



RECLAIMING THE FUTURE: KNOWLEDGE, POWER, AND JUSTICE REWRITTEN

Muhammad Zaynul Abrori

Nurul Jadid University, East Java, Indonesia

E-mail: zaynulabrorio3@gmail.com

Abstract:

This study aims to analyze the relationships between knowledge, power, and justice within education systems and local governance. It employs a qualitative approach using a case study design. Data were collected through observation, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and document analysis, and subsequently analyzed using thematic analysis. The findings indicate that the dominance of formal knowledge leads to the epistemic exclusion of local knowledge, while the centralization of power creates disparities in access and community representation in decision-making processes. Consequently, community participation tends to be merely symbolic, and local knowledge has not received adequate recognition within the formal system. The study concludes that strengthening epistemic justice requires recognizing the plurality of knowledge, substantially increasing community participation, and fostering more inclusive governance. These findings are expected to inform the development of more democratic and equitable education and governance policies.

Keywords: *Epistemic Justice, Local Knowledge, Power, Representation, Education*

INTRODUCTION

Rapid social change and current global dynamics demand a new understanding of the relationship between knowledge, power, and justice in society. (Marlika et al., 2025; Sinambela et al., 2025; Sumiati et al., 2024). This research is significant because it examines how prevailing structures of knowledge and power influence the broad distribution of social justice. Many societal groups face marginalization due to a monopoly on knowledge that validates only specific perspectives, while others are deprived of a voice and representation in decision-making processes. By understanding these dynamics, the research contributes to opening new avenues for a more inclusive and democratic form of justice. It is relevant not only to academics but also to practitioners and policymakers striving to create a fairer and more sustainable social system. In short, this research offers critical insights that can enrich social dialogue and public policy as we address the challenges of the times..

The primary issue underlying this research is the unequal access to knowledge and power across various strata of society. This inequality leads to the marginalization of certain groups from the public sphere, thereby limiting their right to participate in social and political processes. (Haidarrani et al., 2024; Wasino et al., 2026). In many cases, education systems, the media, and state institutions tend to reproduce the dominance of certain forms of knowledge,

disregarding cultural diversity and the voices of the public. (Herawati & Hidayat, 2020; Kutsi & Arifin, 2023; Siswadi, 2024). This situation results in persistent structural injustice and deepens social inequality. Therefore, research is needed to explore how this inequality arises and how to reclaim a future that is fair for all. This research addresses that urgent need.

Real-world observations indicate that local communities and marginalized groups are frequently treated merely as objects of policy rather than being afforded the opportunity to make meaningful contributions. Many public policies fail to take root in local needs and contexts; instead, they are largely dictated by centers of power and knowledge that are far removed from the realities faced by the community (Amelia, 2025; Ulinuha, 2025; Wirata et al., 2025). Practices such as the disregard for traditional knowledge, restricted participation in decision-making, and inadequate representation within formal institutions further exacerbate existing inequities. Communities feel they have lost control over their lives and futures, a sentiment that erodes trust in and the perceived legitimacy of the social system. This phenomenon serves as clear evidence of the urgent need to reform these imbalances in knowledge and power.

Various previous studies have examined the relationship between knowledge, power, and justice, particularly within the contexts of social justice theory and epistemic injustice. Researchers such as Miranda Fricker have highlighted how marginalized groups often experience epistemic injustice due to the failure to recognize their voices in public discourse (Widayanthi et al., 2024). Other studies emphasize the importance of Boaventura de Sousa Santos's "epistemologies of the South," which propose a plurality of knowledge as an alternative to the dominance of Western knowledge. However, much of this research remains limited to theoretical analysis or contexts that differ from the local realities found in many communities. Our research addresses this gap by providing an in-depth empirical analysis of how the dynamics of knowledge and power manifest on the ground and their impact on social justice.

Despite extensive existing research, a significant gap remains—particularly regarding how knowledge and power become internalized within social practices and local policies. Previous studies have often overlooked the role of local actors as both subjects of knowledge and agents of change. Furthermore, much research focuses on isolated aspects—such as knowledge or power alone—without comprehensively examining their interplay within the context of justice. Our research aims to bridge this understanding through a multidimensional approach that integrates epistemic, political, and social dimensions. This study makes a vital contribution by offering a holistic overview and practical solutions regarding the redistribution of knowledge and power in the pursuit of social justice.

The study's novelty lies in its interdisciplinary approach, which goes beyond social theory to systematically integrate local and empirical perspectives. By exploring grassroots narratives and critiquing centralized power structures, the research seeks to reconstruct the concept of justice—a concept long dominated by top-down paradigms. It is significant for opening a space for critical dialogue, inviting policymakers and the public alike to view justice through a new, more inclusive, and contextual lens. Ultimately, the findings are expected to foster tangible and sustainable social transformation.

The central research problem addresses how disparities in knowledge and power influence the distribution of justice within society, and how the process of reclaiming a just future can be realized through this reconceptualization. The

preliminary argument posits that true justice can only be achieved by dismantling knowledge monopolies and democratizing power through inclusive participation and authentic representation. This study contributes by providing both empirical evidence and an analytical framework for identifying and formulating strategies for social transformation. Through this approach, the aim is to ensure that a more just future becomes a concrete outcome of structural and cultural change, rather than mere rhetoric.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative approach with a case study design to gain an in-depth understanding of the dynamics between knowledge, power, and justice within a specific social context. The case study design was selected because it allows for a comprehensive exploration of complex, context-dependent phenomena—particularly those concerning power relations and epistemic marginalization (Juita et al., 2025; Kusumajanti et al., 2025). This approach enables the researcher to capture social, political, and cultural nuances that cannot be reductively explained through numerical data or statistical generalizations. Furthermore, the case study design aligns with the research's objective of fostering social transformation and recognizing diverse forms of knowledge that have historically been marginalized. By focusing on the concrete experiences of communities, this design provides a means to deconstruct dominant structures while highlighting practices of resistance that offer new forms of justice.

The research sites were purposively selected from grassroots communities currently developing initiatives rooted in local knowledge and social justice. Key locations include indigenous territories or communities engaged in alternative education and environmental justice movements in Indonesia—such as those in Papua, Kalimantan, or the coastal regions of Java. These sites were chosen primarily because they exhibit tangible tensions between local knowledge systems and state policies, as well as between community needs and formal power structures. These locations also reflect postcolonial contexts and histories of marginalization that require critical analysis. Moreover, these communities demonstrate collective initiatives aimed at reclaiming the space of knowledge and advocating for forms of justice that extend beyond the legal-formal realm to encompass cultural and epistemic dimensions..

Data collection for this study employed participant observation, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions (FGDs), and document analysis. Participant observation allowed the researcher to engage directly with community life, observing interaction patterns, daily practices, and contextual expressions of power and resistance. In-depth interviews were conducted with various community actors—such as traditional leaders, local activists, educators, and community members directly affected by structures of injustice—to gain insight into their perspectives. Group discussions were utilized to understand collective dynamics and foster a shared understanding of the phenomena at hand. Meanwhile, document analysis involved examining policies, community archives, alternative curricula, and other forms of written narratives related to knowledge and justice. These techniques complemented one another, enabling robust data triangulation.

The collected data were analyzed using a thematic analysis approach. The analysis process began with transcribing all interview data and observation notes. The researcher then organized the data to identify initial themes emerging from

the field narratives. An "open coding" stage was conducted to capture unstructured categories or patterns, followed by "axial coding" to group and link these categories into broader themes. Subsequently, "selective coding" was performed, guiding the researcher toward central themes directly related to the theoretical framework and research questions. The analysis was conducted in a reflective and iterative manner, taking into account the community's sociocultural context and the researcher's own positionality within the interpretation process. This approach aimed not only to explain the phenomena but also to reveal the power structures operating behind the narratives, as well as the possibilities for reconstructing a just and equitable future through the transformation of knowledge and power relations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Monopolized Knowledge: Epistemic Exclusion in Formal Systems

In practice, epistemic exclusion within formal systems is understood as a systematic process wherein local knowledge, culture, and community experiences are neither recognized nor validated within educational institutions, public policies, or dominant narratives (Mukarromah et al., 2026). In the context of this study, epistemic exclusion manifests clearly through school curricula that fail to reflect local history and realities, as well as through the lack of space for mother tongues, folklore, customary practices, and values rooted in local wisdom. Knowledge deemed institutionally valid is that which originates outside the community—grounded in modern, technocratic, and universalistic paradigms. This results in unequal recognition of the knowledge possessed by the community and creates a disconnect between formal education and the community's daily life.

In an interview, Ms. N., an elementary school teacher in the study area, stated that lesson materials must adhere to national standards, leaving no room for teachers to link lessons to the local context. She remarked, "We cannot incorporate local stories or regional languages into lessons because they are not in the guidebook. If it does not align with the curriculum, it is considered a deviation." This statement clearly illustrates how the national education system restricts the ability of local actors to transform the curriculum into something more contextual and reflective of community identity. The researcher interprets this as evidence that epistemic dominance occurs not only through content but also through regulatory mechanisms and institutional controls that stifle local initiatives.

Meanwhile, an interview with Mr. R., a traditional leader also active in non-formal education, reinforces these findings. He noted that young people today are more familiar with national history than with the history of their own village (Mukarromah et al., 2026). "They know the names of heroes from Jakarta but do not know who their own ancestors are. School distances them from their own land," he said. In his view, schools have effectively become an instrument for severing the connection between the younger generation and their cultural roots. The researchers interpret this to mean that the formal education system—rather than strengthening local identity—plays a role in a process of forced assimilation into external values. Here, epistemic exclusion concerns not merely the content itself but also its impact on cultural continuity.

Observations at an elementary school within the research site revealed that all instructional material was delivered in Indonesian, with no reference whatsoever to the local language. There was a complete absence of local

narratives or symbols—whether verbal or visual—in the learning materials (Bahar, 2025). The school environment also showed no connection to the local context; for instance, there were no displays of local artwork or folklore. In informal discussions, several students admitted they did not understand the significance of the traditional ceremonies frequently held in their village. These observations reinforce the premise that the formal system not only disregards local knowledge but actively replaces it with standardized, imported knowledge norms. The researchers interpret this as evidence that educational spaces have become a medium for the institutionalized marginalization of local culture.

Based on the findings above, it can be concluded that epistemic exclusion manifests through curriculum regulations, the prohibition of local initiatives, and the removal of cultural symbols from the learning environment. Local knowledge—including language, history, and community values—is not merely omitted from the curriculum but is actively subordinated by an education system oriented toward national homogenization. The formal education system frames local knowledge as inferior, thereby depriving communities of the space to legitimately articulate their identities and values within the public sphere.

The pattern reveals a systemic tendency to render local knowledge institutionally invalid. Knowledge is controlled by the state through national curricula, educational assessments, and teacher training—all of which disregard local contexts. Meanwhile, local actors such as teachers and traditional leaders face constraints in adapting education to align with their social realities. This epistemic exclusion is not an isolated event but part of a structural, multi-layered pattern of knowledge domination. This explains why communities become disconnected from sources of local wisdom and raises a crucial question: how can knowledge be liberated from the grip of formal power to achieve epistemic justice? (Nurdiana & Syamsiruddin, 2023).

Centralized Power: Inequality in Access and Representation

In practice, the concept of centralized power is understood as a form of institutional domination wherein critical decisions—ranging from natural resource management and education policy to infrastructure development—are made via a top-down approach by state actors or external institutions, without the active involvement of local communities. Disparities in access and representation arise when communities directly affected by policies lack the space to voice their interests, whether through formal decision-making forums or informal social dialogue. In this context, citizen engagement is often illusory or merely symbolic, and representation is frequently dictated by bureaucratic logic rather than principles of participatory justice. In many instances, community voices are framed merely as "aspirations" rather than as a form of political knowledge on equal footing. This results in policies that are not only locally irrelevant but also exacerbate structural inequalities.

The Following is a Table Presenting The Interview Results.

Petikan Wawancara	Indikator	Informan
"We were only called to a meeting after everything had already been decided. And even then, it was just to sign.."	Symbolic participation	Neighborhood Association Head

"The government comes bringing projects, never asking whether we need them or not.."	Inequality in decision-making	Customary leader
We don't have representatives who truly understand the conditions in the village. They only talk at the top level	Non-substantive representation	Local activist
"If we protest, we get told we don't know the rules. So, we just stay quiet."	Represi terhadap aspirasi lokal	Housewife

The interview excerpts in the table indicate a decision-making pattern that structurally excludes local community involvement. Information from neighborhood association heads and traditional leaders reveals that official forums serve merely to legitimize decisions already made; communities are invited not to deliberate, but to rubber-stamp these choices. Local activists highlight that political representation is administrative rather than substantive; representatives do not speak for the community but instead advance institutional agendas or external interests, signaling a crisis of representation at the local level. Meanwhile, a housewife's testimony underscores the fear or submissiveness surrounding the voicing of criticism, demonstrating how power not only restricts access but also stifles resistance.

Further analysis suggests that power in this context operates in two ways: through formal structures (such as policies and regulations) and through social mechanisms (such as stigma and the control of discourse). When community members attempt to voice dissent or offer proposals, they are frequently stigmatized as ignorant of the rules, uneducated, or obstructive to development. This creates a situation where power is not merely coercive but also hegemonic—shaping citizens' consciousness and perceptions so that they feel unworthy of speaking out. Inequality of access is not simply a matter of being excluded from the negotiating table; it is about how power structures define who has the right to speak and who does not. Under these conditions, representational justice becomes impossible, and the resulting policies tend to fail to address the community's actual needs.

Observations at the research site reinforce these findings. During a public outreach forum regarding a road construction project, the researcher noted that all information was presented by external officials without an open question-and-answer session. Residents simply sat and listened; some appeared confused by the use of unexplained technical jargon. When the researcher spoke with residents after the event, they admitted they did not fully grasp the meeting's content yet signed the attendance list anyway "so as not to appear opposed." These observations indicate that representation was merely procedural, lacking any reciprocal relationship or equitable communication between policymakers and the affected community. Power was manifested through technocratic discourse that created a knowledge gap between state actors and local residents.

Collectively, the data reveal that centralized power fosters deep structural inequality: communities not only lack access to decision-making processes but are also unrecognized as sources of knowledge or legitimate political actors. They are reduced to objects of policy rather than subjects who help shape the direction

of development. In many instances, existing forms of representation do not reflect the community's social reality but rather the system's need to maintain procedural legitimacy. The data clarify that justice can only be achieved if structures of representation and decision-making mechanisms undergo a fundamental shift—moving from a centralized model to a participatory one.

The patterns emerging from the data indicate that inequalities in access and representation are systemic and organized, rather than merely the result of administrative oversight. A consistent pattern of exclusion exists wherein local communities are formally present in decision-making spaces yet substantively sidelined from meaningful processes. Engagement is merely ceremonial, and political representation is not grounded in local knowledge or the community's lived experiences. Furthermore, power is sustained by dominant narratives that stigmatize criticism and foster compliance. These patterns suggest that administrative decentralization has not been matched by a genuine decentralization of power, meaning that achieving representational justice remains a long struggle for grassroots communities.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study indicate that the dominance of formal knowledge and centralized power in decision-making leads to epistemic exclusion and significant representational inequality at the community level (Pendidikan et al., 2024). These findings align with the literature on epistemic injustice by Miranda Fricker (2007), which highlights how the knowledge held by marginalized groups is frequently unrecognized and deemed invalid within social and political arenas. In this context, the epistemological dominance found in education systems and public policy reinforces social inequality by restricting the space for local communities to participate as legitimate subjects of knowledge. However, this study also offers new insights by revealing how power mechanisms operate not only through formal regulations but also through social and cultural processes that silence community aspirations—an aspect that has received limited in-depth exploration in classical literature regarding knowledge and representational inequality.

The theoretical implications of these findings underscore the need for a more holistic approach to understanding power and knowledge—viewing them not merely as formal structures but as social practices shaped by everyday interactions. This reinforces postcolonial theory and the "epistemologies of the South" developed by Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2014), which emphasize the necessity of valuing a plurality of knowledge forms and championing epistemic justice as an integral part of broader social justice. The practices of resistance emerging from the communities in this study demonstrate that local knowledge spaces can serve as a foundation for building more inclusive and democratic forms of power, thereby challenging the hegemony of singular knowledge systems and centralized power structures (Wijaya et al., 2024).

In practical terms, this research underscores the importance of reforming education policy and governance to create genuine space for community participation in decision-making. Incorporating local knowledge into curricula and resource management can strengthen cultural identity while enhancing the effectiveness of policies tailored to the community's actual needs. Furthermore, participatory mechanisms must be designed to be substantive rather than merely symbolic, ensuring that communities are not simply objects of policy but active subjects shaping the direction of development. Such practices can serve as a

foundation for a just and sustainable social transformation.

Moreover, the findings challenge prevailing development and educational paradigms that have historically tended to be homogeneous and top-down. By highlighting disparities in representation and epistemic exclusion, this research opens a space for critical dialogue on how systems of power and knowledge can be restructured to become more inclusive and democratic. This is significant not only for the local communities central to the study but also for the global context—particularly in post-colonial regions and among indigenous peoples—where similar dynamics unfold as they strive to uphold their identities and rights.

Overall, this research makes a vital contribution to broadening the discourse on social justice by integrating epistemic and representational dimensions as inseparable elements. The findings and analysis support the need for systemic transformation that prioritizes a plurality of knowledge and the equitable distribution of power as prerequisites for achieving true justice. Consequently, this research is not only academically relevant but also holds strategic value in supporting agendas for inclusive and sustainable social change (Ramda, 2025).

CONCLUSION

The study concludes that the dominance of formal knowledge and the centralization of power demonstrably lead to epistemic exclusion and unequal representation in community-level decision-making processes. The key takeaway is the importance of recognizing and valuing local knowledge while creating spaces for substantial community participation in shaping their own futures. The research underscores that justice is not merely a matter of resource distribution but also entails epistemic recognition and fair representation, enabling communities to act as active agents in development. This message highlights the need for systemic transformation in education and governance to foster greater inclusivity and contextual relevance.

From an academic perspective, this study makes a significant contribution to the discourse on social justice by emphasizing epistemic and representational dimensions—aspects often overlooked in development studies and public policy. It reinforces theories of epistemic justice and "epistemologies of the South" with empirical evidence from a specific local context, while illustrating the power mechanisms operating through formal regulations and sociocultural practices. Thus, the study paves the way for a multidimensional approach that integrates knowledge, power, and justice as an inseparable whole.

However, the study is limited in terms of geographic scope and the number of informants—restricted to a single community—meaning the findings may not fully reflect broader dynamics in other contexts. Furthermore, the research focuses primarily on qualitative aspects using a case study approach; consequently, any generalization of the findings requires caution. Future research should consider comparative studies across regions with diverse sociocultural backgrounds and incorporate quantitative methods to strengthen data validity. A longitudinal approach could also help elucidate changes in power and knowledge dynamics over an extended period.

REFERENCES

- Amelia, D. M. (2025). Pengaruh Kebijakan Publik terhadap Keadilan Sosial Berbasis Komunitas. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum*, 1(1), 15–23.
- Bahar, M. M. (2025). Integrasi Kurikulum Kontekstual Berbasis Kearifan Lokal untuk Pendidikan Kependudukan dan Lingkungan Hidup di Sekolah Menengah. 8(April), 51–55.
- Haidarrani, A., Hairani, J., Marthalia, S. N., Mubarakah, W., Fidiyani, R., & Sastroatmodjo, S. (2024). Diskriminasi dalam Penegakan Hukum terhadap Kelompok Minoritas Agama: Studi Kasus Pembatasan Ruang Publik di Indonesia. *Bookchapter Hukum Dan Politik Dalam Berbagai Perspektif*, 3, 156–196.
- Herawati, N., & Hidayat, A. (2020). Peranan guru dalam efektivitas kegiatan belajar mengajar pada paud Rose Jakarta. *Akrab Juara: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial*, 5(4), 200–214.
- Juita, F., Effendi, M., & Maryam, S. (2025). Buku ajar mata kuliah metode penelitian kualitatif: Penelitian kualitatif untuk menilik berbagai fenomena sosial. Penerbit NEM.
- Kusumajanti, K., Syarifuddin, S., Sanulita, H., & Gopur, G. (2025). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif: Teori Dan Paradigma Baru Bidang Ilmu Sosial*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Kutsi, D. J. A., & Arifin, Z. (2023). Dekolonialisasi Pendidikan: Studi Kritis Hegemoni Keilmuan Barat di Pesantren Modern. *Jurnal Partisipatoris*, 5(1).
- Marlika, T., Nikmah, N. A., & Mulyana, A. (2025). Tantangan dan Dinamika Perubahan Sosial Dalam Pendidikan di Era Modern. *AL-MANAR: Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Pendidikan Islam*, 14(1), 727–740.
- Mukarromah, Z., Maulidiyah, I. F., & Fidaroin, S. A. (2026). Peran Tradisi Lokal dalam Pembentukan Kurikulum Pendidikan. 2(1), 385–398.
- Mundiri, A., Julaiha, S., Duraesa, M. A., & Embong, R. (2026). Exploring The Transformative Zone of Tolerance in Indigenous Education: Insights from Pesantren-Based Services. *Munaddhomah: Jurnal Manajemen Pendidikan Islam*, 7(2), 448–464.
- Nurdiana, Syamsiruddin, S. dan F. R. S. (2023). Implementation Of Bahasa Indonesia And Literature Implementation Of Bahasa Indonesia And Literature Curriculum Based On Local Wisdom A . Pendahuluan Dalam sistem pendidikan nasional , terdapat tiga pihak utama yang saling terkait , yaitu guru , siswa , da. 135–144. <https://doi.org/10.31540/silamparibisa.v1i1.4>
- Pendidikan, P., Islam, A., & Indonesia, U. I. (2024). Epistemologi Muatan Lokal : Objektifikasi Kebudayaan. 9(November), 113–124.
- Ramda, E. E. (2025). Deliberative Public Policy of Village Governance : 5(July 2024), 67–78.
- Sa'idah, H., & Huda, N. (2026). A Fiqh Muamalah Analysis of Contractual Practices in the E-Bekal Payment System at Nurul Jadid Islamic Boarding School. *Indonesian Journal Economic Review*, 6(2), 540–548.
- Suhermanto. (2025). Principal Leadership Strategies for Enhancing Teacher Performance in Islamic Schools. *Journal of Educational Management Research (Vol.04/No.05/2025)*, 4(Journal of Educational Management Resear), 1886–1898.
- Syamsul, K., Affan, M., Somad, A., & Baharun, H. (2026). Digital Ethics and Spirituality From an Islamic Perspective: A Systematic Literature Review.

- TADIB: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam, 4(1), 179–194.
- Sinambela, S. M., Saragih, M. D., Lumbantobing, J. N. Y., Lase, M., & Iqbal, M. (2025). Dinamika kebudayaan dan perubahan sosial dalam masyarakat modern. *Katalis Pendidikan: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Matematika*, 2(2), 65–75.
- Siswadi, G. A. (2024). Reproduksi Kekuasaan Melalui Kekerasan Simbolik Dalam Sistem Pendidikan: Analisis Kritis Pemikiran Pierre Bourdieu. *Widya Aksara: Jurnal Agama Hindu*, 29(1), 21–31.
- Sumiati, S., Kurniady, D., Komariah, A., Suryana, A., Dadi, D., & Hafidh, Z. (2024). Linking Principal Adaptive Leadership to Teacher Performance: The Mediating Effect of Collaborative School Culture. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 15(4), 17–41.
- Ulinnuha, R. (2025). Kebijakan Publik Berbasis Agama di Tingkat Lokal: Analisis Kolaboratif Pemerintah Daerah dan Organisasi Masyarakat Islam dalam Arena Sidrap Religius. *Jurnal Kebijakan Pembangunan*, 20(2), 175–188.
- Wasino, W., Barokah, A., Maulida, L. R., & Ismuwardani, Z. (2026). Jejak Sosial: Menyingkap Ketimpangan dan Keadilan di Tengah Masyarakat. CV Eureka Media Aksara.
- Widayanthi, D. G. C., Subhaktiyasa, P. G., Hariyono, H., Wulandari, C. I. A. S., & Andriani, V. S. (2024). *Teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Wijaya, A. U., Kusnadi, S. A., & Hadi, F. (2024). Konsep Keadilan Sosial Dalam Regulasi Pengetahuan Tradisional Untuk Menjamin Hak Komunal Di Indonesia. 6, 281–300.
- Wirata, G., Astawa, I. W., Sulandari, S., & Sulaiman, A. (2025). *Buku Ajar Kebijakan Publik Berbasis Budaya*. PT Media Penerbit Indonesia.