

## EXPANSION OF REGIONS AND VILLAGE CENTERS MUNANESE IN KENDARI CITY

Wa Ode Sifatu<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Anthropology Department, Humanities Faculty, Halu Oleo University; Home Address: BTN UNHALU BLOK W, Number 28 Kendari, Postal Code: 93232, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia.  
Tel: +62-81341762438, E-mail: [sifatuwaode@gmail.com](mailto:sifatuwaode@gmail.com)

### Introduction

This article describes the process of becoming a number of Muna village centers in Kendari City and its effects. The theory of reading data is the thought of Foucault (1977) about discourse using the Participatory Action Research (PAR) method from Lassiter (2008) on Collaborative Ethnography. As a result of the activity, community leaders from the Muna tribe in the Muna Islands participated in the struggle to give birth to the Province of Southeast Sulawesi (Southeast Sulawesi), since 1957-1964. The discourse on the issue of the capital city of Southeast Sulawesi, the Buton tribe from the Buton Islands wants it in Baubau, the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Regency. The city of Kendari as the capital of Southeast Sulawesi is the result of a collaborative discourse between representatives of the Munanese and representatives of the Tolakinese. To increase the population of Kendari City, representatives of the Munanese and Tolakinese agreed to move the population from the village to Kendari. The Munanese who came by sea had logistical limitations, so they changed their livelihood from farmers to unskilled laborers at the port. Residential houses are made by buying kintal from the Tolakinese, but they are usually deceived. The kintal seller left the land that had been sold, claimed to belong to a different Tolakinese. To overcome this, the Munanese bought land in groups of yards, and their village centers were formed. The implication is that the Munanese in the village pass on poverty to their generations.

Kendari as the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province has a minimum of eight village centers of the Munanese as immigrants from Muna Island. Meanwhile, the Tolakinese as a native of the Southeast Sulawesi peninsula, which is very close to Kendari City, does not have a village center. Media and historical records, Taeha (1982) reported that the Munanese was the locomotive of the struggle in giving birth to the Province of Southeast Sulawesi (Southeast Sulawesi) from 1957 to 1964 through discourses addressed to the Governor of Sulawesi both verbally and in writing in the form of letters and flyers. Kendari is the capital of Southeast Sulawesi and the result of a collaborative discourse between representatives of the Muna Tribe and representatives of the Tolaki tribe.

The study of ethnicity was first proposed by Barth (1969). In 1974, Bruner has made the concept of dominant culture as a model for analyzing relations between ethnic groups in Indonesia. Bruner took cases in two cities, namely Bandung and Medan. The Sundanese are the majority and dominant, i.e. they set the standards for proper behavior to be shown in public places; and, almost all of Bandung's urban institutions are controlled by the Sundanese and operate according to Sundanese cultural patterns. Unlike in Medan, there is no single ethnic group that is socially dominant, and there is no dominant culture like that found in Bandung. The Javanese who are the majority in Medan are not the dominant group, because they are a low social class group that does not have social, economic, and political power. Each ethnic group maintains its culture and ethnicity, living in groups among its fellow ethnic groups. Ethnicity and religion are the main references in the classification among the residents of Medan (see Tijok, 2011), Suparlan (1999). The example of Medan City as mentioned above is similar to Kendari City as the capital city of Southeast Sulawesi Province (Southeast Sulawesi). The difference between Medan City and Kendari City is that in Kendari City there are centers of Muna Tribe settlements (see Hobbes 1984), which are usually claimed to be immigrants. As for the local population, the Tolaki Tribe (see Barth, 1969) no longer has a village center.

If referring to Furnivall, J. S. (2009) about the economy of the Dutch East Indies community who lived independently without any assimilation with each other in one political unit. Kendari City is actually the territory of the Laiwui Kingdom in the southeastern peninsula of Sulawesi Island, but in reality, there is not a single Tolaki village center in Kendari City. In fact, it is the Munanese who have village centers in Kendari City and nowadays they have changed to the names of the forms of village government such as Kelurahan: Gunung Jati, Gunung Mekar, Alolama, Lalodati, Wawombalata, Abeli, Benua Nirae, and Tobimeita. Compare with Bourdieu (1983).

Kendari city is not new in science. There have been many experts who have studied Kendari City, but have not studied the problem of village centers for the Muna ethnic group as immigrants. These experts include: Zainuddin, et al. (2018: 1-5) Latif, et al., (2018: 288-297), Tirtosudarmo, R. (2006), Tuwu, Darmin (2011), Tarimana, Abdur Rauf (1985), Husen Chalikh, A. Husen (1976), Jumaidin, La Ode

(2011), Justawan and Adrian Tawai (2012), Karmisla (2013), Kruijt, AIB (1992), Laxmi and Koodoh (2011), Nur, Rifai (1999), Rahman, Ali (2004), Su'ud, Muslim (2001), Taeha, M. Arsyad (1982), Tamburaka, Rustam E. (1999 , 2002). Dirman, La Ode (2007), D., Said (2007), Barlian (2010), La Welendo, et al (2021: 1-20), Hamid, Nisrina, et al (2021: 200-2015), Irma and Swaidatul Masluhiya AF (2020: 73-83), Sri Maryanti and Febrianty Erni Enrike (2019: 407-410), Abdullah M. Zein and Rekson Solo Limba (2012).

To expand the horizon of thought regarding urban development in general experts have studied it. They include: Rosni, et al. (2016: 113-123 ), Xiaomei Pu ( 2019: 252-256), amangaya et al (2019: 172-190), Lingling Peng (2019: 361-367 ), Aini, Nurul (2019: without page), Rumetna , (2017: 225-234), Sriyanto, et al (2005: 155-179), Wijaya, et al (2006: 101-118), Joko Sujarto (1993: 3-25), Vioya, Arrauda (2010: 215 -226), Hartono, et al (2014: 74-96), Radhinal, and Ariyanto (2017: 97 – 107), Alifiansyah, et al (2017: 67-72), Ngangi et al. (2018: 82-92), Damayanti (2016: 1-13), Aquarita, et al. (2016: 14-20), Dewi et al. (2016: 21-27), Napirah, et al. (2016: 28-38), Rezagama et al. (2016: 39-48), Wardhana et al., (2016: 49-56), Adimagistra, et al (2016: 57-65), Raditya, et al (2016: 66-73), Prafitri, et al. (2016: 74-82), Yulastuti, et al (2016: 83-90). None of the articles that have discussed cities have examined the problem of village centers which are dominated by immigrant ethnic groups such as in Kendari City. The service found that the ownership of the Muna village centers in Kendari City was not actually an improvement but was only an effect of the relatively immature development implementation in its planning. The effect is that the Munanese who urbanize to the City even though in order to increase the population in Kendari City when it was formed inherit poverty which is also a burden for the government on an ongoing basis.

## Discussion

### 1. Kendari City Brief History Analysis

The location of Kendari City can be seen on the map below.



Source: [https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berkas:Lokasi\\_Sulawesi\\_Tenggara\\_Kota\\_Kendari.svg](https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Berkas:Lokasi_Sulawesi_Tenggara_Kota_Kendari.svg)  
accessed on July, 27 2019.

Cahsarmili, Aug 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012 reports on the development of Kendari City before it became the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province. In 1964 and so on, it has now become 10 sub-districts and 60 sub-districts. Cahsarmili further explained that Kendari City before becoming the capital city began with the establishment of the Laiwoi royal palace by King Lakidende. Furthermore, Kendari City is famous in the outside world based on the report of Vosmaer (1839). In 1906 Dutch ships began anchoring in Kendari Bay.

The demographics of Kendari City according to the Central Statistics Agency 2020 are 404,232 people. The city of Kendari was not known in the early days of the independence of the Republic of Indonesia (RI). Taeha (1982) explained that Southeast Sulawesi was known as part of South-Southeast Sulawesi (Sulselra) which was then known as Groote Celebes which was led by a governor whose capital was Makassar. In its development, the Governor of Sulawesi issued Government Regulation (PP) No. 34/1952, regarding the establishment of an autonomous region at the district level consisting of seven administrative regions, namely: Makassar, Bonthain (read Bantaeng), Pare-pare, Mandar, Luwu, and Southeast Sulawesi. The capital city of Southeast Sulawesi at that time was located in Baubau. Southeast Sulawesi itself at that time consisted of four Kewedanaan (district level), namely: a) Kewedanaan Buton whose capital was Bau-bau, Muna Kewedanaan whose capital was Raha, Kolaka Kewedanaan whose capital was Kolaka, and Kendari Kewedanaan whose capital was Kendari.

The group of people who came from the Muna Kewedanaan made a demand to the central government that Southeast Sulawesi Regency be turned into its own administrative region, namely Southeast Sulawesi Province. This condition was a struggle through the discourse of the demands to be noted during the visit of the resident coordinator of Southeast Sulawesi on September 13, 1957. This demand through the discourse of the Munanese was recorded in letter number 3/4/17 dated November 8, 1957 which was addressed to the Governor of Sulawesi. The demands of a number of Munanese in the form of discourse were taken seriously by the Governor of Sulawesi through a discourse also in the form of a wire to the regional head of South Sulawesi. Seeing the discourse of his superiors in the form of a letter number 3/4/17 dated November 8, 1957, which was addressed to the Governor of Sulawesi in the form of the discourse of the Munanese demanding that the Southeast Sulawesi autonomous region be taken seriously by the Governor of Sulawesi, it was also followed by the discourse of a number of people from the Buton administration, the Kolaka administration, Kendari. Finally, on July 22, 1959, at the Kewedanaan Kendari, an inter-wedanaan deliberation was held, each of which sent a representative (see Monograph, 1997:99). The results of the deliberation that resulted in a discourse that must be submitted to the Governor of Sulawesi resulted in a general discourse in the form of Law Number 29 of 1959 concerning the establishment of four Level II Autonomous Regions with their respective regional heads.

## **2. Historical Analysis of the Formation of the Muna Village in Kendari City**

At the beginning of the independence of the Republic of Indonesia (RI) there was no discourse in the form of the Southeast Sulawesi region as a province in Indonesia. became one of the Tolaki, Buton, and Muna tribal associations that succeeded in fighting for the establishment of Southeast Sulawesi Province in 1964. However, there was a conflict between them during the process of determining the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province. Buton tribe representatives proposed Bau-Bau city to be the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province with the following considerations: adequate number of people, already has a university of Southeast Sulawesi (Universitas Sulawesi Tenggara), already has the availability of urban infrastructure facilities because since the sultanate era it became the capital of the Sultanate of Buton, the era of Indonesian independence has become the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Regency. While the Kendari area is not yet worthy of being the capital city of Southeast Sulawesi Province because it is only a place to dry fish, caught by Bajo and Bugis fishermen, does not have urban infrastructure facilities, and does not have a university. Meanwhile, representatives from the Tolaki Tribe proposed Kendari to be the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province with the following considerations: the Kendari area is the mainland of Sulawesi, the Japanese army during the Japanese occupation era had used Kendari Bay as a port. The representatives of the Muna Tribe became the determining factor, because choosing one of the Bau-Bau or Kendari areas was certain to be the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province. Apparently, in the end the representatives of the Muna tribe chose the Kendari region. The choice of representatives of the Muna Tribe disappointed the representatives of the Buton tribe so that they were not responsible for overcoming the limited population in Kendari. Yacob Silondae as the head of the Tolaki Tribe delegation asked La Ode Rasyid, the head of the Muna Tribe delegation, for consideration on how to overcome the problem of limited population in Kendari. La Ode Rasyid proposes to mobilize farming families from Muna and Tolaki to farm in Kendari on condition that the location for agricultural land must be clear. Yacob Silondae agreed to La Ode Rashid's proposal and determined the areas where the Tolaki and Muna tribes farmed in Kendari, including: in Anduonohu, in Abeli, in Tobimeita, in Nanga-Nanga, in Lepo-Lepo, in Poasia, and its surroundings.

When the Kendari region became the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province, Yacob Silondae became the Regent in Kolaka Regency and La Ode Rasyid became the Regent in Muna Regency. Yacob Silondae and La Ode Rasyid easily mobilized farming families in their respective districts to Kendari. The mobilization is not supported by logistics. Muna farmers go to Kendari by using wooden boats carrying supplies of corn and rice, because wooden boats are sometimes available and sometimes not available in a week. They only brought a little rice and corn from Raha Harbor to Kendari Harbor.

Having not had the opportunity to open gardens, they ran out of rice and corn. To make a living, they are forced to work as pelvic laborers at Kendari Bay Harbor by staying close to the port. The place where they live is a hill so they call it Gunung Jati. Gunung Jati means the hill where the Munanese produce teak wood. Unlike farmers from the Tolaki Tribe, if they run out of rice, they can only walk back to their respective villages to pick up rice. Thus, the Tolakinese can complete their gardens so that they can be planted. Meanwhile, the Muna tribe not only couldn't finish their garden, they didn't even understand its location.

According to Husein Abd. Khalik (1976: 16-26) The city of Kendari was originally inhabited by Bugis and Bajo people, followed by the entry of Muna, Tolaki, Butonese, Wawonii, Bugis, Tator, and Transmigration people. It is also stated that until 1950 Kendari's largest population was the Bugis, following the Muna and Bajo tribes. Meanwhile, the Tolakinese until 1950 were residents outside Kendari City, except for a few people who were employees and government officials.

Southeast Sulawesi as a new province still has limited Human Resources (HR) for Civil Servants (PNS) to fill the bureaucracy. To solve this problem, the rulers of the parent province of South Sulawesi mobilized the families of Bugis-Makassar civil servants from the South Sulawesi Governor's Office to Kendari. Those who change their workplaces to Kendari bring their ideology, "wherever they are, there is their homeland". As a result, the Muna, Tolaki, Bugis, and Buton tribes developed independently based on their livelihoods, namely: the Tolaki tribe as farmers, the Muna tribe as laborers at Kendari Bay Harbor, and the Bugis-Makassar Tribe as Civil Servants (PNS), bureaucrats, and entrepreneur, has become a new habitus in Kendari City. Habitus is a historical product that is formed after humans are born and interacts with society in a certain space and time (see Bourdieu, 1988[1984]). The condition of inter-ethnic relations is manifested in inter-ethnic relationships. The Muna-Buton (archipelago) and Bugis tribes with a work ethic The Tolaki tribe (mainland, commonly called the owner of the land) with a weak work ethic because they are spoiled by nature and the availability of Kendari City infrastructure.

Subsequent developments, the Muna tribe increased in number so that the area where they lived experienced limited space. The Muna tribe in Gunung Jati has the principle of saving from income as pelvic laborers at Kendari Bay Harbor. Over time, one to two people can collect a certain amount of money. The Tolaki tribe who work as farmers have a habit of big parties as a prestige for the family. To organize a big party, the Tolakinese sell their gardens. The Munanese can raise some money to buy a garden from the Tolaki Tribe in the hope that it will become a new domicile. But unfortunately, the garden that has been purchased from a Tolakinese can be claimed as a different Tolaki garden. As a result, the Munanese who had moved from Gunung Jati to the garden they had just purchased had to return to Gunung Jati and had to be willing to lose their garden to the Tolakinese who were different from the seller.

The Munanese, knowing the condition of their friend whose garden was lost, was claimed by a different Tolakinese from the seller, arranged a joint strategy to buy the garden. The strategy in question is to buy sugarcane from the Tolakinese in groups so that the Tolakinese who dare to claim the gardens that the Munanese have bought will be fought together. This incident happened repeatedly until it reached one area so that the Muna village was formed as mentioned above. The Tolakinese at that time were still young, remembering the incident when the Munanese bought gardens in groups around their homes and over time and continuously many Munanese came to this day.

### **3. Agreed Solutions through This Activity**

PAR implementation mechanisms offer a radical alternative to knowledge development as a collective inquiry, self-reflection for the purpose of improving situations in communities or in marginalized groups of individuals (Koch, Selim, & Kralik, 2002; Maguira, 1987). While there are some challenges in conducting PAR research, it is a valuable research methodology for any researcher looking to take action and make a change. The material needed in the activity is a number of examples that have accommodated the children and the experience of the host so that the children experience failure and successfully complete their studies. LDPD, AD, LDD, MR, and LSRD. Here the author will display the profile of each case. LPDP, work as a Civil Servant (PNS), AD is also a Civil Servant, LDD is a civil servant, MR is an entrepreneur, LSRD is a civil servant who has now passed away. Furthermore, we also dig up information on five people who successfully completed the study to get a job. They are JN as entrepreneur, WSF as civil servant, LKRM as civil servant, ARM, LRB as entrepreneur. The profile of each case can be understood through the following table.

**Table Host and Foster Child's Profile**

No.	Profile	Disadvantage	Advantage	Information
<b>Host</b>				
1	LDPD	a. It's hard to change old habits b. Lack of support from parents c. Lack of motivation d. Lack of discipline	a. Lack of support from parents b. Nothing affects the child's mind c. Want to achieve goals	
2	AD	a. Shady b. Parents feel sorry for their child who is invited to work by the host c. Have no ambitions d. Tempted by the material	a. Always reminded b. His parents surrendered and thankful c. The life of a successful person becomes a story d. The child is patient	
3	LDD	a. Often run away and go home b. Difficult to teach discipline c. Used to be pampered at home d. Have no ambitions	a. Useful creation b. Knowing rights and obligations c. Work hard first, have fun later.	
4	MR	a. Work is considered torture b. Not good at discipline c. Get used to worship, but unresponsive	a. There's always time to play b. Know your rights and obligations. c. Work hard first, have fun later.	
5	LSRD	a. It's hard to understand the host's good intentions. b. Persistent c. Does not consider the host as his or her parents.	a. Not easily influenced by others. b. Cheerful c. The host is a role model	
<b>Foster Child</b>				
1	JN	My friend prefers to go around with his mother selling sales	Can eliminate longing for biological family.	
2	WSF	My friend is quickly attracted to the opposite sex	Life is better with adoptive parents	
3	LKRM	With mom selling sales, you don't need to be good at reading	Adoptive parents are not angry even though I am not good at reading.	
4	ARM	My friend is dishonest, used to steal money	I'm sincere so I can change my life	
5	LRB	My friend can't be disciplined	I'm at a loss if I go back to my biological parents	

The table above shows that children's understanding of the importance of preparing for the future from an early age is very important. Preparing for the future of children is not an instant thing. Thanks to the help of the Muna Community Leaders in the village centers so that these activities can run, even though the results are little or not optimal. Togetherness is better than individualism in dealing with children from poor families.

Personally, the Muanese have been established to be able to help overcome the problem of poverty in Kendari City. The problem is only the management is not optimal. That is, the awareness stage is an initiation stage to make all poor people in the center of the Muna village aware to understand the conditions and impacts if the children's future is not properly prepared. Participating in the involvement or active participation of children and assisting the community to build human resources is not easy. Community service activities have been going on since 2006 through the DPRM DIKTI. This competitive grant scheme has shown success. Observations of interviews with subjects continue to be carried out to add data until now.

Eight urban villages as the center of the Muna village in Kendari City, namely: (1) Gunung Jati Village; (2) Jati Mekar Village; (3) Alolama Village; (4) Kelurahan, Lalodati; (5) Abheli Village; (6) Benua Nirae Village; (7) Tobimeita Village; and (8) Anggalo Melai Village. This activity reflects the community's characteristics towards cooperative attitudes, socio-cultural adaptation, and ways to prepare for the future of children. This condition is much different from the findings of Lee (2007) in Central Sulawesi that there are different ideals between development planners and development targets.

## Conclusion

This activity explains that the ownership of the Muna village centers in Kendari City is not intentional but is a victim of development in politics. The Munanese and the Tolakinese who were mobilized to become residents of the city of Kendari as the capital of Southeast Sulawesi Province produced different life effects. The Munanese can have a village center in Kendari City as poor people, while the Tolakinese as local residents of the Southeastern peninsula of Sulawesi do not have a village center. These village centers have become one of the places of inheritance of community poverty in Kendari City. There are no social integration efforts in the community. This can be a lesson for national attitudes. The image of the Munanese as poor people, port workers, and unskilled workers originates from the political arena of the government in the past. Recommendations, the government should be neutral in dealing with the people and try to create social integration in the community in Kendari City.

## References

1. Abdullah M. Zein dan Rekson Solo Limba (2012) Analisis Konflik dan Rekomendasi Kebijakan di Kota Kendari. Kendari: Laporan Hasil Penelitian Balai Penelitian Unhalu, tidak diterbitkan.
2. Adimagistra, Tiasa, dan Bitta Pigawati (2016) Evaluasi Penyediaan Sarana Dan Prasarana Di Perumahan Puri Dinar Mas Semarang Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1 p. 57-65
3. Aini, Nurul (2019) perkembangan ekonomi kota medan dan perkembangan ekonomi kawasan pesisir sekitarnya; suatu review atas tulisan welly andriant, bachtiar h. m. budi dan kasyful mahalli. jurnal ilmiah fakultas teknik sipil danperencanaan, institut teknologi sepuluh nopember (its).
4. Alifiansyah, Dimas dan Abd. Jamal (2019) Profil Urban Kota Banda Aceh. Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa (JIM) Ekonomi Pembangunan Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Unsyiah, Vol.2 No.1, p. 62- 72
5. Aquarita, Dian, Arief Rosyidie, Wiwik Dwi Pratiwi (2016) Potensi Pengembangan Wisata Sepeda Di Kota Bandung Berdasarkan Persepsi Dan Preferensi Wisatawan. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota. Volume 4, Nomor 1 P.14-20
6. Barlian (2010) Gerakan Mahasiswa di Kendari, Sulawesi Tenggara. Disertasi Universitas Negeri Makassar: tidak diterbitkan.
7. Barth, Frederik (1969) "Introduction," in *Ethnic Group and Boundaries The social Organotation of Culture Difference*. Boston: Litle Brown and Company
8. Berthyn Lakebo, Bertin (1983) Sistem Kesatuan Budaya Komunitas Orang Tolaki, Buton, Muna. Kendari: Depdikbud Tingkat I Sulawesi Tenggara, tidak diterbitkan.
9. Bourdieu, Pierre (1988[1984]). *Homo Academicus*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, Cabridge Polity Press.
10. BPS Kota Kendari, 2020.
11. Bruner, Edward M. (1974) "The Expression of Ethnicity in Indonesia", *Urban Ethnicity*. A. Cohen, Eds. London: Tavistock.
12. ----- (1984) *Text, Play, and Stories* (ed.). Washington DC: American Athropological Association.
13. Bogdan, Robert C. (1972) *Participant Observation in Organizational Setting*, Syracuse, N.Y. Syracuse University Press.
14. Bourdieu, Pierre (1976) *Out Line of Theory and Practice*. London, New York, Melbourne: University of Cambridge.
15. ----- (1983) *Form of Capital*. Originally Published as "*Ökonomisches Kapital, kulturelles Kapital, soziales Kapital*." in *Soziale Ungleichheiten (Soziale Welt, Sonderheft 2)*, edited by Reinhard Kreckel. Goettingen: Otto Schartz & Co. pp. 183-98. Translated by Richard Nice.
16. Damayanti, Maya (2016) Peningkatan Kinerja Dan Keselamatan Persimpangan Di Kawasan Pusat Kota Malang. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota. Volume 4, Nomor 1, p. 1-13.
17. Departemen Penerangan (1953) Republik Indonesia. Provinsi Sulawesi; Jakarta: tidak diterbitkan.
18. Depdagri (1992) Profil Provinsi RI Sulawesi Tenggara. Jakarta: Yayasan Bakti Wawasan Nusantara.
19. Denzin, Norman K. And Yvonna S. Lincoln (eds). 2005 *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London, New Delhi: Sage Publication.
20. Dewi Wulanningrum, Sintia, Theresia Budi Jayanti (2016) Perencanaan Konsep Minapolitan Di Kawasan Tambak Lorok, Semarang Utara. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1 p. 21-27



21. Dirman, La Ode (2007) Sejarah Sulawesi Tenggara. Kendari, Badan Riset Daerah Sulawesi Tenggara, Kendari: tidak diterbitkan.
22. D., Said (2007) Lakilaponto – Murhum – Haluoleo, Gelar Sultan Qaimoeddin Khalifatul Khamiz. Profil Tokoh Pejuang Kemanusiaan”. *Wakapendik*. 2, 1-116.
23. Foucault, Michel (1980) Power/Knowledge, Selected Interview & Other Writing 1972-1977, New York: Pantheon.
24. [Furnivall, John S.](#) (2009). Hindia Belanda: Studi tentang Ekonomi Majemuk. Jakarta: Freedom Institute.
25. Hamid, Nisrina, Asy Ari Adnan Hakim, Waode Maratun Shaleha (2021) Etos Kerja Dan Pengembangan Karir Terhadap Komitmen Organisasi Karyawan Pada Hotel Claro Kota Kendari. Jurnal Valuasi. Volume 1 Nomor 1 pp. 200-215. DOI Issue : 10.46306/vls.vii1.
26. Hartono, Yudi, Dodeik Phrasetyo Utomo, dan Yuli Astutik, Dewi Sugiarti, Intan Permata Sari (2014: 74- 96) Perkembangan Kota Madiun Sebagai Kota Gadis Tahun 2000-2013. Jurnal Agastya, Vol. 04 NO. 02 p. 74-96.
27. *Hobbes, Thomas 1984. Leviathan. New York: Penguin Books.*
28. Joko Sujarto (1993) perkembangan kota baru. telaah. jurnal pwk no. 9, p. 3-25.
29. Husen Chalik, A. Husen (1976) Sejarah Daerah Kendari. Kendari: Depdikbud Tingkat I Sulawesi Tenggara Proyek Penggalan Nilai-Nilai Budaya dan Sejarah, tidak diterbitkan.
30. Irma dan Swaidatul Masluhiya AF (2020) Perbedaan Karakteristik Keluarga Dengan Kejadian Gizi Kurang Pada Balita Suku Bajo Dan Non Bajo Di Wilayah Pesisir Kota Kendari. Jurnal CARE Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Kesehatan, Vol 8, No 1. pp. 74-83.
31. *Jumaidin, La Ode (2011) Identifikasi dan Pemetaan Potensi Konflik Sosial Serta Skenario Pencegahannya (Studi Tentang Model Penyelesaian Konflik Sosial Berbasis Kearifan Lokal Antaretnis di Kota Kendari. Kendari: Laporan Hasil Penelitian Balai Penelitian Unhalu. Tidak diterbitkan.*
32. *Justawan dan Adrian Tawai (2012) Dinamika Sosial Mahasiswa (Studi Tentang Integrasi dan Wacana Pluralitas Mahasiswa Pada Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Unhalu. Kendari: Laporan Hasil Penelitian Balai Penelitian Unhalu, tidak diterbitkan.*
33. Karmisla (2013) Budaya Politik Aktivis Mahasiswa Jurusan Antropologi Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Haluoleo. Sripsi, Kendari. Tidak diterbitkan.
34. Kruijt, A.I.B. (1992) Een En Ander Over De Tolaki Van Mekongga; dalam Tijd LXI, Hal 427-470.
35. Lassiter, Luke Eric (2005). The Chicago Guide to Callaboratiive Ethnography. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
36. Latif Aslan, Juhaepa, dan Megawati A. Tawuloa (2018: 288-297). Upaya Buruh Perempuan Yang Telah Berumah Tangga Dalam Membagi Waktu Antara Keluarga Dan Pekerjaan (Studi di PT. Sulawesi Tenggara Tuna Perikanan Samudera Kota Kendari). Neo Societal; Vol. 3; No. 1; p. 288-297.
37. Laxmi, dan Erens Elvianus Koodoh (2011) Identifikasi Konflik dan Kekerasan di Lingkungan Kampus Unhalu. Kendari: laporan Hasil Penelitian Balai Penelitian Unhalu, tidak diterbitkan.
38. La Welendo, Ridwansyah Nuhun, Muh. Abdul Rajab (2021) Model On-Street Pada Kawasan Pasar Anduonohu Kota Kendari. STABILITA]] Jurnal Ilmiah Teknik Sipil. Vol. 9 No. 1. pp. 11-20. Tersedia di [http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/stabilita\\_jtsuho/](http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/stabilita_jtsuho/) index
39. Lingling Peng (2019 ) urbanization and public policy research: how should local think tanks act? scientific research publishing. open journal of social sciences, 7, p. 361-357. doi: 10.4236/jss.2019.77030.
40. Li, Tania Murray (2007) *The Will to Improve. Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
41. Napirah, Muh Ryman, Abd Rahman, Agustina Tony (2016: 28-38) Faktor-Faktor Yang Berhubungan Dengan Pemanfaatan Pelayanan Kesehatan Di Wilayah Kerja Puskesmas Tambarana Kecamatan Poso Pesisir Utara Kabupaten Poso. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1 p. 28-38.
42. Ngangi, Reddy Silvano, Papia J.C Franklin & Windy Mononimbar (2018: 82-92) Analisis Pertumbuhan Kawasan Mapanget Sebagai Kota Baru. Jurnal Jurnal Spasial Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota Vol 5. No. 1, 2018, p.82-92.
43. Nur, Rifai (1999). Pasukan Djihad Konawe: (Gejolak Sosial di Kewedanaan Kendari Sulawesi Tenggara 1955-1958). Jakarta: Tesis Program Studi Ilmu Sejarah Pascasarjana Universitas Indonesia.
44. Olsen, Wendy (2004) Triangulation Forthcoming as a chapter in Developments in Sociology. In M. Holborn (ed). Ormskirk: Causeway Press.

45. Pemda Tk. I Sulawesi Tenggara (2005) Monografi Daerah Sulawesi Tenggara. Kendari: Biro Pemerintahan Daerah Tk. I Sulawesi Tenggara, tidak diterbitkan.
46. Prafitri, Gita Ratri, Maya Damayanti (2016: 74- 82) Kapasitas Kelembagaan Dalam Pengembangan Desa Wisata (Studi Kasus: Desa Wisata Ketenger, Banyumas. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1, p. 74-82
47. Rahman, Ali (2004) Gerakan Mahasiswa Kampus Perak: Studi di Kota Kendari. Skripsi FISIP Unhalu, Kendari, tidak diterbitkan.
48. Su'ud Muslimin (2001) Asal Usul Etnik Tolaki Dan Hubungan Kekerabatan Etnik-Etnik di Sulawesi Tenggara. ( Makalah seminar) yang diselenggarakan FKIP Unhalu 14 Februari 2001.
49. Raditya, Dewa, Putra, dan Wisnu Pradoto (2016: 66-73) Pola Dan Faktor Perkembangan Pemanfaatan Lahan Di Kecamatan Mranggen, Kabupaten Demak. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1 p. 66-73
50. Rezagama, Arya, dan Ahmad Tamlikha (2016: 39-48) Identifikasi Pencemar Waduk Manggar Kota Balikpapan. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1 p. 39-48.
51. Rosni, muhammad arif, herdi (2016 ) “analisis kondisi sarana dan prasarana pasar tradisional kampung lalang di kecamatan medan tunggal kota medan. jurnal geografi vol 8 no. 2 p. 113-123.
52. Rumetna, matheus supriyanto, eko sediyono, dan kristoko dwi hartomo (2017: 225- 234). analisis perubahan tata guna lahan di kabupaten bantul menggunakan metode global moran's i. jurnal buana informatika, volume 8, nomor 4, p. 225-234.
53. Spradley, james (1997) metode etnografi.. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana
54. Sri Maryanti dan Febrianty Erni Enrike (2019) KARAKTERISTIK IBU DENGAN PERSALINAN SECTIO CAESARIA DI RUMAH SAKIT DR. R. ISMOYO KOTA KENDARI. Jurnal Ilmiah Kesehatan Diagnosis Volume 14 Nomor 4, pp. 407-410.
55. Sriyanto, Bambang, Eko Prakoso, Dan Luthfi Muta'ali (2005). Dinamika Pertumbuhan Kota-Kota Dan Pemilihan Alternatif Pusat Pertumbuhan Baru Di Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. Majalah Geografi Indonesia, vol. 17 no. 2, p. 155-179.
56. Taeha, M. Arsyad (1982).. Kabupaten Sulawesi Tenggara (Fase Perkembangan) Ke Status Provinsi, Kendari : Biro Hukum Pemda Tk. I Sulawesi Tenggara.
57. Tamburaka, Rustam E.(1999) Resensi Hasil Seminar Nasional Tentang Peranan dan Perjuangan Haluoleo (1493-1587) untuk Diusulkan Sebagai Pahlwan Nasional. Kendari: Panitia Seminar Nasional Kerjasama Pemda Tingkat I Sulawesi Tenggara Dengan Unhalu , Kendari, 24 Agustus 1999, Tidak Diterbitkan.
58. Tamburaka, Rustam et.all. (2002). Sejarah Sulawesi Tenggara dan 40 Tahun Sulawesi Tenggara Membangun. Jakarta: C.V Himep.
59. Tarimana, Abdur Rauf (1985) Sebagai Pusat Kebudayaan Tolaki. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
60. Tirtosudarmo, R. (2006)“Desentralisasi dan Good Governance di Sulawesi Tenggara” dalam H. Warsilah, R. Tirtosudarmo, T. J. Lan, & Soewarsono (2006), *Kelas Menengah & Demokratisasi*. Jakarta: Pusat Litbang Kemasyarakatan dan Kebudayaan LIPI - LIPI Press.
61. Tuwu, Darmin (2011) Merajut Perdamaian Kampus Unhalu (Konteks, Aktor, Dinamika, dan Resolusi Konflik Unhalu. Kendari: Laporan Hasil Penelitian Balai Penelitian Unhalu, tidak diterbitkan.
62. Vioya, Arrauda (2010: 215-226) Tahapan Perkembangan Kawasan Metropolitan Jakarta Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota, Vol. 21 No. 3, Desember 2010, hlm 215 – 226.
63. Wijaya, Bayu, Dan Hastarini Dwi Atmanti (2006: 101-118) Analisis Pengembangan Wilayah Dan Sektor Potensial Guna Mendorong Pembangunan Di Kota Salatiga. Jurnal Dinamika Pembangunan No. 2. P 101 – 118.
64. Xiaomei pu ( 2019: 252-256) an overview of research on the definition and formation of cities. scientific research publishing. open journal of social sciences, 7,p. 252-256. doi: 10.4236/jss.2019.76021.
65. Yuliasuti, Nany, Annisa Muawanah (2016) Transformasi Perumahan Sosial Dan Keberlanjutan Perumahan Di Perumnas Sendangmulyo. Jurnal Pengembangan Kota, Volume 4, Nomor 1 p. 83-90.
66. Zainuddin, Asnia, Fithria, La Ode Ali Imran Ahmad, Sriana Meiriani Nurardhi (2018: 1-5 ) Aktor Yang Berhubungan Dengan Konsumsi Jajanan Pada Anak Di Sdn 2 Baruga Kota Kendari. Preventif Journal. Jurnal Ilmiah Praktisi Kesehatan Masyarakat Sulawesi Tenggara, Vol. 3/No.1, P. 1-5.
67. Sumber:<https://www.slideshare.net/cahsarmili/sejarah-kendari>, diakses tanggal 27 Juli 2019.
68. Sumber:[https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kota\\_Kendari#Jumlah\\_dan\\_Laju\\_Pertumbuhan](https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kota_Kendari#Jumlah_dan_Laju_Pertumbuhan). diakses tanggal 27 Juli 2019.



69. Sumber: <https://kendarikota.bps.go.id/dynamictable/2018/01/16/37/jumlah-penduduk-dan-rasio-jenis-kelamin-menurut-kecamatan-di-kota-kendari-2016.html> diakses tanggal 27 Juli 2019.