

**Trabalho em equipe interpessoal entre grupos étnicos para o desenvolvimento econômico em áreas de transmigração**

**Interpersonal teamwork among ethnic groups toward economic development in transmigration areas**

**Trabajo en equipo interpersonal entre grupos étnicos hacia el desarrollo económico en áreas de trans migración**

Recebido: 04/10/2019 | Revisado: 13/10/2019 | Aceito: 17/10/2019 | Publicado: 29/10/2019

**Jamaluddin Hos**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6871-518X>

Sociology Department, Social and Politic Faculty, Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

E-mail: [jamaluddin\\_hos@uho.ac.id](mailto:jamaluddin_hos@uho.ac.id)

**Ambo Upe**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8468-075X>

Sociology Department, Social and Politic Faculty, Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

E-mail: [dear\\_upe@yahoo.com](mailto:dear_upe@yahoo.com)

**Muhammad Arsyad**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2905-6668>

Sociology Department, Social and Politic Faculty, Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

E-mail: [muh.arsyad@uho.ac.id](mailto:muh.arsyad@uho.ac.id)

**Suharty Roslan**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6689-0304>

Sociology Department, Social and Politic Faculty, Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

E-mail: [suhartyroslan@yahoo.co.id](mailto:suhartyroslan@yahoo.co.id)

**Hasniah**

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3873-8938>

Anthropology Department, Humanities Faculty, Halu Oleo University, Indonesia

E-mail: [hasniah.antrounhalu@gmail.com](mailto:hasniah.antrounhalu@gmail.com)

**Resumo**

Este estudo teve como objetivo revelar alguma forma de trabalho em equipe interpessoal, bem como normas sociais notáveis de interesse mútuo no desenvolvimento econômico entre membros de grupos étnicos em áreas de transmigração. O método utilizado nesta pesquisa é

qualitativo. A descoberta indicou que o campo social mais dominante que influenciava a interação do trabalho em equipe social era a vida econômica. A forma do trabalho em equipe podia ser vista no arrozal, no processamento de arrozais e no cultivo de arroz na comercialização de produtos agrícolas. Essa cooperação entre grupos étnicos foi baseada nos valores e normas adotados por cada grupo étnico.

**Palavras-chave:** Trabalho Em Equipe; Grupo Étnico; Valor Social; Norma Social.

### **Abstract**

This study purposed to reveal some interpersonal teamwork form as well as remarkable social norms for mutual interest in economic development among members of ethnic groups in transmigration areas. The method used in this research is qualitative. The finding indicated that the most dominant social field influencing social teamwork interaction was economic life. The form of the teamwork could be seen in the paddy field, in the processing of rice fields and rice cultivation in the marketing of agricultural products. This cooperation among ethnic groups was based on the values and norms adopted by each ethnic group.

**Keywords:** Teamwork; Ethnic Group; Social Value; Social Norm.

### **Resumen**

Este estudio se propuso revelar algunas formas de trabajo en equipo interpersonal, así como normas sociales notables para el interés mutuo en el desarrollo económico entre los miembros de grupos étnicos en las áreas de transmigración. El método utilizado en esta investigación es cualitativo. El hallazgo indicó que el campo social más dominante que influyó en la interacción del trabajo en equipo social fue la vida económica. La forma del trabajo en equipo se podía ver en el campo de arroz, en el procesamiento de campos de arroz y en el cultivo de arroz en la comercialización de productos agrícolas. Esta cooperación entre grupos étnicos se basó en los valores y normas adoptados por cada grupo étnico.

**Palabras clave:** Trabajo en Equipo; Grupo Étnico; Valor Social; Norma Social.

## **1. Introduction**

Some social interactions among ethnic groups has generated a social force that can be associated in terms of strengthening relationship among people manifested in life cooperation, mutual respect and benefit. It can also be dissociative in the sense of mutual open, distant and repulsive that manifests in conflict, hatred, suspicion, and self-superiority. Associative

relation usually comes from the existence of equations among the participants, such as equations of descent, ethnicity, language, culture and religion. On the contrary, the dissociative relation usually comes from the difference of these things above (Ismaila & Jekayinfa, 2013). Furthermore, it can also arise due to the competition for resources that is minimally but equally needed.

It should be known that inter-ethnic relations do not always lead to conflict or hostility. Relations between ethnic groups where this study took place shown accommodative and cooperative social process. In this study, attention was focused on processes among ethnic (associative) groups.

This research was conducted in Puuduria village, Wonggeduku sub-district, Konawe regency. These research objectives were (1) preventing and understanding the form of cooperation among ethnic groups in transmigration area, and; (2) describing and understanding social values that guided and governed the offender.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Theoretical Framework**

This study referred to social definition paradigm with directs attention to the “social process”(Ritzer, 1992). However, it is notcovering the social facts directly, rather, the important point is the process of social fact formation. According to Max Weber, social reality is something which in accordance with individual motivation and social actions. In this case, social action is defined when people associate the act with a subjective meaning,thus, the action has a purpose or meaning (Laeyendecker, et al., 1983).

Weber provides an understanding on inter-relation among social actors, some actions of different actors, as long as they are meaningful (the actors have their own subjective motivations) and are linked and directed to the actions of others(Ritzer, 1992). Social interaction among ethnic groups is an action from the different ethnic actors and cultural backgrounds. The different ethnic actors have their own motivations that are directed to others different ethnicity.

Talcott Parsons as Weber's followers emphasized that the situational factors are guides for individual action. The problem for Parsons is not the individual action, but the norms and social values that guide and regulate behaviour (Poloma, 1992). In pursuit of their goalsas well as for choosing alternative ways, the actor is directed by a norm-like situation. However, these norms do not specify the choice of what to use but are determined by the actor's ability

to choose the right way. Parsons named this ability as voluntarism. This means that human action is derived from its will, desires, decisions, and purposes as a major element of interaction system of social forces (Veeger, 1993).

Based on Parsons' Voluntarism diagram, the actors in this study are citizens of four ethnic groups, namely 1) Javanese and Sundanese ethnic, since those two groups who are included into common transmigrants, 2) Bugis ethnic who are self-supporting transmigrants, and, 3) Tolaki ethnic who are indigenous people. Social interactions among ethnic groups in transmigration areas are performed in order to achieve the goals. In general, these objectives are expected to be economic objectives, especially efforts to improve living standards. This is in line with one of the main objectives of transmigration program which emphasizes on improving people's living standards and the main motive of transmigrants leaving their home areas and moving to transmigration settlements.

The selection of infrastructure tools concerning to improvement toward living standards, the actors of these four ethnic groups are influenced by their norms and values, as well as the situational conditions that exist in the transmigration areas. Norms and values may be in the form of general norms and values, such as national law rules, human values, welfare values, unity values or national integration. It can also be in the form of norms and values that come from religion and culture adopted by each ethnic. While situational conditions that exist in the transmigration area can be: the presence or absence of certain ethnic groups that are dominant (political and economic); limited economic resources; new settlement; form of settlement (segregative, semi-segregative, or mixed); similarities or livelihoods that permit mutual completeness; the presence or absence of social institutions as the social arena for inter connectedness.

## **2.2. Ethnic Group As the Cultural Product**

Koentjaraningrat (1993) argued values and norms as one form of culture serving as a set of rules that govern, control, and give direction to human behaviour within society. Geertz (1992) described that humans are the most dependent on the control mechanisms (cultural programs) to regulate their behaviour. Therefore, actions, even emotions, such as the human nervous system are included as the product of culture. Referring to the arguments, it is understandable why the social behaviour of member in particular ethnic group is different from the social behaviour of other ethnic group members. The social behaviour of ethnic groups is formed at the same time based on its ethnic-cultural characteristics. Primordial

bonds such as the appropriateness of blood, heredity, and custom have an unforgettable, overpowering, force in and from the conformities themselves. Direct relationships and especially kinship relationships are innate circumstances that originate from the state of being born into a particular religious community, speak with a particular language, or even a particular language dialect, and follow certain social practices, make people closely related to their relatives, neighbours, and fellow-people. Consequently, it is not just personal affection, practical imperatives, common interests, or compulsory obligations, but at least largely based on certain unlimited absolute inputs imposed on the bond itself.

### **2.3. Ethnic group's Interpersonal Relationship**

Ethnic boundaries become major factors that influence social interaction. Meanwhile, the thickness of ethnic boundaries is determined by ethnic identity and social distance between various ethnic groups. If ethnic boundaries are large, social interactions will be less and lead to dissociative social processes. Otherwise, if the limits of ethnic is small, social interaction tends to be intensive and leads to an associative social process (Yusof, 2012). The stronger the primordial bonds in the social life of each group ethnicity. It would increasingly raise a conflict among ethnic groups. The socio-historical experience shows that pluralistic can be a "source" of integration and disintegration.

As matter of fact, transmigration is commonly consists of various ethnic groups that are socially considered to be located and have developed their own subculture. This group differences are usually associated with a particular ancestor, but the identifiable features may be language, religion, residence (national origin), nationality, and physical form or a combination of some characteristics.

According to Polak (1991), in-group attitude generally has a high factor of sympathy and solidarity, it always has close feelings with group members. Meanwhile, attitudes toward out-group are usually characterized by a disorder and even antagonism. In-group as well as out-group feelings are the basis of ethnocentrism's attitude, which is an assumption that everything belongs to the group's habits is best compared to the other group's habits. With respect to different ethnic groups, there is a tendency to conduct "prejudice" assessments that have implications for the way people treat people from other ethnic groups based on group classifications, rather than on individual traits (Mason, 1970). Such conditions are often found in the attitude of an ethnic-group against other ethnic groups (Soekanto, 1983). Costalli & Moro (2011) in Bosnia, showed that ethnic dimensions are very relevant to encourage social

violence.

In addition, things of social interaction between ethnic groups in the transmigration area are economic resources of the community and the similarities or differences in livelihoods. According to Koentjaraningrat (1993), sources of conflict among ethnic groups in developing countries such as Indonesia occur when 1) the citizens of two ethnic groups each compete for the same livelihood; citizens of one ethnic group try to impose its cultural elements on the citizens of another ethnic group; 2) citizens of one ethnic group try to impose their religious concepts on the citizens of other ethnic groups; 3) an ethnic group seeks to dominate a political ethnic group; and 4) the potential for latent conflicts exists in the relationship between indigenous ethnic groups.

On the contrary, concerning to social interactions among ethnic groups, there is a potential for unity or at least to cooperate, in case 1) citizens of two different ethnic groups can work together either socially or economically, this occurs if each ethnic group can get a livelihood that is different and complementary (symbiotic relationship); 2) citizens of two distinct ethnic groups are oriented toward a third group, which can neutralize the relationship between the two ethnic groups.

### **3. Research Method**

The subjects of the study were Javanese, Sundanese, Bugis, and Tolaki ethnics. These four ethnic groups sufficiently described background variations of ethnic groups in the study sites. The Javanese and Sundanese ethnic group is common transmigrants whose existence in the research location is under a government program. Bugis ethnic groups are pure self-initiated transmigrants whose existence is based on their own initiative and cost to find employment. While the Tolaki ethnic group is a native who is basically a “host” because his ancestors are indigenous.

Because of social life, interaction of both Javanese and Sundanese were not seen as different ethnic, the research took the form either Javanese or Sundanese as one subject. Hence, in the social life, these two ethnic groups were not distinguished by the Bugis and Tolaki people in social interaction. Both Javanese and Sundanese commonly named as “Javanese.”

The data were obtained through in-depth interviews with research subjects as well as direct observation of every social interaction. Since this research is categorized as a qualitative research, the number of informants was not a major requirement, rather, the most

important was the quality of data sources and information collected. Determination of informants was based on some requirements: comes from one of ethnic groups that were subjected to research, namely Java or Sunda, Bugis, and Tolaki; having a lot of knowledge about the dynamics of society; and being resident at the research site for at least five years.

The primary data were obtained from participant observation and in-depth interview. After the data obtained at the same time, the data grouping then is performed. This was intended to be able to do data condensation which coming from various sources, making it easier for analysis. Furthermore, the data were analyzed through interpretative understanding, in which the researcher did interpretation to the data and facts related to the research focus, that was cooperation among ethnic groups in the economic field.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1. Interpersonal Teamwork Among Ethnic Groups**

The social interactions among ethnic (mainly economic) people in Puuduria, as mentioned above, did not always lead to social conflict as it was found in another transmigration areas such as conflicts over land ownership and the distribution of other economic resources. But, there was also a lead to social interaction that showed the existence of interpersonal cooperation (teamwork). Here are the headlines of interpersonal teamwork among ethnic groups in Puuduria village, Wonggeduku sub-district, Konawe Regency:

#### **4.1.1. Teamwork on Agricultural Process**

The main economic sources in the transmigration area of Puuduria Village are paddy fields. Agricultural land cultivation becomes the main as the bridge of social interaction, including those leading to the process of teamwork. The form of cooperation in the processing of agricultural land is possible because of differences in expertise and differences in farming patterns. This difference in the pattern of livelihood binds ethnic groups based on complementary services and needs.

This unified was shown by the Javanese/Sundanese as well as the Bugis in plowing/cultivating rice fields and planting rice. In the village of Puuduria, generally the *dompeng* (Hand Tractor) was Bugis, thus the Javanese/Sundanese who needed the services of a tractor to plow their fields could rent from Bugis people. In contrast, the Javanese/Sundanese had rented rice farming group that usually consists of mothers. This

group offered services to grow rice with rent IDR 1,000,000/hectare and it was profitably utilized by Bugis people while working in their large fields.

The establishment of rented rice farming group was possible because of the availability of labor from Javanese/Sundanese women and it was regarded as something common. While based on Bugis culture, women are generally considered "inappropriate" for handling over directly the farming paddies. The main task of Bugis mother was taking care of the kitchen to support the work of fathers in the fields. Thus, the Bugis people who generally cultivate the rice field would relatively need the services of rice growers from the Javanese / Sundanese ethnic groups.

In wet land farming, Bugis generally cultivated more land than Javanese/Sundanese, which was on average of more than two hectares. Meanwhile, the Javanese/Sundanese was generally working on rice fields of only 1 hectare. This was caused by a trouble they faced about business land with the local community. They also had not been able to work on large fields because it required substantial capital. The process of cultivating the land ranging from plowing land with tractors, planting rice, weeding, fertilizing, pest spray (treatment) to harvest (including the transport of crops from rice fields to homes) almost everything was financed. This condition was also a reason for the Javanese/Sundanese not to dare to accept doing someone else's land with a profit-sharing system or to form a "rented rice farming group" to sell energy.

There were several factors allowing Bugis to work in wider fields than other ethnic groups. First, the Bugis are economically more established because long-term crops such as chocolate and coffee with high commodity value have been successful. Thus they are able to hire labor to plow the fields, plant rice and finance the harvest. Secondly, socially Bugis have the skills to print fields to enable them to borrow Tolaki land which is still in the form of forests and swamps to work on. Third, Bugis people in Puuduria still maintain the culture of mutual help though in a limited capacity. Bugis people still have the habit of calling each other to help plant rice each day in one growing season, if in one day it is not finished planted, the rest must be rented out. Therefore if a man working on a 2-hectare paddy field and in one day it can be planted 1 hectare, then the rent is thought to be living 1 hectare.

#### **4.1.2. Teamwork for Food Shortage**

Both Javanese and Sundanese initially tended to plant short-term crops to meet the daily needs of rice, crops, and vegetables. This was done to get results quickly, hence they



could ensure their survival in an unfamiliar area. While Bugis people came to the location to improve their lives compared to before, in addition to plant some rice and long-term crops such as bananas, chocolate, and coffee. This situation created conditions that need each other. Bugis meet vegetable needs by buying from Javanese/Sundanese and Javanese/Sundanese need Bugis as vegetable consumers. In a further development, the Javanese/Sundanese also plant long-term crops after seeing the Bugis' successful.

Regarding to their primary needs fulfillment, the Tolaki people who had traditionally farmed, in addition to lending their land to the Bugis, had partially cultivated their own rice fields although they were still limited. They learnt from Javanese or Bugis on ways to cultivate the rice fields and try to absorb and used modern agricultural technology as well as Javanese and Bugis. While those who could not farm the rice fields, tried to meet the needs of his life by looking for fish in the swamp and then sell it to the Javanese/Sundanese or Bugis.

#### **4.1.3. Teamwork on Agricultural Field Production**

Tolaki ethnic in their history has a livelihood system in the form of shifting cultivation. Since the entry of agricultural irrigation at transmigration sites, they could no longer continue the livelihood system. As it was known that shifting cultivation was a form of dryland farming, while the land they have already flooded into swamps due to the entry of irrigation. They had to turn to wet land farming, but they did not have sufficient skills about how to make and cultivate the fields. This gave birth to the form of cooperation among ethnic groups in terms of printing paddy fields.

The interpersonal teamwork was shown by both Bugis and Tolaki people. Bugis people had skills to create and cultivate the fields, thus those who did not have their own land or want to expand the land could borrow land that was still in the form of forests and swamps from Tolaki people around residential location to be molded into rice fields and the results were taken up to five times. When it was successful, it could be managed with the profit-sharing system. The Tolaki people hadan interest in lending their land to the Bugis because they didnot have the sufficient kills to print rice fields. By lending to Bugis people meant that forests and swamps would become rice fields that had high economic value. While Bugis people had an interest to borrow the land from Tolaki people to be printed into rice fields in order to get land that could be cultivated, although later the fields were not hers. At least he could get agricultural produce or add production in accordance with his goals coming to Puuduria Village.

The prior facts related to cooperation among ethnic groups above indicated that the (economic) objective created several rational ways to be achieved. The ways that subsequently gave birth to the action were the result of free creativity of individual ethnic group residents derived from the meaning in the process of social interaction. The results of social conditions that indicate different skills and working patterns in farming cultivated the feelings of mutual need each other. The chosen form of cooperation was encouraged and gained legitimacy from the value system and norms of each ethnic group.

#### **4.2. Social Values that Encourage Interpersonal Teamwork**

The forms of interpersonal teamwork such above statement were inseparable from the influence of values and social norms. The social values embraced by every ethnic group were reflected in the background of their existence at transmigration site and underlying motivation.

The Javanese and Sundanese in transmigration were funded by government since their departure up to a two-year cost of living expenses and obtaining a house and farm land in a new location of 2 hectares per family. Generally, the transmigrants were small farmers and homeless laborers in their home. Their primary motivation to migrate was to get a proper living guarantee, especially due to their children live.

The interviews result revealed that the main factor of transmigrants to leave their home areas was the lack of economic assets in their regions. Through this program, they expected to have economic assets giving them more viable life assurance. The circumstances motivated them to participate in transmigration that give shades in the form of social interaction among ethnic groups. Javanese/Sundanese cultural values oriented towards life harmony for the citizens of this ethnic group to build cooperation with other ethnic group residents, especially in the processing of agricultural land.

Bugis people came to transmigration settlement site in Puuduria following the construction of a technical irrigation project around 1985. They bought Javanese transmigrant land and homes that returned to their villages in Java. In addition of buying Javanese land, some of them also bought indigenous peoples' land (ethnic Tolaki) around settlements that still in the form of forests and swamps. For the Tolaki people who basically had no experience in rice farming, the price of land offered by the Bugis is "expensive" and hence they were interested to sell the land. Meanwhile, for Bugis people, the land price was very cheap compared to the results that would be obtained after being printed into rice fields.

In contrast to Javanese transmigrants, Bugis came to the districts at their own expense as they saw opportunities to acquire large land and more agricultural production their home country. They also generally had high mobility. This could be seen by the frequent movements of places before living in Puuduria. Before settling in Puuduria, some of the Bugis ethnic groups had moved around, both within the province of South Sulawesi and Southeast Sulawesi.

The above description shows that Bugis existed in transmigration settlement sites because they saw an opportunity to improve their living standard. In their home areas they were “not classified as poor.” The main motivation was a change to a better life than ever before.

Unlike the Javanese, Sundanese and Bugis who were transmigrants, Tolaki people were natives. These ethnic groups occupied land areas from Konawe, Southern Konawe, Northern Konawe, Konawe islands and Kolaka districts. In addition being in the transmigration settlement as a participant of the placement of Local Population (APPDT), the Tolaki people also occupied the surrounding villages and directly adjacent to the residential location. As indigenous peoples, Tolaki people initially possessed the extensive land as well as tied to traditional farming patterns, namely shifting cultivation. After the arrival of immigrants, both Javanese and Bugis transmigrants, they gradually marginalized because of their many lands that changed hands and traditional farming patterns they could no longer do. This condition forced them to change their agriculture form into a new pattern, namely rice farming. For that, they had a lot to learn from the immigrants who already had the knowledge, skills and experience in the processing of paddy fields.

By the overall statement, it seems that the most prominent and common social values in social interaction among ethnic groups in Puuduria were economic values. Thus, their behavior within social interaction was based on economic considerations. This economic value that is often generated as dispute happened when the economic interests of each ethnic group were in incompatible. The conflicts of land ownership in the second business land among Javanese, Sundanese and Tolaki people were from the conflict of economic interests. Each ethnic group involved in the conflict felt economically disadvantaged if it did not defend the land.

However, not all economic interactions among ethnic groups led to dispute, sometimes it led to mutually beneficial forms of cooperation. Although they felt that there were principal differences in socio-cultural values and norms, economic values could eliminate those differences and create cooperative social processes. It is shown by Bugis and Tolaki people

while producing new fields. The Bugis borrowed the unoccupied land of Tolaki people to push up their cultivation land and incomes. Otherwise, Tolaki people who are experienced in assessing the paddy land, tend to lend their land to the Bugis people so that the land can be used into rice fields.

Throughout economic values which are described above, each ethnic group had its own behavior patterns. This could be seen from the agriculture patterns in which each ethnic group had its own characteristics. As matter of fact, both Javanese and Sundanese commonly had short-term crop-oriented farming patterns, such as rice, palawija, and vegetables. Meanwhile, The Bugis combined short-term crops of rice and long-term crops such as bananas, chocolate and coffee. In the contrary, the local indigenous people (Tolaki) were still tied to traditional farming patterns.

The farming patterns differences were related to underlying motivation and expectations. The Javanese/Sundanese had motivation to quickly obtain agricultural product to be able to survive in unfamiliar places. While the Bugis people had the motivation to get more results than when they were still in the area of origin. Based on information from some Bugis people who were successfully interviewed, in general, they came to transmigration site to buy land from the more narrow “land sales” in their home areas. The price of land with the size of 70 acres in the area of origin could be bought back the land of 2 ha at the transmigration site.

In addition to economic values, ethnic citizens were also influenced by other common social values in their social interactions such as human values, nationalism, and religious values. By the point, religious values served to stifle the greater conflict caused by the clash of economic interests. The values of humanity and nationalism became a common ground in building inter-ethnic harmony. It was formed and developed in joint activities such as work service and teamwork in repairing water irrigation. While religious values (equally Muslim) is a bridge among them for their ethnic boundaries. Although culturally they retain their ethnic identity, they continue to build cooperation in the economic field because it is bridged by religious values.

## **5. Final Considerations**

The economic values are the main social tool for social interaction which eases the social interaction among ethnic groups. Therefore, economic interaction became the most interpersonal teamwork among ethnic groups compared to another. There are two conclusions drawn from the results of this study. First, this form of cooperation is motivated by the efforts

of ethnic group residents to obtain economic resources, where each ethnic group citizens need each other. Interpersonal teamwork among ethnic groups is becoming stronger when ethnic groups cannot meet their own needs without the involvement of other ethnic groups. This was demonstrated by Bugis and Tolaki ethnic groups in the case of paddy field printing, among ethnic Javanese/Sundanese and Bugis ethnic groups in the case of paddy fields and rice cultivation and marketing of agricultural products.

Second, interpersonal teamwork mentioned above is based on the values and norms adopted by citizens of each ethnic group and the expectations and goals to be achieved by each ethnic citizen. Values, norms, and other ideas lead ethnic group to the choices that are deemed appropriate for achieving the goal. Meanwhile, economic objectives have involved ethnic group individuals in rational acts in the sense that they are always considered on an economical disadvantage basis. These considerations lead to the realization of cooperation among ethnic groups when the parties involved get the benefits.

## References

- Costalli, S., & Moro, F. N. (2011). The patterns of ethnic settlement and violence: a local-level quantitative analysis of the Bosnian War. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(12), 2096–2114.
- Geertz, C. (1992). *Agama dan Kebudayaan*,(terj.) Francisco Budi Hardiman. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Ismail, O. O., & Jekayinfa, A. (2013). Cultural pluralism, reconstructive education and nation building in Nigeria. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology*, 5(5), 140–146.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1993). *Aneka Warna Manusia dan Kebudayaan Indonesia dalam Pembangunan: Manusia dan Kebudayaan Indonesia*. Jakarta: Djambatan Publisher.
- Laeyendecker, L., Samekto, & Suryochondro, S. (1983). *Tata, perubahan dan ketimpangan: suatu pengantar sejarah sosiologi*. PT. Gramedia.
- Mason, P. (1970). *Patterns of dominance*. London; New York: published for the Institute of Race Relations [by] Oxford University Press.

Polak, J. B. A. F. M. (1991). *Sosiologi, Suatu Buku Pengantar Ringkas*. Jakarta: PT. Ikhtiar Baru–Van Hoeve.

Poloma, M. M. (1992). *Sosiologi kontemporer*. Rajawali Pers.

Ritzer, G. (1992). *Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science (Sosiologi Ilmu Pengetahuan Berparadigma Ganda)*, terj. Drs. Alimandan. Rajawali Pers, Jakarta, Cet. II.

Soekanto, S. (1983). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Rajawali.

Veeger, K. J. (1993). *Pengantar Sosiologi: buku panduan mahasiswa*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Yusof, N. M. (2012). Study of social interaction among students of Vision Schools in Malaysia. *Asian Ethnicity*, 13(1), 47–73.

**Percentage contribution of each author in the manuscript**

Jamaluddin Hos - 20%

Ambo Upe - 20%

Muhammad Arsyad - 20%

Suharty Roslan - 20%

Hasniah - 20%