrelated and are inherent in the existence of weak social cohesion. A series of weakening social cohesion effects on the degradation of togetherness which are collectivity and solidarity that can be observed in Figure 4.




Figure 4: The effect of weakened social cohesion on the degradation of respondents' togetherness

All groups of respondents lacked a feeling of togetherness in terms of livelihood diversification, and this issue should be addressed immediately based on the potential of local resources. The weakened social cohesion among respondents, especially those classified as T3 and T4, requires strengthening through a persuasive social approach. Strengthening social cohesion could increase their awareness, spirit, and entrepreneurship to develop the capacity to process local resources creatively and it's pro conservation (Morris *et al.*, 2017; Dumasari *et al.*, 2019; Dumasari et al., 2020).

Increasing livelihood diversification among landless peasants, especially sharecroppers and farm laborers, will require increasing social cohesion and cooperation among all four types of respondents with regard to productive activities on and off farms. T3 and T4 respondents need to be made aware of the benefits of technology in farm management, because agricultural technology determines the productivity during each harvest. All four

groups of respondents are most likely to obtain information about other agricultural technologies during group meetings, which could increase cooperation and encourage the sharing of experiences about activities with economic benefits. Mutual trust also needs to be increased by raising awareness about the similarities of community sentiments among landless peasants.

Close social relationships are a vital element of social cohesion, which will affect the potential of landless peasants. Another important element of social cohesion is willingness to pay activity fees; these can be used to cover the costs of collective procurements connected to the transfer of agricultural technology and innovation. Strengthening these and other elements of social cohesion will contribute to improved social relations, cooperative networks, and solidarity and collectivity of respondents in diversifying their livelihoods.

Increasing the awareness, enthusiasm and ability of respondents especially T3 and T4 to do livelihood diversification through strengthening social cohesion certainly facilitates the realization of participatory empowerment. Alternative solutions to solve the problem of livelihood diversification lags in both types of respondents refer to the hypothetical model formula. The formulation of the model is based on the results of an analysis of several important elements in terms of social cohesion, social relations, networks of cooperation, solidarity and collectivity. Another element that is attached to the model is the opportunity to share experiences through focused discussions, training, counseling, platform, workshop, joint visits, comparative studies and internships. The model is useful as a guideline to develop awareness, enthusiasm and ability of respondents, smallholders and farm laborers to develop diversified livelihoods on on farm, off farm and non farm. The model is a repetitive cycle that results in increased livelihood security, increased income and economic security. The model of developing livelihood diversification through strengthening social cohesion in landless peasants, including the types of farm laborers and sharecroppers, can be seen in Figure 5.




Figure 5. Model of livelihood diversification development based on strengthening social cohesion in landless peasant and farm laborers

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Landless peasants have experienced social differentiation in Baturaden and Purbalingga Wetan. As a result, their social structure has become fragmented. They have become segregated because of different tenure rights regarding land owned by others. As a result, they can be classified into four main categories: tenants, tenant cultivators, sharecroppers, and farm laborers. Each group has different socioeconomic characteristics.

Farm laborers and sharecroppers experience slowness in developing diversified livelihood patterns. The dependence of these two categories of Landless peasants is high on the on farm. Even though the wages received by farm laborers are relatively low. Sharecroppers also receive only a sharecroppers share of the crop from harvesting the product as a substitute of wage labor. Nevertheless, farm laborers and sharecroppers keep on continuing their main occupation on the on farm.

Landless peasant lags in developing livelihood diversification are inseparable from the increasingly weakened social cohesion conditions. Weakening of some elements of social cohesion has resulted in poor collaboration, networking, solidarity and collectivity between tenant, tenant cultivator, sharecroppers and farm laborers. Farm laborers and sharecroppers suffer losses due to weak social cohesion. The access of these two landless peasant categories to economic opportunities is very limited to on farm, off farm and non farm. The participation of farm laborers is lowest in participatory empowerment. Farm workers are not involved in agricultural extension activities. If forced to attend, farm laborers roled only as

spectators. Tenant and tenant cultivator rarely interact socially and communicate with sharecroppers and farm laborers. This condition further weakens social cohesion in the landless peasant

A hypothetical model formulation has been compiled at the end of this study. The model serves as an alternative solution to solve the problem of inaction of landless peasants to do livelihood diversification. The model is adaptive because it is adjusted to the conditions, problems and needs of landless peasants, especially sharecroppers and farm laborers. The essence of the model construction lies in strengthening social cohesion. The working mechanism of the model is in the form of a cycle of mutual support and complementarity so that sharecroppers and farm laborers achieve conditions of livelihood guarantee and economic security.

## Acknowledgment

Thank you to the Directorate of Research and Social Service (DRPM/BRIN), Ministry of Research and Technology/National Research and Innovation Agency of Republic Indonesia has provided research grants to the research team. The research grant was given, including the category of centralization of basic research schemes in the first phase of the 2020 period.

## 5. REFERENCES

- [1] Borrego, Armonia & Skutsch, M. (2019). How Socio-Economic Differences between Peasants Affect Forest Degradation in Western Mexico. *Forests Journal*. 10(10).
- [2] Dumasari, Darmawan, W., Ismangil, Dharmawan, B., and Santosa, I. (2020). Empowerment of Subsistence Craftsmen through the Adoption of Environmentally Friendly Cocodust Production Technology. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*. 10 (2): 691-702. <http://dx.doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.10.2.8522>.
- [3] Dumasari, D., Darmawan, W., Iqbal, A., Dharmawan, B., and Santosa, I. (2019). Development of Production Creativity among Craftsmen by Identifying Techniques for Characterizing Coconut Waste. *International Journal on Advanced Science, Engineering and Information Technology*. 9(2): 717-723.
- [4] <http://dx.doi.org/10.18517/ijaseit.9.2.5871>
- [5] Dumasari, D., Dharmawan, B., Santosa, I., Darmawan, W., Utami, P., & Aisyah, D. D. (2019). Sociocultural and Economic Conditions as Causes of the Weakened Social Cohesion in Landless Peasants. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*. 8(6):11–18.
- [6] Dumasari, D., Darmawan, W., Iqbal, A., Dharmawan, B., and Santosa, I. (2020). A Pro-Conservation Adaptation Power Model for Cococraft Craftsmen Using Coconut Waste in Purbalingga, Central Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Conservation Science*. 11(1):87–96. [http://ijcs.ro/public/IJCS-20-08\\_Dumasari.pdf](http://ijcs.ro/public/IJCS-20-08_Dumasari.pdf).
- [7] Han, Lu, Haijun Bao, & Yi Peng. (2017). Which Factors Affect Landless Peasants' Intention for Entrepreneurship? A Case Study in the South of the Yangtze River Delta, China. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 9(7).

- [8] Heger, Isabel. (2020). More Than ‘Peasants Without Land’: Individualisation and Identity Formation of Landless Peasants in the Process of China’s State-Led Rural Urbanisation. *Journal of Current Chinese Affairs*. 0 (0):1–25.
- [9] Hudcová, Eliška, Chovanec, T., & Moudrý, J. (2018). Social Entrepreneurship in Agriculture, a Sustainable Practice for Social and Economic Cohesion in Rural Areas: The Case of the Czech Republic. *European Countryside*. 10 (3):377–97.
- [10] Jerumeh, Tolulope R. and B. T. Omonona. (2018). Determinants of Transition in Farm Size among Cassava-Based Peasants in Nigeria. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences* . 1:97–103.
- [11] Jilito, Fufa, M., Okoyo, E. N., & Moges, D. K. (2018). An Empirical Study of Livelihoods Diversification Strategies among Rural Farm Households in Agarfa District, Ethiopia. *Journal of Rural Development*. 37 (4):741.
- [12] Kalolo, Albino, Mazalale, J., Krumeich, A., & Chenault, M. (2019). Social Cohesion, Social Trust, Social Participation and Sexual Behaviors of Adolescents in Rural Tanzania. *BMC Public Health*. 19 (1):1–9.
- [13] Keji, Ma and Hu Liping. (2014). The Research Of Landless Peasants Social Risk Management Which Is Based On The Perspective Of Social Security. *International Integration for Regional Public Management (ICPM 2014)*. 126–30
- [14] Lanfranchi, M., C. Giannetto, T. Abbate, & V. Dimitrova. (2015). Agriculture and the Social Farm: Expression of the Multifunctional Model of Agriculture as a Solution to the Economic Crisis in Rural Areas. *Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science*. 21 (4): 711–18.
- [15] Liang, Ying and Li, Shuqin. (2014). Landless Female Peasants Living in Resettlement Residential Areas in China Have Poorer Quality of Life than Males: Results from a Household Study in the Yangtze River Delta Region. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes*. 12 (1): 1–17.
- [16] Liang, Ying, Wanyi Lu, & Wei Wu. (2014). Are Social Security Policies for Chinese Landless Peasants Really Effective on Health in the Process of Chinese Rapid Urbanization? A Study on the Effect of Social Security Policies for Chinese Landless Peasants on Their Health-Related Quality of Life. *International Journal for Equity in Health*. 13 (1): 1–16.
- [17] M.B. Miles and A.M. Huberman. (1991). *Designing Qualitative Research*.
- [18] Martínez Valle, Luciano & Godoy, D. M. (2019). Territorial Dynamics and Social Differentiation among Peasants in the Northern Highlands of Ecuador. *Journal of Agrarian Change*. 19 (4): 635–53.
- [19] Memon, Qurat Ul Ain, Shoaib Ahmed Wagan, Dong Chunyu, Xiao Shuangxi, and Luan Jingdong. (2019). An Analysis of Poverty Situation of Landless Peasants: Evidence from Sindh Pakistan. *Journal of Poverty*. 23 (4): 269–81.
- [20] Morris, Wyn, Henley, A., & Dowell, D. (2017). Farm Diversification, Entrepreneurship and Technology Adoption: Analysis of Upland Peasants in Wales. *Journal of Rural Studies*. 53 (May): 132–43.
- [21] Ofuoku, Albert Ukaro and Ekorhi-Robinson, O. I. (2018). Social Inclusion of Landless Peasants in Extension Services in Delta State, Nigeria: Implications for Agricultural

Development. *Open Agriculture*. 3 (1): 226–35.

- [22] Sari, Suzanna Ratih, Suwarno, N., Nuryanti, W., & Diananta. (2014). The Role of Social Cohesion to Reduce Social Conflict in Tourist Destination Area. *Komunitas: International Journal of Indonesian Society and Culture*. 6 (2): 294–302.
- [23] Tong, W., Zhu, L., Lo, K. (2019). Livelihood Adaptation and Life Satisfaction among Land-Lost Peasants: Critiquing China’s Urbanisation-Driven Land Appropriation. *Bulletin of Geography. Socio-Economic Series*. 46 (46): 149–61.
- [24] Vanwey, Leah and Trina Vithayathil. (2013). Off-Farm Work among Rural Households: A Case Study in the Brazilian Amazon. *Rural Sociology*. 78 (1): 29–50.