

MAKING RESPONSIBILITY VISIBLE, LEAVING AUTHORITY OPAQUE: GENDERED SUBJECT POSITIONS IN DOCUMENTARY ACCOUNTS OF COMMUNITY CHILD MARRIAGE ADVOCACY IN SOUTH SUMATRA

Viona Yolanda ^{a*)}, Diana Dewi Sartika ^{a)}, Rudy Kurniawan ^{a)}

^{a)} Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

^{*)}Corresponding Author: vionyolanda@gmail.com

Article history: received 19 June 2026; revised 05 July 2026; accepted 01 August 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v09i02.400>

Abstract. Community advocacy against child marriage does more than communicate risk or link residents to services. It also makes social positions recognisable and distributes preventive work. This secondary qualitative analysis examines nine adult interview documents associated with Women's Crisis Center Palembang in South Sumatra, Indonesia. Because the analysis was restricted to the approved adult corpus, girlhood is examined through adult- and programme-mediated representations. A critical interpretivist single-case design combined framework analysis with scholarship on subject formation, recognition, responsabilisation, gendered community labour, and participation. The records depict recurring dialogue, accompaniment, women's cadres, material activities, referral, and institutional relationships. They offer three interconnected subject positions: the future-oriented girl, the preventive female caregiver, and the relational woman intermediary. These positions articulate education, employment, preparation, and delayed marriage as legitimate futures, while making women's local knowledge and community proximity organisationally useful. Yet the records document preventive labour and recognition much more clearly than resource control, agenda-setting, household decision authority, or enforceable institutional obligations. The article proposes responsibility-authority asymmetry as a diagnostic concept for this uneven evidentiary visibility. It does not establish that authority was absent or unchanged in practice. The corpus supports reported changes in understanding, caregiving orientation, and future planning, but not behavioural change, reduced child-marriage incidence, programme effectiveness, or causal impact. The contribution is to connect social-identity formation with the allocation of preventive labour while specifying the evidentiary limits of claims about power.

Keywords: child marriage; social identity; subject formation; gendered labour; community advocacy; responsibility-authority asymmetry

I. INTRODUCTION

Child-marriage prevention is commonly justified through a protective imperative: sustaining girls' education, reducing reproductive and psychosocial risks, limiting exposure to violence and economic dependence, and keeping alternative futures open. Prevention, however, is not only a response to an already defined problem. Advocacy also represents what child marriage is, identifies the conduct expected to change, establishes which futures count as legitimate, and allocates responsibility among households, communities, organisations, and public institutions [1]. These processes are identity-making because they position people as recognisable subjects who may be protected, instructed, mobilised, trusted, blamed, or authorised to act.

The politics of recognition cannot be separated from material exclusion and power. Recognition may enhance legitimacy and access without redistributing resources or decision-making capacity [2]. Subject positions may enable action while binding actors to normative expectations of care, self-management, and responsibility [3]. Recent studies clarify different dimensions of this relationship. [4] show

how imagination and relational conditions shape autonomy under oppressive circumstances; [5] examines how active participation can coexist with intersectional misrecognition; and [6] links recognition to formal status and material mobility. Together, these studies direct attention to what recognition enables, what it demands, and which institutional capacities accompany it.

Child marriage provides a particularly revealing field for analysing this relationship. Decisions about marriage are embedded in schooling, household insecurity, sexuality, reputation, religious and legal authority, and unequal gender relations. Indonesian feminist scholarship therefore cautions against treating girls either as autonomous choosers or as passive victims. Agency is exercised within local moral worlds and institutional constraints that distribute the capacity to decide unevenly [7]. Prevention may articulate alternatives to early marriage while also producing an ideal of the responsible girl who must remain in education, manage risk, regulate sexuality, and plan correctly.

Intervention research reports heterogeneous effects across norm-focused and multi-component programmes [8], [9].

This literature is indispensable for determining whether interventions alter behaviour or incidence, but it is less equipped to examine how repeated advocacy practices constitute social positions and allocate the everyday labour of prevention. Conversely, scholarship on girlhood, participation, recognition, and gendered community work does not always examine how these processes are assembled through local organisational relationships, referral routes, and material activities. The resulting gap is analytic rather than evaluative: how does advocacy produce the subject positions through which prevention is expected to occur?

Women's Crisis Center (WCC) Palembang is analytically useful because the supplied records place a women's organisation between households, recurring community groups, health services, village actors, religious and judicial institutions, and government agencies. The accounts describe dialogue, accompaniment, women's cadres, economic or material activities, referral, and institutional engagement. Women are especially visible as caregivers, participants, and local intermediaries. The same records offer much less direct evidence about men, household decision-makers, institutional officials, programme budgets, governance procedures, or enforceable obligations.

The study addresses two questions. First, how do the supplied accounts position girls, female caregivers, and women intermediaries within community child-marriage advocacy? Second, what do those accounts make visible, and leave unresolved, about preventive labour, accountability, resources, and authority? The analysis concerns reported arrangements and meanings rather than programme effectiveness. Its central proposition is responsibility-authority asymmetry: a diagnostic pattern in which preventive duties and visibility are extensively documented while control over resources, agendas, household decisions, and institutional responses remains comparatively under-documented. The concept names an evidentiary configuration and identifies a question for political analysis; it does not prove that authority was absent, unchanged, or uniformly concentrated elsewhere.

Child-marriage prevention as a gendered and institutional field

Child marriage is shaped by schooling, household insecurity, gender relations, sexuality, family authority, community expectations, law, and institutional access [10], [11]. Prevention cannot therefore be reduced to correcting deficient knowledge. It is a cross-sectoral field in which actors possess unequal resources, legal standing, social legitimacy, and decision powers.

Indonesia's legal setting illustrates this complexity. Law No. 16 of 2019 raised the minimum marriage age to nineteen for women and men (Republic of Indonesia, 2019). Judicial dispensation nevertheless continues to permit marriage below that age, with decisions mediated by family applications, evidentiary claims, judicial interpretation, and competing accounts of urgency and children's interests [12]. Indonesian studies also report intergenerational differences in perceptions of marriage readiness and its consequences, as well as variation in the acceptability of child marriage across communities [13], [14]. Apparent agreement with prevention

may therefore coexist with unequal control over mobility, money, sexuality, and marriage decisions.

Interventions operate through distinct mechanisms. Cash-plus programmes and the combined operation of marriage and education policies cannot be treated as equivalent forms of prevention [15], [16]. Norm-focused interventions use dialogue with adolescents, parents, peers, religious actors, and other reference groups, but may also reproduce dominant voices or conceal disagreement [17], [18]. The relevant analytical question is therefore not merely whether participation occurred, but what participation changed in recognition, access, influence, resources, or decision power.

Subject formation, girlhood, and recognition

Girlhood is treated here as a socially produced gendered and generational position rather than a self-evident biological category. It is constituted through ideas about vulnerability, maturity, education, sexuality, work, family obligation, and future possibility. Girlhood scholarship cautions against presenting the vulnerable girl and the empowered, self-managing girl as simple opposites. Both can individualise structural inequality by locating either risk or success within girls' conduct [16].

Child-marriage advocacy makes this tension visible. Representing girls as students, prospective workers, or future decision-makers can challenge early marriage as inevitable. The same representation can prescribe an ideal future-oriented girl who understands risk, remains in school, prepares economically, and overcomes constraints she does not control. Indonesian decolonial feminist analysis is especially important here because universalised empowerment narratives can obscure the historical, religious, classed, and local moral conditions within which agency becomes possible [19].

Subject positions are understood as effects of normative practice rather than labels attached to pre-existing actors. Recognition makes some identities intelligible and legitimate, but its political significance depends on the capacities that accompany recognition. Fraser's distinction between recognition and redistribution prevents visibility from being equated with material power [20]. Recent studies demonstrate different implications of this distinction: imagination can support the rearticulation of identity under oppressive conditions [21]; intersectional participation may remain misrecognised; and formal recognition can connect identity claims to state classifications and material opportunities [17]. These insights direct attention from identity labels to the resources, audiences, and institutional effects attached to them.

Responsibilisation, gendered labour, and participation

Problem representations produce responsible subjects. [22] shows that policy responses help constitute the problems they appear to address, while [8] directs attention to governing through encouraged self-conduct. In community prevention, responsibilities may move towards girls, caregivers, volunteers, and intermediaries without equivalent movement in resources or authority. Feminist research on community organising shows that expanded public roles can coexist with

retraditionalised expectations of care, availability, and self-sacrifice [18]. Additional responsibility may therefore enable action, create burden, or combine both effects.

This article separates four dimensions that participation and empowerment narratives frequently collapse. Labour includes attending meetings, advising families, reporting concerns, maintaining relationships, and implementing activities. Accountability concerns who is expected to respond, prevent harm, or bear blame. Resources include time, money, training, protection, supervision, information, and institutional access. Authority concerns control over priorities, resources, household decisions, or institutional action. Analytically separating these dimensions makes it possible to recognise meaningful activity without presuming empowerment.

Children's-participation scholarship provides an additional safeguard. Meaningful participation requires space, voice, an audience, and demonstrable influence, not attendance or consultation alone [9]. Collective organisation and access to influential adults also affect whether expression produces political consequences. The same distinction applies to community intermediaries: proximity and organisational recognition may create access without ensuring control over agendas or responses.

Rothman's distinction among locality development, social planning, and social action is used only as a map of intervention form [7]. Locality development emphasises relationships and participation; social planning emphasises expertise, coordination, and services; social action emphasises collective claims and leverage over unequal power. Feminist critiques warn that such classifications can conceal whose labour sustains participation and whose knowledge becomes authoritative [14]. The present framework therefore uses Rothman to describe the relative visibility of practices while retaining a separate analysis of subject formation, labour, resources, and authority.

Research gap and analytical proposition

The literatures reviewed here pursue related questions from different starting points. Outcome studies ask whether interventions alter knowledge, behaviour, or incidence. Identity and participation scholarship asks how subjects become recognisable and whether voice becomes influence. Gendered-labour scholarship asks who absorbs unpaid or weakly supported work. The gap addressed in this article is the relationship among these questions within a single organisational case: how recurring dialogue, accompaniment, material activities, community intermediation, referral, and institutional ties jointly represent identities and allocate preventive work.

Responsibility-authority asymmetry is proposed as an evidence-sensitive bridge among these conversations. It is not a fixed programme type and cannot establish actual power relations from documentary silence. Instead, it asks whether labour, accountability, resources, and authority move together or become visible at different rates. In this case, the concept is warranted only if documented responsibility remains clearly distinguished from unverified authority and if missing

evidence is treated as an inferential boundary rather than proof.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

Study design and epistemological orientation

The study is a secondary qualitative analysis of pre-existing interview documents within a critical interpretivist single-case study of WCC Palembang. Secondary analysis can revisit an existing corpus through a new or more theoretically specific question, while case study preserves attention to organisational and institutional context [15]. The primary unit of analysis is the reported advocacy arrangement attributed to WCC Palembang. Embedded domains include recurring community groups, accompaniment, women's intermediation, service links, material participation, representations of girlhood and caregiving, and allocations of preventive responsibility.

Interview documents are treated as situated accounts, not transparent reproductions of programme reality. Their content may reflect participant position, programme involvement, interview design, interviewer relationships, and the conversion of speech into writing. The theoretical concepts functioned as sensitising resources rather than a closed coding system. Interpretations were required to remain distinguishable from independently verified events, outcomes, or institutional arrangements.

Case boundary, corpus, and exclusion decision

WCC Palembang was selected because the supplied material described a bounded organisational case connecting households, community groups, health services, and public institutions. Selection rested on analytical relevance and the availability of records from several adult participant positions. It does not imply representativeness or typicality within South Sumatra or Indonesia. Community A is the principal local setting represented in the interview documents. Reported chronology extends from preliminary work in 2023 to interviews conducted during 2025-2026; this range does not support longitudinal inference.

The supplied corpus comprised ten interview documents. The record attributed to a participant under eighteen (CHP-01) was excluded to preserve the approved adult-only analytical scope and avoid extending the secondary analysis to data concerning a minor. The analysed corpus therefore comprised nine adult interview documents. PAR-03 was reviewed as part of that corpus but contained no material sufficient to support or contradict the retained findings. No claim of saturation, population coverage, or community representation is made.

The interview corpus contained no observation records, monitoring series, policy submissions, referral registers, budget documents, governance protocols, or administrative outcome data. Additional contextual programme materials comprised two activity photographs and an advocacy-process flowchart. The photographs are not reproduced because visual data fall outside the approved analytical scope of this article. The flowchart was assigned the internal identifier DOC-P01 for traceability. It was not coded as interview evidence and is

used only to describe the programme's reported or intended sequence; it cannot independently verify implementation, reach, resource allocation, outcomes, or causality.

Table 1. Analysed interview corpus and evidentiary positions

Participant group	Codes and n	Analytical position	Evidentiary boundary
WCC personnel	WCC-01-WCC-03; n=4	Organisational leadership, accompaniment, and field roles	Supports staff-reported activities and institutional relationships; does not independently verify participant experience or programme outcomes.
Parents or caregivers	PAR-01-PAR-03; n=3	Female caregivers connected with programme activities	Supports caregivers' reported orientations; does not represent fathers, resistant households, or the wider community. PAR-03 was reviewed in full but contained no material sufficient to support or contradict the retained findings.
Adult women participants	AWP-01-AWP-03; n=3	Participants in community activities; some reported intermediary roles	Supports participant experience and perceived change. AWP-01 attended her first discussion on the interview date.
Total analysed	n=10	Three adult analytical positions	Information-rich purposive corpus; not representative. No saturation or population-coverage claim.

Original data generation and documentary governance

The project description identified purposive sampling, but original eligibility criteria, recruitment routes, numbers approached, refusals, recruiter relationships, and reasons for non-participation were unavailable. No complete interview schedule or question-by-participant matrix was supplied. Question equivalence, prompting, and coverage of conflict, workload, compensation, authority, or collective action therefore cannot be fully assessed [11].

Interview sheets reported durations of 30–60 minutes, totalling 380 minutes across the original ten documents. The duration attributable to the excluded child record was not available separately, so a total duration for the nine-record analytical corpus cannot be reported. Most interviews were dated April or May 2026, while one director interview was dated May 2025. Audio files were unavailable. The materials did not establish whether the documents were verbatim transcripts, edited transcripts, or detailed interview notes, nor did they document recording, preparation, checking, interview language, or translation procedures. The analysis therefore avoids close linguistic interpretation, reconstructed quotation, and claims dependent on exact wording or interactional sequence.

Programme exposure was treated as evidence rather than background. First-time or recent participation could support immediate impressions, aspirations, or intentions, but not sustained influence. Staff accounts could describe organisational practice but not independently establish community reception or effectiveness. Reporting uses indirect paraphrase and participant codes. Community A replaces the small setting's name.

Analytical procedure and claim calibration

Framework analysis supported comparison across participant positions while preserving links among source, category, case, and interpretation [10]. The documented procedure comprised four stages: classification by participant position; indexing with deductive descriptors from the analytical framework and data-derived descriptors; charting by participant position and analytical domain; and an evidence-to-claim audit. Data-derived descriptors concerned relational access, future orientation, caregiving, intermediation, material relevance, institutional linkage, and perceived change.

Comparison examined convergence, divergence, silence, contradiction, exposure differences, absent actors, and plausible alternative explanations. The evidence-to-claim audit recorded the participant codes supporting each retained claim, the type of evidence, contradictory or limiting material, programme exposure, and the strongest permissible wording. This retrospective procedure improves traceability but does not substitute for a contemporaneous codebook, segmented extracts, framework matrix, reflexive memos, or decision log. The available documentation also does not establish the number of analysts, whether interpretations were independently challenged, or whether qualitative software was used; no claim of intercoder reliability is made.

Claims were calibrated to the strongest available evidence. Organisational activities were attributed to staff reports; participant experience required participant attribution; perceived change remained self-reported. Behavioural change, prevalence reduction, effectiveness, empowerment, and authority required evidence unavailable in the corpus.

Silence was treated as absence of evidence, not evidence of absence. Single accounts could be retained as bounded or deviant evidence but were not generalised.

Table 2. Analytical architecture and inferential rules

Dimension	Guiding question	Inferential rule
Subject formation and recognition	How are girls, caregivers, and intermediaries made recognisable and legitimate?	Describe offered or reported positions; do not infer internalised identity or transformation.
Participation and influence	What spaces, voices, audiences, and decision effects are reported?	Distinguish attendance, expression, access, influence, and authority.
Preventive responsibility	Who performs labour, bears accountability, receives resources, and exercises authority?	Analyse the four dimensions separately; do not infer empowerment from activity or recognition.
Institutional relationships	What links, obligations, disagreements, resources, and escalation mechanisms are documented?	Use linkage or network unless formal integration and enforceable duties are evidenced.
Intervention form	Which practices resemble relationship-building, planning, coordination, or collective leverage?	Use Rothman descriptively; do not infer effectiveness or political absence from relative visibility.
Change and outcomes	Does the evidence concern activity, perception, intention, behaviour, incidence, or causal effect?	Match wording to evidence level and state plausible alternatives.

Reflexivity, trustworthiness, and ethics

Researcher position can shape recruitment, questioning, disclosure, coding, and interpretation [9]. The supplied records did not document the original data collector's relationship with WCC or participants, or the relevant disciplinary, gendered, and generational positions. The secondary analyst had no participant contact. The analytical stance was neither celebratory nor presumptively critical: women's participation could enable, burden, or combine both effects; protection could be necessary while narrowing agency; and cooperative relationships did not prove either integration or political weakness.

Trustworthiness was pursued through explicit case boundaries, differentiated participant positions, conservative treatment of document uncertainty, attention to limiting and deviant material, exposure-sensitive interpretation, and evidence-to-claim calibration. SRQR and COREQ were used as reporting prompts rather than as certifications of quality

[23]. Full source-level reproducibility remains impossible without a verified corpus inventory, coded extracts, a framework matrix, analytical memos, and a decision log [24].

Ethical approval, adult informed consent, data-owner authorisation, permission for secondary analysis, and permission for anonymised publication were confirmed for the adult interview corpus. The analysis remained restricted to anonymised adult interview documents and excluded the child record and participant photographs.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings are organised around five connected patterns. Table 3 identifies the evidence base and interpretive boundary of each pattern before the detailed analysis.

Table 3. Evidence map for principal findings

Principal finding	Evidence base	Interpretive boundary
Relational access and material relevance	WCC-02, WCC-03, PAR-02, AWP-01, AWP-03; material activities also reported by WCC-01, PAR-01, AWP-02.	Supports accessible participation and material relevance among interviewed participants; not community-wide inclusion, trust, income change, or asset control.
Programme-mediated future-oriented girlhood	PAR-01, PAR-02, AWP-02, AWP-03, with programme framing from WCC accounts.	Supports adult- and programme-mediated representations of girls' futures; not girls' collective reception, subjectivity, or decision influence.
Preventive female caregiving	PAR-01 and PAR-02, interpreted alongside programme framing.	Supports reported caregiving orientations among participating women; not general parenting change or redistributed household power.
Relational women's intermediation	WCC-01, WCC-02, AWP-02, AWP-03.	Supports intermediary labour and reported service access; training, compensation, protocols, authority, and service outputs were undocumented.
Institutional linkage and uneven evidentiary visibility	WCC-01, WCC-02, PAR-01, PAR-02, AWP-01, AWP-02, WCC-03.	Supports reported linkage, perceptions, and a documentary asymmetry; not an integrated system, causal impact, or unchanged authority.

Relational access and material relevance

Recurring community groups were the main reported setting for WCC advocacy. WCC-02 and WCC-03 described monthly meetings that combined educational material, experience-sharing, critical discussion, and occasional economic activities. PAR-02 valued discussions that encouraged parents and young people to reconsider early marriage. AWP-01 and AWP-03 described everyday language, humour, games, and informal interaction as making questions easier to ask. These accounts support a relational form of access rather than one-directional message delivery.

Staff also described counselling, facilitation, guidance, and personal support extending beyond scheduled sessions (WCC-02; WCC-03). The records present accompaniment as a practice through which organisational knowledge became available within ongoing relationships. Yet participation was selective. Staff identified distance, work, transport, fatigue, boredom, and reluctance as barriers. Most community interviewees were already connected with WCC, and the corpus says little about people who distrusted, rejected, or avoided the organisation.

Savings, lending, sewing, gardening, and food production linked advocacy to household needs and children's education (WCC-01; WCC-02; PAR-01; AWP-02; AWP-03). Participants described these activities as relevant to everyday household concerns. The records do not establish higher income, asset control, bargaining power, or durable participation. Accounts also disagreed about Credit Union interest, leaving the material terms unresolved. The defensible finding is that relational and material practices were

meaningful to interviewed participants, not that they produced economic empowerment or community-wide inclusion.

Programme-mediated future-oriented girlhood

The documents represented child marriage through reproductive, educational, economic, emotional, and relationship risks. PAR-01 and PAR-02 associated early marriage with pregnancy risk, interrupted education, economic dependence, violence, divorce, and limited preparation. AWP-02 and AWP-03 linked delayed marriage with schooling, employment, and economic readiness. Across these adult accounts, girlhood became a period in which education, work, and preparation should precede marriage.

This future orientation presented marriage as something that could be delayed rather than an inevitable early transition. It also prescribed conduct. The recognisable future-oriented girl was expected to understand risk, remain in education, prepare economically, and plan responsibly. Protection and self-management therefore appeared together rather than as opposites. The accounts articulated education, employment, preparation, and delayed marriage as legitimate futures while potentially relocating responsibility towards girls' conduct.

This finding is necessarily representational. The analysed corpus contains no direct evidence of how girls accepted, negotiated, or resisted the offered identity because the child record was excluded. Nor does it show girls shaping programme agendas, controlling resources, or influencing household and institutional decisions. The adult records therefore support a programme-mediated representation of future-oriented girlhood, not a claim about transformed subjectivity or transferred authority.

Preventive female caregiving

PAR-01 and PAR-02 described caregiving responsibility as extending beyond authorising or arranging marriage. They emphasised communication, reproductive knowledge, education, protection, guidance, and support for children's plans. PAR-01 reported stronger efforts to direct younger children towards education and employment, while PAR-02 emphasised sexuality, protection, and discouraging early marriage.

These accounts positioned the responsible caregiver as an active facilitator of education and future planning. Prevention entered everyday care through monitoring risk, communicating with children, interpreting programme knowledge, and directing acceptable futures. Participants' accounts present this role as potentially enabling because it supplied language and support for delaying marriage. At the same time, it remained continuous with gendered expectations that women should be available, protective, and responsible for family wellbeing.

The absence of fathers and other male household actors is analytically decisive. No identified male participant described household decision-making, labour division, or programme engagement. The study cannot determine whether men shared preventive work, retained greater authority, resisted programme messages, or participated in changing household arrangements. The documents make women's reported caregiving labour visible; they do not establish a general transformation of parenting or household power.

Relational women's intermediation and institutional linkage

WCC-01 and WCC-02 presented One Stop Service Learning (OSSL) as a link among community groups, WCC, and health services. Staff described routes for circulating information, reporting concerns, and seeking help through local facilities. AWP-02 and AWP-03 described serving as cadres and encouraging other women to reconsider child marriage. Their intermediary position combined community proximity, organisational recognition, and reported access to services.

This position made selected women legible as people who could listen, explain, connect, and refer. Their local relationships may have supported approachability, while programme involvement marked them as knowledgeable. The corpus establishes intermediary labour more clearly than intermediary authority. No training records, referral protocols, supervision arrangements, confidentiality procedures, compensation records, safeguarding procedures, or service statistics were available. The data cannot show whether cadres controlled resources, shaped priorities, or could require institutional responses.

Staff also reported relationships with health centres, village authorities, government agencies, courts, social services, education authorities, and representative institutions (WCC-01; WCC-02). PAR-01 and PAR-02 confirmed occasional participation by village officials and health workers. These accounts support reported institutional linkage through

expertise and referral. Formal responsibilities, financial commitments, decision procedures, escalation routes, monitoring obligations, and enforcement mechanisms were not documented. An institutional network is therefore a more defensible description than an integrated prevention system.

Sustained social action was less visible than cooperation, education, accompaniment, and referral. The records contained little detail about collective claims, organised negotiation, public accountability, or strategic legal pressure. This pattern may reflect programme practice, but it may also result from interview design, participant selection, documentary editing, or the absence of institutional respondents. The conclusion concerns limited evidentiary visibility, not confirmed absence of collective action.

Uneven evidentiary visibility and responsibility-authority asymmetry

Participants reported greater understanding of reproductive health, marriage law, family economics, education, violence, and relationship risks. PAR-01 and PAR-02 described changes in how they advised children. AWP-01 and AWP-02 expressed stronger intentions regarding education, employment, and preparation before marriage. Exposure varied substantially: AWP-01 attended her first group discussion on the interview date. Her account supports an immediate impression or intention, not sustained programme influence.

Some informants perceived fewer child marriages, while staff acknowledged unregistered marriages and inaccurate age reporting (WCC-02; WCC-03). No baseline, comparison group, longitudinal behavioural record, or reliable denominator was available. Positive accounts may also reflect programme-linked recruitment, organisational loyalty, or social desirability. The evidence supports perceived change, not verified incidence reduction or causal effect.

Across the corpus, preventive visibility and labour were documented much more specifically than resources or decision authority. Women were described as attending, advising, accompanying, connecting, and encouraging others. Girls were represented as responsible for education and future planning. Institutions appeared as referral and cooperation partners, but enforceable duties, resource commitments, and decision procedures remained unresolved. This uneven visibility is the empirical basis for responsibility-authority asymmetry.

The asymmetry is documentary before it can become a claim about politics. It identifies a mismatch between what the records make visible and what they leave unresolved. Because institutional decision-makers, male household actors, governance records, and resource documents were absent, the analysis cannot establish the actual distribution of authority. The concept instead identifies a proposition for stronger research: whether preventive duties are matched by resources, protection, influence, and enforceable institutional response.

Table 4. Programme-reported advocacy sequence and analytical status

Stage in contextual flowchart (DOC-P01)	Programme-reported content	Analytical status in this study
Problem diagnosis and targeting	High child-marriage prevalence, contributing factors, and selection of three South Sumatran target districts.	Programme representation; no independent prevalence or targeting audit was available.
Network mobilisation	WCC, OSSSL cadres, government offices, health centres, district health and social services, KUA, religious courts, village actors, community leaders, parents, and adolescents.	Maps intended or reported participants; does not establish actual participation, role consistency, or decision power.
Planning and organisation	Programme design, scheduling, task allocation, cross-sector coordination, and formation of community groups.	Supports an organisational sequence; budgets, agenda control, governance procedures, and accountability mechanisms were not supplied.
Implementation	SRHR education, critical dialogue, case accompaniment, OSSSL consultation and referral, and Credit Union activities.	Consistent with interview reports of activities; does not verify reach, fidelity, quality, or outcomes.
Reported outputs and long-term aspiration	Knowledge, cadres, participation, economic strengthening, child-protection practices, and sustained advocacy.	Treated as reported or intended outputs, not verified effects or a tested theory of change.

Note. Author reconstruction from contextual programme document DOC-P01. The date, authorship, approval status, and intended audience of the source flowchart were not available to the secondary analyst. KUA = Office of Religious Affairs; OSSSL = One Stop Service Learning; SRHR = sexual and reproductive health and rights.

Discussion

Recognition and the allocation of preventive work

The records depict social identities as positions carrying practical expectations. The future-oriented girl, preventive female caregiver, and relational woman intermediary were not merely descriptive labels: each specified what a recognisable subject should know, desire, or do. Girls were represented through education, employment, preparation, and delayed marriage; female caregivers were expected to translate programme knowledge into everyday guidance; and cadres were recognised as approachable connectors between community relationships and organisational or service access.

The analytical contribution lies in linking recognition to the allocation of preventive work. Women's local knowledge was treated as relevant, caregivers reported gaining language for supporting delayed marriage, and cadres described routes towards services. Yet the records do not show recognition automatically becoming redistribution or decision power. This distinction extends Fraser's separation of status recognition from material power into the everyday organisation of prevention [5]. The comparison with recent identity scholarship also clarifies the limits of the present evidence. Unlike [15], the corpus does not contain life stories through which girls articulate or revise their own identities. Unlike [14], it cannot directly reconstruct intersectional

misrecognition from participants' lived accounts. And unlike [17], it provides no evidence that organisational recognition generated formal status or material benefits.

Relational intermediation as an organising configuration

The empirical configuration suggests an organising pattern of recognition through intermediation. Recurring dialogue and accompaniment treated everyday experience as relevant knowledge. Material activities connected advocacy to household concerns. Cadre roles translated community proximity into organisational usefulness, while referral relationships connected local concerns to services. Through these reported practices, identities became channels through which information, expectations, and requests could circulate.

This pattern is interpretive rather than causal. The corpus cannot show that these practices produced behavioural or institutional change. It instead identifies how the reported arrangement organised prevention: women's proximity and care relations were mobilised through communication, accompaniment, persuasion, and referral labour. Rothman's locality-development and social-planning modes were visible in relationship-building and coordination, whereas sustained social action was less documented. The intervention form therefore organised subject positions as well as activities.

The pattern also reveals an unresolved ambivalence. Relational proximity may make support accessible, but it may also expand expectations placed on women who already perform care work. Organisational recognition may enlarge a cadre's capacity to act while leaving compensation, confidentiality protection, supervision, and escalation authority uncertain. Community intermediation should therefore be assessed through both its enabling possibilities

and the resources, protections, workload, and influence that accompany it.

Responsibility-authority asymmetry: contribution, distinction, and scope

Responsibilisation explains how actors are encouraged to govern conduct and assume duties [22]. Recognition and redistribution distinguish status from material power, while participation scholarship distinguishes expression from influence [25]. Responsibility-authority asymmetry brings these insights into a single evidence-sensitive framework by separating labour, accountability, resources, and authority. Its added value is diagnostic: it identifies which dimensions a corpus substantiates and which remain unresolved, including household decision-making and enforceable institutional response.

In the WCC records, labour and visibility were clearest. Women attended, advised, accompanied, connected, and persuaded; girls were represented as learning, planning, and orienting themselves towards education and work. Evidence concerning agenda-setting, resource control, household decisions, compensation, and enforceable institutional response was much weaker. The concept is therefore supported as a diagnostic of uneven evidence, not as proof that responsibility existed without authority in every relationship.

The distinction imposes three safeguards on interpretation: attendance is not decision-making participation; recognition is not resource control; and additional responsibility is not equivalent to empowerment. These safeguards are particularly relevant where programmes rely on women volunteers, caregivers, peer intermediaries, or informal referral networks. The concept is useful when duties are visible while resources and decision rights are informal, dispersed, or poorly documented. It should not be used to infer an asymmetry in actual power when authority has not been directly examined.

The concept also specifies a comparative research agenda. Stronger tests require perspectives from girls, men, non-participants, programme staff, service providers, and public decision-makers, alongside governance records, resource flows, referral outcomes, and decision procedures. Comparative cases could then establish whether documentary opacity reflects actual concentration of power, informal shared authority, programme design, or simply data collection that privileged implementation stories over governance.

Alternative explanations and deviant evidence

Several alternative explanations constrain interpretation. The visibility of women's labour may partly result from a corpus composed mainly of women already linked to WCC. The opacity of institutional authority may reflect interview questions that concentrated on activities and perceived benefits rather than governance. Organisational documents may foreground cooperation and intended outputs while omitting conflict, failed referrals, and resource negotiations. Positive accounts may reflect loyalty or social desirability.

Deviant and limiting evidence is therefore analytically important. AWP-01's first-day participation prevents claims

of sustained influence. Disagreement about Credit Union interest complicates an uncomplicated account of material benefit. Staff reports of transport, fatigue, boredom, and reluctance show that relational access was not universal. Recognition of unregistered marriages and inaccurate age reporting undermines any inference from perceived decline to verified incidence. The absence of fathers, resistant households, and institutional officials prevents reconstruction of household or public authority. These materials do not invalidate the findings; they define their scale and show why the central claim must remain evidence-sensitive.

Programme and evaluation implications

The analysis does not evaluate WCC Palembang. It identifies governance domains that future programme documentation and evaluation need to make answerable: training, supervision, confidentiality, safeguarding, compensation, workload, protection, referral duties, and escalation routes for cadres and caregivers. Participation structures also require evidence of whether girls and community actors can influence priorities and assess institutional responses, rather than records of attendance alone.

Evaluation would need to follow decision processes and resource flows alongside knowledge and attitudes. Relevant evidence includes who controls budgets and agendas, how cases move through referral systems, whether services respond within specified obligations, how workloads are distributed, and whether participants can challenge or revise programme priorities. These questions distinguish relational access from leverage and reported cooperation from accountable institutional integration.

For identity scholarship, the broader implication is that prevention programmes do not merely target pre-existing groups. They help produce recognisable subjects and attach practical obligations to them. The political significance of those identities depends on both the futures they legitimate and the material and decision-making capacities that support those futures.

Limitations

This secondary analysis draws on nine adult interview documents from one organisational case. Its contribution is interpretive and process-oriented. It cannot support statistical representation, cross-organisational comparison, verified implementation claims, prevalence estimates, or causal evaluation.

Corpus provenance and document status remain uncertain. Audio recording, transcription, language, translation, checking, and completeness were not verified. The analysis therefore avoids direct quotation and detailed discourse interpretation. Documentary editing may have removed context, contradiction, hesitation, or interviewer influence. The available records also do not establish the number of analysts, independent interpretive challenge, or a contemporaneous audit trail.

Participant coverage is narrow. Girls' direct accounts were excluded from this conservative revision, and fathers, male adolescents, husbands, non-participants, resistant households,

health workers, village officials, religious actors, judges, and government representatives were absent. Girlhood was therefore adult and programme mediated, while household and institutional authority could not be reconstructed directly.

Programme exposure varied, and most community interviewees were already connected with WCC. Participation bias, organisational loyalty, and social desirability remain plausible. No baseline, denominator, longitudinal outcome record, or independent monitoring series was available. The contextual programme flowchart describes an intended or reported sequence but does not verify implementation or outcomes.

The retrospective evidence audit improves claim discipline but cannot substitute for contemporaneous source-level records. A verified corpus inventory, interview schedules, coded extracts, framework matrix, reflexive memos, and decision log remain necessary for fuller auditability. Lawful secondary use and adult consent were institutionally confirmed for the analysed corpus.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Community child-marriage advocacy concerns more than the timing of marriage. It also concerns which futures are articulated as legitimate, who is expected to perform prevention, whose knowledge becomes recognisable, and how community concerns reach institutions. The WCC records describe advocacy through dialogue, accompaniment, material participation, women's intermediation, referral, and institutional relationships.

Within these adult and programme-mediated accounts, girls were represented as future-oriented subjects, female caregivers as preventive guides, and selected women as relational intermediaries. These positions made educational futures, caregiving knowledge, and local intermediation visible. They also documented women's preventive labour more clearly than the resources and decision powers associated with that labour.

Responsibility-authority asymmetry names this uneven evidentiary configuration without claiming that authority was absent or unchanged. It asks whether assigned duties are matched by resources, protection, compensation, influence, and enforceable institutional obligations. Used within these limits, the concept connects social-identity formation to the organisation of labour and power and offers a comparative agenda for research on community prevention.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. O. A. Haliem, "Forced Marriage in Islamic Countries: A Study of Zana Muhsen's Memoir Sold," *Arabic and World Literature: Comparative and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, vol. 2025, 2025, doi: 10.31526/AWL.2025.568.
- [2] E. Sibanda and F. Sibanda, "Regai Dzive Shiri: Early Girl-Child Marriage, Human Trafficking, and Erasure to Development in Masvingo Province," 2024, pp. 49–75. doi: 10.1007/978-3-031-76088-4_4.
- [3] T. A. S. Mohammed, "Exploring Child Marriage in Yemen: A Critical Analysis of an Arab Media Corpus," *Qualitative Research Journal*, vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 125–146, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1108/QRJ-02-2024-0036.
- [4] S. Sumadi, "Grassroots Feminist Resistance Against Human Trafficking: The Role of Women's Movements in the Documenter Film 'Begini Kawin Kontrak di Cianjur,'" in *International Conference on Interdisciplinary Gender Studies*, 2024, pp. 1–10. Accessed: Aug. 10, 2026. [Online]. Available: <https://proceeding.uinsuku.ac.id/index.php/ICIGS/article/view/1276>
- [5] L. A. Kagher, L. Otaye-Ebede, and B. Metcalfe, "Black Lives and Bodywork Matters: a Postcolonial Critique of Gender and Embodiment in Nigeria," *Gend. Work Organ.*, vol. 28, no. 5, pp. 1787–1804, Sep. 2021, doi: 10.1111/gwao.12638.
- [6] A. Dragojlovic and K. McGregor, "'They Call Me Babu': The Politics of Visibility and Gendered Memories of Dutch Colonialism in Indonesia," *Womens Hist. Rev.*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 933–952, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1080/09612025.2022.2090709.
- [7] H. R. Wibowo, M. Ratnaningsih, N. J. Goodwin, D. F. Ulum, and E. Minnick, "One Household, Two Worlds: Differences of Perception towards Child Marriage among Adolescent Children and Adults in Indonesia," *Lancet Reg. Health West. Pac.*, vol. 8, p. 100103, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.lanwpc.2021.100103.
- [8] E. K. M. Tisdall and P. Cuevas-Parra, "Challenges for Children's Participation: Child Activism for Ending Child Marriage," *Child. Youth Serv. Rev.*, vol. 108, p. 104568, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2019.104568.
- [9] R. T. Naved *et al.*, "Effectiveness of Combined Interventions to Empower Girls and Address Social Norms in Reducing Child Marriage in a Rural Sub-District of Bangladesh: A Cluster Randomised Controlled Trial of the Tipping Point Initiative," *J. Glob. Health*, vol. 14, p. 04020, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.7189/jogh.14.04020.
- [10] A. Pourtaheri, M. Mahdizadeh, H. Tehrani, J. Jamali, and N. Peyman, "Socio-Ecological Factors of Girl Child Marriage: A Meta-Synthesis of Qualitative Research," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 24, no. 1, p. 428, Feb. 2024, doi: 10.1186/s12889-023-17626-z.
- [11] A. Pujar *et al.*, "Boys' Perspectives on Girls' Marriage and School Dropout: A Qualitative Study Revisiting a Structural Intervention in Southern India," *Cult. Health Sex.*, vol. 26, no. 5, pp. 701–716, May 2024, doi: 10.1080/13691058.2023.2241525.
- [12] N. K. Gale, G. Heath, E. Cameron, S. Rashid, and S. Redwood, "Using The Framework Method for The Analysis of Qualitative Data in Multi-Disciplinary Health Research," *BMC Med. Res. Methodol.*, vol. 13,

- no. 1, p. 117, Sep. 2013, doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-117.
- [13] M. Ratnaningsih *et al.*, "Child Marriage Acceptability Index (CMAI) as an Essential Indicator: an Investigation in South and Central Sulawesi, Indonesia," *Glob. Health Res. Policy*, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 32, Sep. 2022, doi: 10.1186/s41256-022-00252-4.
- [14] S. Suleymani, "Azerbaijani Turk Women's Resistance and The Woman, Life, Freedom Movement: The Politics of Intersectionality and Recognition in Iran," *Social Identities*, pp. 1–22, Apr. 2026, doi: 10.1080/13504630.2026.2662613.
- [15] S. Saharso, S. Tack, and L. Blonk, "Living with and Leaving Oppressive Conditions: The Role of Imagination in Migrant Women's Life Stories," *Social Identities*, pp. 1–15, Mar. 2026, doi: 10.1080/13504630.2026.2635130.
- [16] M. Gonick, "Between Girl Power and Reviving Ophelia?: Constituting the Neoliberal Girl Subject," *NWSA Journal*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 1–23, Jul. 2006, doi: 10.2979/NWS.2006.18.2.1.
- [17] B. D. Biswas, "The Politics of Recognition: The Role of Identity in Social Mobility Among Marginalised Communities in India," *Social Identities*, pp. 1–12, Jun. 2026, doi: 10.1080/13504630.2026.2682888.
- [18] M. Dungy and A. Krings, "Responsibilization and Retraditionalization: How Neoliberal Logics Reproduce Gender Inequities Among Women Community Organizers in Chicago," *Affilia*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 683–700, Nov. 2024, doi: 10.1177/08861099241238199.
- [19] K. Austrian *et al.*, "Long-Term Impacts of a Cash Plus Program on Marriage, Fertility, and Education After Six Years in Pastoralist Kenya: A Cluster Randomized Trial," *SSM Popul. Health*, vol. 26, p. 101663, Jun. 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2024.101663.
- [20] V. Adriany, N. N. S. Qosyasih, and E. Malihah, "Unpacking the Discourse of Child Marriage in Indonesia: A Decolonial Perspective," *Child. Soc.*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp. 89–98, Jan. 2026, doi: 10.1111/chso.13013.
- [21] D. Kalfas, S. Kalogiannidis, O. Papaevangelou, K. Melfou, and F. Chatzitheodoridis, "Integration of Technology in Agricultural Practices towards Agricultural Sustainability: A Case Study of Greece," *Sustainability*, vol. 16, no. 7, p. 2664, Mar. 2024, doi: 10.3390/su16072664.
- [22] C. Bacchi, "The Ethics of Problem Representation: Widening the Scope of Ethical Debate," *Policy Soc.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 5–20, Jan. 2007, doi: 10.1016/S1449-4035(07)70112-1.
- [23] R. Berger, "Now I See It, Now I Don't: Researcher's Position and Reflexivity in Qualitative Research," *Qualitative Research*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 219–234, Apr. 2015, doi: 10.1177/1468794112468475.
- [24] R. J. Sampson and S. Consoli, "Innovating Language Motivation Research: The Localized Possibilities of Practitioner Research," *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, pp. 1–13, Apr. 2025, doi: 10.1080/17501229.2025.2492293.
- [25] N. Fraser, *Scales of Justice: Reimagining Political Space in a Globalizing World*. Columbia University Press, 2008.