



Hambor as little narrative in managing conflict and peace situation in Manggarai, Flores, East Nusa Tenggara

Maksimilianus Jemali^{1*}, JB Banawiratma², Wening Udasmoro³

¹Inter-Religious Studies Program UGM Graduate School, and Indonesia Catholic University of Saint Paul Ruteng; ²Duta Wacana Christian University; ³Universitas Gadjah Mada

*<maksimilianusjemali82@mail.ugm.ac.id>

Abstract

This article explores the practice of Hambor tradition as little narrative in managing conflict and peace situations in Manggarai, Eastern Indonesia. Hambor, which means peace, is a component of local wisdom and a strategy for resolving conflict based on local culture. There are several issues to address, including the following: what is the meaning, impact, and manifestation of Hambor for Manggarai people on a personal and social level? What is the role of Hambor tradition in managing conflict and peace in Manggarai? This research used the ethnographic method through the genetic structuralism approach developed by the French philosopher and sociologist Pierre Bourdieu to understand the meaning, impact, and implementation of the Hambor process in daily life by the Manggaraian speech community. The research result shows that Hambor is the leading force in creating peace and harmony for the Manggarai people. Hambor is the substance of harmony between humans, the world (tana lino), the ancestors (wura agu ceki), and the God (Mori Kraéng). Hambor process in Manggarai will be useful if it is based on a mutual commitment to overcoming disputes, transformative option (post-conflict), and the involvement and willingness of perpetrator and victim to forgive one another.

Keywords: Hambor, little narrative, Bourdieu, conflict, peace

Introduction

This article provides an in-depth exploration of the practice of the *Hambor* tradition in Manggarai Regency, Flores, East Nusa Tenggara,

Indonesia. *Hambor*, which means peace is a form of peace tradition that has persisted to the present day. This exploration of *Hambor* attempts to understand the significance of praxis

and cultural activities as little narrative and an integral part of local people's everyday lives. The authors connected the *Hambor* tradition with Bourdieu's habitus, field, capital, and practice theory. This tradition develops within childhood and reflects the durability of practical experience within a personal and social context.

In the postmodern era, the fundamental paradigm of scientific knowledge is flexibility toward little narratives. Jean-François Lyotard, a French postmodern paradigmatic philosopher, emphasized that scientific knowledge of the postmodern era must examine the vitality of little narratives in local culture.[1] Scientific knowledge contributes to the process of transition. It is focused not only on the context of scientific and academic thought but also on the practical life of the grassroots.

Lyotard saw the urgency of the transition of the philosophy paradigm and the movement of knowledge called postmodernism.[1] Postmodernism, which European theorists in the 1970s took up, is a philosophical movement to overcome the crisis of grand narratives[2] in modernity and take the little narratives or local cultures as a representation of knowledge. Pierre Bourdieu, a French philosopher, and a sociologist, also criticizes modern society as a structure of domination due to inequity in the distribution of material resources.[3]

Exploring little narratives in local

cultures is also an important study of Bourdieu's philosophy and sociology. He prioritized the empirical approach when he was researching Algeria.[4] Bourdieu criticizes the development of philosophy, which overemphasizes the dualistic position between agent and structure, subjectivism and objectivism, individualism and structuralism, mechanicalism and finalism.[5] He claimed that to overcome the divide of dualistic position,[6] the choice between the two groups is a false choice or false anonymities.[5],[7]

Bourdieu attempts to "reconcile" the divergent analytic frames of objectivism and subjectivism[8] and integrates both. He defines the new perspective about the relationship between agents and structure. He further explores the practice activities constituted through the dialectics of objective social relations and actions in everyday lives based on subjective dispositions.[8],[9] As a relational theorist, Bourdieu said that what exists in the social world are objective relations. The real is relational. [10],[11],[12] Through habitus, objective relations bind the objective with the subjective social world[13] and represents the relationship between what agents do in the field and the various limitation of their actions within that field.[14] In identifying the culture of society, Bourdieu mentions five aspects of cultural reproduction and social reproduction, such as habitus,

field, capital, practice,[15] and illusion.
[16]

Bourdieu believed the conditions of society always grew and developed as a result of the embodied habits. It is called habitus. Habitus is an old Latin term, includes the concept of bodily hexis by Aristoteles, which Thomas Aquinas was changed and transmitted with memory and learning. However, Bourdieu used habitus in a distinctive and specific way.[17],[18] Through the habitus, agents come to know the world and feel at home in the world as the world is embodied in them.[16] Habitus is internalized and rooted in familial socialization and is conditioned by the position of agents in the social structure.[15] In local communities, various habitus has its own identity, characteristic, and doxa. Substantially, what counts as doxa for one habitus may differ from what counts as doxa in another habitus.[19]

Bourdieu defines habitus ‘as a set of durable, transposable structuring dispositions; structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures’.[20] This definition shows two pivotal points: first, habitus is shaped by the structures of society. Second, habitus organises and generates praxis.[21],[22] In the context of the meaning of these two pivotal points, Power analysis that habitus is about the product of structures and producer of practices and the reproducer of structures though potentially with

modifications.[23] In the context of the product of history, habitus produces individual and collective practices following the schemes engendered by history.[17],[20] Practices allow us to act while thinking, planning, considering, or responding to various changes in a social context.[24]

Although habitus is a system of durable, it does not mean that habitus is eternal[11] or unchangeable.[25] Habitus is not a static concept[26] because a dialectical relationship between agents and structures allows for changes in context. Change is not only based on the current situation. Changes always connect with the past and to the future. Durability and transposability emphasize the project from the past to the present and perpetuate the present to the future.[27] Humans are conscious beings, exist in time, and always have questions of consciousness that stretched out between a past, a present, and a future.[59] Here, Bourdieu reveals that habitus as embodied history[21] because of the present situations based on dispositions generated by past experiences.[25] Atkinson disclosed that ‘The habitus is the individual’s sense of what is possible, their intuition of the game, built up through the past experiences in the field and adjusted to ongoing experience within the field’.
[28]

Habitus provides light on the conditions that enable the social transformation to occur or social change

become possible[22] According to his findings, Schlerka shows Bourdieu as a change theorist focusing on social aging as the changes of disposition resulting from communal experience, intergenerational changes as a product of education, and struggle as a significant category of change.[25] These changes are always related to the role of the individual to accumulate and mobilize the forms of capital and transform or legitimate the meaning of relation through changes in the doxa and practical logic.[29] Therefore, agents will be better understood as dynamic subjects, context-sensitive, and have sensibility.[30] However, we must understand that individuals will behave in a certain way in certain circumstances.[31],[32]

Bourdieu also saw the concept of the social field as the disposition of habitus. The dialectical relationship between habitus and the social field is one of the ontological complicity between the individual and the social world. Bourdieu affirmed that it was important to synthesise subjectivity and objectivity[11],[16],[33] the social field. Objectivity and subjectivity were two sides of the same coin.[34] This idea shows that the field plays an essential role in building the relationship between autonomy and engagement.[35] In the field, there is a social space. A social space means agents' objective positions and relations are rooted in distributions and configurations of

capital.[13],[36],[37] The social space is also used to assert an identity of the community, to express itself and its social goals, and create networks between group members.[38]

Bourdieu's theory on the field demonstrates the identity of society. Society is divided into a series of fields, including autonomous relatively and characterized by organizing logic, interests, and particular principles,[39] and each field has its habitus, doxa, and illusio. Here, doxa means taken for granted what goes on in the field. Illusio means belief in the significance of the field's stakes as a specific transmission of libidinal energy.[28] In the social field, individuals construct relationships to create structures. Every structure implements its role. However, according to Bourdieu's analysis, 'social structure is shaped through social connections and power relations, the historicity of events, and the role of institutions'. [5] Therefore, the field also provides for competition and conflict to have a strategic position in the structure. Even in the processes of conflict, competition, and invidious distinction are crucial dynamics in the social field generally. Thus, the field is a concrete arena of struggle, contestation,[13] and action.[36] Every people is looking for strategies to improve or maintain their respective positions.[28],[37] In the context of accumulated capitals by agents or groups in the field, capital may decrease or increase depending on how

they are used and mobilize the capacity to produce specific effects.[20] In the social field, the strategy of struggle needs capital. Capital is the kind of resources that may be used consciously or unconsciously, and agents lead the social interaction or the products of interactions.[13] This concept of capital is interconnected with the social space and habitus positions[37] and the field. [60] Therefore, agents attempt to have capital within a field and struggle to accumulate or monopolize the kinds of capital that determine their strategic positions.[40],[61] Bourdieu criticizes and extends the concept of economic capital found in Karl Marx to its relation with cultural, social, and symbolic capital. Bourdieu affirmed the four forms of capital: economic capital, cultural capital, social capital, and symbolic capital.[5],[41],[42] The relationship between the four capitals is transformational because it helps the subject develop one capital that impacts other capitals. Nevertheless, these capitals are non-replaceable because they exist with their independent logic and context.[43] Each capital form can be explained below:

First, the economic capital. Economic capital is not independent but inherent in other capitals. This capital refers directly to convertible into money and property rights.[43]

The second, social capital. Social capital is a particular potential capacity of agents as members of society

and tradition. The role of agents in social life and the series of events is a significant part of this capital. Social capital is a never-ending effort achievement in social life. There are many ways to agents negotiate this social capital. The negotiation's success depends on social agents' position in the social field.[44]

Third, cultural capital. Bourdieu defines cultural capital as 'knowledge, information, or informal know-hows and styles that can function as resources for solving relevant problems in a given field or converted to and from other types of resources'.[45] Through this cultural capital, agents can explore their cultural knowledge and cultural values for the common interest. Cultural competencies are rooted in dispositions, embodied habits, and patterns of categorization, and emotional resonance of the habitus. [46] Children inherit cultural capital from their parents and the educational system from their teachers.[47] Here, families, schools, workplaces, and others can shape the dispositions of the subject.[48] There are three essential dimensions of cultural capital, the embodied state, the objectified state, and the institutionalized state.[49]

Fourth, symbolic capital. Bourdieu also mentions symbolic capital as the fourth capital. Bourdieu reveals that economic capital is not the only thing important in human relations but also symbolic capital[50] through cultural

symbols and symbolic positions in local communities. Symbolic capital affects social agents' recognition, prestige, and appreciation. Therefore the struggle for prestige and recognition is a fundamental dimension of social life. [51]. Capital is also closely related to symbolic power. Symbolic power can generate trust, obedience, and consensus in the dominated. [52]

Bourdieu's conceptual formulation stresses the relational frame between agent and society. The agent does not stand in opposition to society. The agent is one of the social existence forms. [53],[54] Matthäus, in his exploration of Bourdieu's thinking, reveals that the discourse on habitus always relates to 'individuals as always becoming social beings, as essentialized and existentialized subjects'. [55] In social practices, there is a condition which models as "the dialectic of the internalization of externality and the externalization of internality. [20],[54],[56] It means that the subjects receive the facts of the external world in their social life and give their capacities for social life.

Bourdieu's dialectical concept refers to knowledge and practical relation. Bourdieu analogous practical knowledge with Aristotle's term, "phronesis". [11] Phronesis is a continually moving forward process about social values in the traditions of society. This knowledge can be found in traditional leaders or cultural leaders

through experience and learning in social life.

The epistemological basis of Bourdieu's work is inseparable from the dialectical relationship between agents and structures in the social world. This relationship can refine the habitus, capitals, and practice orientation of agents. However, undeniable, the social relationship also appears conflict. To find conflict resolution is an important point, precisely, through the local tradition. One of the essential peace traditions is *Hambor* in Manggaraian culture.

Method

This research used an ethnographic method through the genetic structuralism approach. This method was used by Bourdieu when researching Algeria to formulate his habitus theory. The orientation of the method is to comprehend the elements of habitus, capitals, field, praxis, and doxa in Manggaraian culture, mainly how the power of the *Hambor* gives influence to their everyday lives and how they are making *Hambor* as the way to resolve conflicts and to maintain peace situation. The authors intend to comprehensively formulate scientific explanations related to the meaning of *Hambor* tradition, its types, essential goals, and philosophical underpinnings. The first tool in this research is the authors themselves, supported by interview guides and video recordings.

The research was conducted in Manggarai Regency from September 2020 to June 2021.

Data collection technique is related to the research problem to be solved, that is, *Hambor* as the way to managing conflict and peace situation. Therefore, there were fifty interviewees in this research from eight categories: eight traditional leaders (ages 50-70), eight cultural experts (ages 40-60), eight religious leaders (ages 25-45), eight academics (ages 35-60), ten youths (ages 20-35), and eight government figures (ages 30-60). From these interviewees, there are thirty male interviewees and twenty female interviewees. Specifically, in conducting the interview process with traditional leaders, the authors use some tools as part of Manggaraian tradition, such as a rooster, a bottle of tuak- a traditional alcoholic drink (kapu manuk lélé tuak), and cigarettes. The interviewees were selected by using the purposive technique. The reason for selecting these interviewees is based on their knowledge, experiences, and involvement in the *Hambor* process.

In this research, the authors formulate the interview questions based on the binding terms of Bourdieu's theory. There are 18 questions about the meaning and the praxis of *Hambor* tradition, 12 questions about habitus in the context of Manggaraian culture, seven questions about the social field, nine questions about the capitals,

six questions about the cultural responsibility, and six questions about inter-religious *Hambor* tradition. This research used the qualitative data analysis method to understand the data comprehensively on *Hambor*. The authors also classify data into these six parts. From many responses by the interviewees, authors selected the meaning of certain adages (*go 'et-go 'et*), dominant, significant, and relevant words. Based on the selection process, the authors describe it in findings and discussion.

Findings

Ruku Mosé Hambor (Habitus of Peaceful Life)

Hambor is a peace tradition of Manggaraian culture, Flores, East Nusa Tenggara, Indonesia. *Hambor*, a Manggarai word, which means peace is also synonym with the expressions of living in peace (*mosé Hambor*), making new peace (*damé kolé*), treating others properly (*di'a tau*), loving each other (*momang tau*), and maintaining unity (*nai ca anggit, tuka ca léléng*). This meaning reveals individuals connected with the people outside.

Hambor, as a local tradition, has a specific rite and particular meaning. This tradition develops within childhood from one generation to another generation and reflects the durability of practical experience within a social context. *Hambor* is called habitus of peace. Manggarai people mention

habitus as ‘*ruku*’, ‘*saké*’ or ‘*serong disé empo, mbaté disé amé, pedé disé endé*’. *Ruku* is the durability of communal experience and relationship generated by ancestors (*ruku eta mai empon* or *saké disé empo*), internalized and externalized personally and communally by the present generation (*ruku data uwa weru ata haéng taé repéng pedé*), and should be developed by future generation (*wa-wa na’a, urang tali wua tungku tali wunut*). ‘*Ruku mosé Hambor*’ shows the experience of present situations on the substance of dispositions inherited by the past experiences and putting the significance to the future experiences.

Relationally, Manggarai people are conscious that many life substances have *Hambor* dimensions. *Hambor* is the identity (*tandan*) and entity (*rao neho ajo cawi neho wua*) of everyone disposition with the realities in the external world. Through *Hambor*, subjectivity and collectivity are mutual dialectical relationships. This collectivity shows habitus of a peaceful life is not exclusive but inclusive disposition because the subject needs the existence of others.

Manggarai people see that ‘*ruku mosé Hambor*’ has a dialectical relationship with the external world. They divide the world into two forms: the macro-cosmic world (*tana lino mésé*) and the micro-cosmic world (*tana lino koé*). *Tana lino mésé* is the whole creation (*awangn éta, tanan*

wa or heaven and earth). *Tana lino koé* means the small earth refers to the created (human being). The word ‘*koé*’, which means small, symbolizes the smallness of the human being in front of heaven and earth. While ‘*tana lino mésé*’ means vast creation, symbolizing the universe’s greatness and power. Between ‘*tana lino mésé*’ and ‘*tana lino koé*’ have a mutual relationship. There is a definitive link for both. Therefore, the Manggarai people call this world like a giant spider web. If humans (as one of the webs) make a mistake and disintegrate from the other, then there are broken relations. In this context, *Hambor*, as a peace tradition, brings people in connectivity with a more powerful and more substantial system.

Manggarai people utilize ‘*ruku mosé Hambor*’ in the collective activity of society. They have *Hambor* as an integral part of relational life between humans, nature, and God. The relationship with nature appears in making peace with the trees (*Hambor haju*), with the wild animals (*Hambor kakar tana*), and with the spirit of land keeper (*Hambor naga tana*).

Hambor haju is a form of tradition still implemented, specifically when families build a new house (*Adak hesé ngando*) in the village. The tree is one of the most popular building materials, and it is used in house construction. The trees may be brought from the forests. In Manggarai belief, conflict can occur between the kinds of trees because of

differences of origins. The trees came from different places (*haju woléng pu 'u*, *haju lagé ngalor*) with different spirits. They fight each other. Therefore, there is a rite to making peace with them. The trees have their spirit. *Hambor haju* ritual intends to make the trees living in peace together. The owner of the house can live comfortably and undisturbed (*toé manga rojong toko*, *bentang tuju*, *mut kali locé kumbu*). The trees have a transformation process. They are no longer called the trees, but they are an integral part of a house.

Hambor kakar tana can occur when someone injures a wild animal accidentally. There is the belief that the perpetrator also feels the same psychic pain when a sick or injured wild animal. This rite intends to the perpetrator talks to the injured animal, ideally proferring healing and making reconciliation. Local people also mention this *Hambor* as '*compung*' or '*rudak*'. Concerning the spirit of the land keeper, they are also making '*Hambor naga tana*'. They ask permission to the spirit of the land keeper when making public facilities to prevent workplace accidents.

Manggarai people also making '*ruku mosé Hambor*' with God. They believe that God has a close relationship with humans. There is three identification of God. First, cosmologically. God is called as '*awangn éta-tanan wa*' (the sky above, the earth below), '*ulun lé-wa'in lau*' (the head in the spring and the foot in

the ocean), '*parn awo-kolépn salé*' (the sunrise in the east and sunset in the west). Second, anthropologically. God as '*amé éta mai-iné wa mai*' (father above and mother below), *amé rinding mané-iné rinding wié* (a father act to protect his children in the afternoon and a mother act to protect her children at night). Third, theologically. God as '*Mori ata jari agu dédék*', *Mori Kraéng* (the founder and the Creator). They called God '*Mori Kraéng*' after Christianity started its mission in the Manggarai region.

For Manggarai people, making peace is a human substance. There are two kinds of *Hambor* with the soul: '*Hambor weki agu wakar*' (making peace with the soul) and '*Hambor agu asé ka'é weki*' (making peace with the spirit of self-keeper). '*Hambor weki agu wakar*' departs from Manggaraian belief that before a mother pregnancy (*dé'i/wantang*), she or her husband have a dream of drawing water from the spring (*nipi téku waé lé waé téku*). Drawing water (as the source of life) from the spring is a symbol of the soul (*wakar*) of the baby. The water becomes amniotic fluid. The amniotic fluid comes out from the mother's womb during birth. It is called '*ka'én*' (brother) or '*waé inungn*' (drinking water). '*Ka'én*' or '*waé inungn*' means the soul of the baby. For Manggarai people, soul and body are two separate and autonomous elements. Making a *Hambor* between body and soul is most important to unite

them. If the soul does not unite with the body, a baby will become an idiot and suffer from chronic illness (*beti jéjék*).

'Hambor agu asé ka'é weki', specifically, is making for teenagers. In Manggaraian belief, teenagers will be the dream about first sex, called a wet dream. It is natural for boys and girls. With whom they are making love in the dream, that is called *'asé ka'é wéki'*. *Asé-ka'é wéki* is also referred to as *'wina pele sina'* (the wife in another world) for boys and *rona pele sina* (the husband in another world) for girls. Boys and girls are required to feeding the soul (*takung asé ka'é weki*) as a symbol of unity and drawing attention to their wife or husband in another world. *Hambor agu asé ka'é weki* is significant, so there is no angry and sulky from *wina-rona pele sina*.

Ruku Hambor in Social Field

Conflicts in the Field

Hambor as a habitus (*ruku*) cannot be separated from the subject's disposition in the social field. For Manggaraian, the field consists of five substantial elements: the village (*béo baté élor*), the house (*mbaru baté ka'éng*), home yards (*natas baté labar*), the wellspring (*waé baté téku*), and the communal land as a workplace (*uma/lingko baté duat*). The main requirement for a new village is that villagers must have these five elements. There is no only harmony in the field between those five elements, but also conflicts and

competitions. Conflicts are identified as *'beté tau, toé curup tau, da'at tau, méla tau'* (disharmony with one another), *'biké, behas, koas'* (disintegration), *'jogot, kodo, ning, rangkat'* (hatred), *'pélé ngger lé, pacu ngger lau'* (opposite conditions each other). So, conflict, for Manggarai people, means disharmony, disintegration, hatred, and opposite conditions.

Socially, in the practical life of the Manggaraian community, there are forms of conflict and violence, such as *'lewang tau'* or *'gentes tau'* (arguing), *'raha tau'*, *'ngaok tau'*, *'loer tau'* (fighting, have an argument and hitting each other). There are also *'ongga tau'* or *'rani tau'* (hitting each other physically), *'paki tau'* (fighting that involves using sharp tools but does not cause death), *'ala tau'* (fighting that causes death). There are many reasons for conflict, such as *'toto rang'* (showing domination for others), *'loér tau'* (bullying each other), *'campit langang, rumbu lingko'* (land problems), or *'woléng imbi'* (religious issues).

Conflicts can involve two or more actors (*campit lata sua ko lata do*), between wife and husband (*wina agu rona*), parents and children (*ata tu'a agu ro'éng koéd*), sisters and brothers (*weta agu nara*), the youngest and the eldest (*asé agu ka'é*), between families (*léténg kilo*), between clans (*léténg panga*), between extended families, such as *'anak wina'* (wife receiver or recipient of the wife) with *'anak rona'* (wife giver

or giver of the wife), between villagers (*asé ka'é pa'ang ngaung*), between villages (*léténg béo*), between villagers and immigrants (*léténg asé ka'é ata lonto béo agu ata long*), and between people of different faiths (*léténg asé ka'é woléng imbi*).

Conflict Resolution in the Field through Hambor

In a conflict situation, *Hambor* means an effort to restore negative attitudes because of problems in the family or society (*caca mbolot*). Conflict happens because practical life is never free from disputes and quarrels. Subject or groups members show their superiority (*toto rang*) before others by committing acts of violence.

Hambor also means how to get rid of hatred and lousy attitude through the running water and the sunset (*oké du waés laud du lesos saléd sanggéd jogot agu rangkat tau*). This meaning correlates with the commitment of conflicting parties to admit and forgive past mistakes so that destructive impacts will not happen again (*boto cuku nunga*). However, they have a hard time putting mistakes out of their mind. The adage 'oké du waés laud, du lesos saléd' relates to courage and strong determination to get out of the burdens of the past. They will have a future and start something new in a brotherhood atmosphere.

Manggarai people practicing *Hambor* in four stages:

First, conflict resolution is

conducted by two conflicting parties (a perpetrator and a victim). Conflicts, such as fighting cases, can be resolved by the conflicting parties without a mediator. This process is often called *bantang*. Both of them only show apologies (*néka rabo ta, calang daku bo, tegi nai ngalis tuka ngéngga dité/I'm sorry, I was wrong. I ask your sincerity to forgive my wrong*).

Second, conflict resolution by the head of the nuclear family (*tu'a kilo*). There is a conflict between family members. They can ask 'tu'a kilo' to resolve the conflict. 'Kilo' is a family group consisting of parents and children. A father usually becomes a "tu'a kilo" because of his charisma, responsibility, and wisdom. He invites the conflicting parties to find the best solution. It is called 'bantang kilo'. If conflicting parties agree on the resolution from 'tu'a kilo', they can make peace with apologising, shake their hands, and have dinner together.

Third, conflict resolution by the head of the clan (*tu'a panga*). *Tu'a panga* is the head of the extended family in one clan. Usually, in a village, there are clans. The combination of clans is called 'haé wa'u' or 'hae diding'. The members of clans are usually called 'hae wa'u ca beo'. Sometimes, there are conflicts between extended family. Here, 'tu'a panga' has a pivotal role in mediating the process of *Hambor*. If the conflicting parties receive the resolution by 'tu'a

panga', they can be making *Hambor* with feeding to the spirit of ancestors by '*adak manuk Hambor*' ritual. The primary orientation of this ritual is making peace and reconciliation. The same conflict will not happen again in the future (*rantang manga cuku nunga*).

Fourth, conflict resolution by the head of the village (*tu'a golo*). In the conflict between clans or between villagers, the head of the village has a prominent role in making peace. '*Tu'a golo*' will invite (*siro*) the villagers, *tu'a-tu'a kilo*, *tu'a-tu'a panga*, and *tu'a teno* to join this process as well as giving solutions as part of considerations for *tu'a golo*'s decision. Hopefully, '*tu'a golo*' has the proper resolution. They make *Hambor* in a drum traditional communal house (*mbaru gendang*) through '*lonto léok*' (sitting in a circular shape). At this moment, honestly, the conflicting parties have the opportunity to share their problems. Telling the truth within '*mbaru gendang*' is most important to conflicting parties. It is related to the Manggaraian perspective that, in '*mbaru gendang*', all words are part of a rite. They believe that '*mbaru gendang*' is a sacred place. The assumption is that they also affirm, absolutely, *Hambor* as the definitive process of conflict resolution. If they are still defending their argument and refuse the resolution from the mediators, '*tu'a golo*' will remind them about the impact of their rejection. They may

be excommunicated from the village's activities everyday lives.

Following the resolution, there is a sanction for perpetrators called '*wunis péhéng*'. '*Wunis*' means turmeric. In everyday life, turmeric is used to treat and heal wounds. '*Péhéng*' means injuries or material losses. In the following meaning, '*wunis pehéng*' is defined as a perpetrator's responsibility to heal the victims from physical injuries or material losses.

The resolution of one case can involve the leaders in the village. If '*tu'a kilo*' cannot solve the conflict, he can discuss it with '*tu'a panga*'. If '*tu'a panga*' can not find the best solution, '*tu'a kilo*' with '*tu'a panga*' will ask '*tu'a golo*' for more help. The resolution is delegated to '*tu'a teno*' and '*tu'a golo*' for land conflicts within the village. '*Tu'a teno*' is chief of land. His role is to divide the land (*lingko*) to the villagers according to '*tu'a golo*' guidance.

Praxis of Hambor

On the one hand, there is a simple way to making a *Hambor* between the conflicting parties. They have the initiative to apologise without involving the role of mediators. On the other hand, the conflicting parties need mediators, such as the *ata tu'as*, the villagers, and a specific rite. They can make rite with the following conditions:

First, there is an agreement about the place and the time of *Hambor* (*leso remong, tantu ra'up*). They can conduct

Hambor in the conflicting parties' houses, house of *tu'a kilo*, house of *tu'a panga*, or *mbaru gendang*. Second, the attendance of the perpetrator and the victim, *ata torok* (a leader of the ritual when feeding to ancestors and God), and extended family (*asé-kaé*, *wing agu dading*, *anak rona*, and *ata tu'a*). According to Manggarai belief, the ancestors and God's spirit also come and follow every stage of the ritual. Third, there are tools of *Hambor*, such as betel nut, *tuak*, roosters, cigarettes, traditional cloth (*lipa*), money, or pigs and so forth. These tools depart from the spontaneity of the perpetrator as a part of awareness of his/her mistakes.

There are several stages of the *Hambor* ritual:

First, there are welcoming words from one of the *ata tu'as*. This welcoming is called '*kari*', '*wéwa*', '*baro*', '*réis*', or '*kinda*'. The *ata tu'a* who says opening to the attendance is called '*ata kari*, *ata wéwa*, *ata kinda*'. While holding a '*tuak reis*' (*tuak* of welcome), '*ata kari*' will explain why they are sitting in a circular shape and the aims of this ritual. Specifically, this 'welcoming' is conducted to the five figures. They are perpetrator (*ata campit*), the victim (*ata péhéng*), villagers (*asé kaé pa'ang agu ngaung*), *anak wina*, and *anak rona*. The five figures also have a chance to answer what '*ata kari*' said, and actually, they are ready to join the ritual. This stage is the best moment for the perpetrator to

say "apologize publicly" to the victim before a large audience, and he/she has a chance to give tools of *Hambor*. At the same time, the victim forgives the perpetrator. After that, they have a chance to drinking cold water from one mug.

Second, '*ata torok*' will say the essence of asking of *Hambor* to the ancestors and God, thankfulness (*naring*), and refuse disaster (*kando*). It is always called '*icin*' or '*rajan torok*', '*tudak*', or '*réngé*'.

Third, hand over the people who attended the rite. This section consists of three things: (1) refusal of the causes of disintegration or conflict (*toso agu tondek*), (2) refusal of bad things (*ata da'at*), (3) protection of people's souls who are attending the rite. The intention is that their soul cannot follow the ancestral spirits. This stage is always called '*condos sangged ata*'.

Fourth, taking the bad or anticipating bad things. In this stage, *ata torok* will say about asking for instruction, whether the ritual is accepted or not. If the ritual is not accepted, it will be shown on the chicken stomach (*toto urat*). It is like swear to absence conflicts, disintegration, and disharmony. This stage is always called '*emi ata da'atn*'.

Fifth, *emi ata di'an* (taking or asking for good). It is the opposite of the fourth part of refuse bad things. The main intention of this section is to rebuild a broken relationship. With

the ritual of *Hambor*, everyone admits the significance of peaceful situations and reconciliation. The present and the future will exist if there is forgiveness and reconciliation. A rooster was killed with a knife. Its blood smeared on the toes of the perpetrator and the victim as a symbol of family reunification, ancestors' blessings and God's blessings.

In the *Hambor* process, the tools have specific meanings, such as *waé cés* (cold water), *ca mok mese* (a big mug), *tuak bakok* (white *tuak*), *towé wéngkol/lipa* (traditional cloth), and *manuk lalong bakok* (a rooster). Coldwater is a symbol of eliminating anger, hatred, arrogant attitude (*inung waé ces kudut kolé wa nai da'at, ngger wa rak, ngger éta lemas*). A mug reveals reconciliation and reunification. *Tuak* (a traditional alcoholic drink during rituals) symbolizes togetherness, happiness, and brotherhood. A rooster (not a hen/*manuk mokang*) is always used to feed the ancestors during rituals. The rooster is usually used for traditional rites in Manggaraian culture. For Manggarai people, the rooster is humans' closest. It can live in three worlds (on the land, water, and the air) and often crows to signal for specific situations. The *mbaru gendang* symbolises trust, purity, healing, peace, human relationship with God and ancestors, togetherness, and willingness to make *Hambor* a peaceful force.

The *Hambor* process above is

conflict resolution in the village field. In this case, conflict resolution needs the wisdom of traditional leaders. However, in another context, there are modifications of the *Hambor* process because of plurality. There are many people come to Manggarai with different culture, religion, and ethnic background.

These conflicts need the pivotal role of the traditional leaders, government, religious leaders, and cultural leaders to resolve conflicts through a *Hambor* process. It means people can modify the praxis of *Hambor* based on the context of conflict. It also affects the rituals and the ways to making peace between the perpetrator and the victim. They need an open apology, willingness to fulfill '*wunis peheng*', and an agreement letter. The mediators have also involved the chairman of the neighborhood association, the headman, religious figures, cultural figures, government, and even academics. Thus, the process of *Hambor* having transformation even though the same of spirit and values.

In the context of interreligious dialogue, the religious people in Manggarai also use *Hambor* as conflict resolution. In October 2014, there was a clash between young Muslims and young Catholics in Reo. Reo is a sub-district of Manggarai regency and is located in the northern part of Manggarai. In Reo, there are many Muslims and Catholics. There were no fatalities in this violent conflict, but

some were severely injured, and 14 houses were damaged. The government and Law apparatus tried to facilitate the peace process, but it was not effective. In the spirit of *Hambor*, the perpetrators, public figures, religious leaders, law apparatus, and government were sitting together to facilitate the reconciliation.

There are three steps of *Hambor*. First, each religion (Islam and Catholic) implemented its meeting and discussion facilitated by the Religious Harmony Forum. Second, there was a meeting and discussion that involved all conflicting parties in the Islamic Center. They were sharing their problem. Third, there was a meeting in Catholic Church and tried to find the causes of conflict and plan a peace agreement. Through *Hambor* and lonto leok, on 4 September 2015, there was a peace agreement. Both conflicting parties were subject to fines.[57]

Interestingly, both conflicting parties recognize the reconciliation process by the spirit of *Hambor* in Manggaraian culture. “Reo Case” proposes the result of making peace and reconciliation by the tradition of local culture such as *Hambor*. The *Hambor* tradition has tied the conflicting parties to respect for religious plurality. There are Christians besides Muslims; there are Muslims besides Buddhism, and so forth. We need everyday peace and harmony. Here, people need essential roles like ‘ata tu’a’ or the government, religious leaders, or academics.

Hambor as a Capital

Hambor has a close connection with people’s capitals, personally and socially. An capital, which is understood as ‘*manga*’, ‘*ngancéng*’, ‘*bora*’, ‘*pu’un*’. *Hambor* puts forward the ability to making peace in a complex conflict. Therefore, to realizing *Hambor*, people need to struggle and be strategic through their capital.

Economic capital is the people’s capacity to fulfill their needs. For example, they must have some materials to making *Hambor* and collect the villagers. These materials are the result of their work hard in everyday lives. Manggarai people call it, ‘*gempur agu gejur kudut manga hang bara agu towé wéngko*’. *Hambor* is related to the social capital of traditional leaders (*tu’a kilo*, *tu’a panga*, *tu’a teno*, *tu’a golo*) and the villagers. They construct the power of social networks like a spider’s web, develop their potential, and social obedience to traditions. The traditional leaders have a responsibility to secure the trust of the villagers. They must have social capital, such as being good listeners (*tong tilu te séngét*), cooperate, being patient (*lewe nai*), provide appropriate solutions (*cimpa ata agiln*), wisdom (*ngalis nai*), and the role model for many people (*toming lata do*). They can embrace ideas and thoughts. The attendance of villagers also shows a form of ontological complicity between an individual and the social world.

Hambor is also related to cultural

capital. It is part of the Manggaraian culture of peace. Everyone must have the spirit of *Hambor* in their life. Here, parents and teachers have a significant role in generating the values of *Hambor* to the children. In 'lonto léok', the parents have a chance to speak about the Manggaraian tradition of peace, the rites, the social world, and the relation with nature and God. In the same orientation, teachers, through the education process, have a responsibility to generate Manggaraian cultural values, such as *Hambor*, to the students.

Hambor also has symbolic capital. The positions in the structure of society have certain privileges. Traditional leaders have certain privileges, trust, and obedience of the people. For example, people respect the decision of 'tu'a golo'. This position is also considered unique because a village only has one 'tu'a golo'. However, his task is not easy. *Tu'a golo* must struggle to get specific recognition, trust, and credit consistently.

Discussion

Exploring philosophical values in local culture (such as *Hambor*) is an essential option for a pluralistic society. It emphasizes the urgency and significance of values as a force to eliminate forms of conflict and acts of violence. People use the unique ways that they believe as the proper process of effective conflict resolution. *Hambor* becomes a habitus of peace for the

Manggarai people. They believe that all rites have the meaning of *Hambor*, from the ritual of birth to the rituals of death.

At a philosophical level, resolutions based on local culture become useful little narratives. These narratives show the acceptance of the truth mainly and locally. Through local culture, local people have many ways to making reconciliation and peace. We also recognize that there are kinds of conflict resolution from local communities. It departs from the philosophy of everyday life. It is an opportunity to making peace based on the local culture approach.

The authors analyze that *Hambor* has three essential meanings: *Hambor* as peacekeeping, *Hambor* as peacemaking, and *Hambor* as peacebuilding.

Hambor as Peace Keeping

For Manggarai people, *Hambor* is a power of peace and harmony. It has a generative capacity that allows for modifications but within certain limits. The people show that living in peace (*mosé Hambor*) is part of human identity and entity. *Hambor* is a habitus (*ruku, serong disé empo, mbaté disé amé, pedé disé endé*) that is accepted as one of the main traditions from generation to generation explicitly. Inherently, the spirit of *Hambor* is not only in the context of conflict but also becomes a source of harmony in everyday lives. 'Mosé Hambor' correlates with the perspective of the universe like a giant spider web. Every web is most potent and requires

an understanding of harmonization. They related to each other. The web will be broken down if there are conflicts, disintegration, and hostility. Maintaining peace and harmony with one another and with nature is a big responsibility of the people.

The inheritance of habitus first by the leaders (*ata tu'a*), academics, religious leaders, government figures, parents, and the communities through the oral tradition or education process. There are the principles of education in Manggarai: '*teing agu tating*' (learning to give and accepting the learning tirelessly), '*toing agu tong*' (teaching to know and accept what has been taught), '*titong agu tingeng*' (giving an example and remember what has been exemplified), '*tatang agu tamang*' (motivation and rooting motivation in oneself), and '*tatong agu toming*' (internalizing and implementing the spirit of solidarity or peace). The inheritance will realize in practice if there is a solid collaboration between the structures and the agents. Structures have an essential role in managing peace and harmonious interaction between agents. Social structures (*ata tu'a*) produce habitus (structured structures). On the other hand, the involvement of villagers reveals the influence of agents toward certain decisions in structuring structures.

Conflict resolution occurs through '*lonto léok*'. It means sitting in a circular position and symbolizing

togetherness, harmony, synergy, or continuous connectedness. Like a circle has no end, the people create connections and attachments to one another. In that connection, there is completeness like a circle. They dare to look at one another as inseparable subjects collectively. '*Lonto léok*' is defined as social capital and cultural capital. As social capital, '*lonto leok*' emphasizes the attendance of many people. They come with the spirit of peace, and they have a chance to speak about peace and harmonious situations. *Lonto léok* has a generative capacity for young people. As a cultural capital, it shows the habits of Manggarai people in making important decisions. It also has symbolic capital through the role and the position of traditional leaders.

For Manggarai people, a cycle (*léok*) also means '*wéngké*'. *Wéngké* has two kinds: '*wéngké oné*' (inner circle) and '*wéngké pé'ang*' (outer circle). '*Wéngké oné*' is based on five entities: '*mbaru baté ka'éng*' (the house), '*natas baté labar*' (home yards), '*compang baté dari*' (a place for feedings), '*waé baté téku*' (water spring), '*uma baté duat*' (communal land). The five entities are related to each other. A village must have these five entities. In the ritual of '*penti*' (the rite of thanksgiving by the villagers), these entities are reconciled. *Wéngké pé'ang* (outer circle) is part of the circle of creation in the world, but it has an outside position from the village. '*Wéngké pé'ang*' also have five entities:

‘*boa*’ (the tomb), ‘*poco or puar*’ (the forest), ‘*nanga*’ (the beach), ‘*sano*’ or ‘*ngalor*’ (the river), and ‘*satar*’ (the savanna).

Through the *lonto leok* tradition, people can communicate, socialize, innovate, and reconcile. Sitting position (*lonto*) also means openness, equality of rights and obligations, and willingness to listen to each other (*ca léléng do, do léléng ca*/one means many, many mean ones). When villagers involve in *lonto leok*, at the same time, there is also a representation of the community that gives them equal rights and opportunities without discrimination and domination.

Hambor as Peacemaking

Challenges for the people that even though there is a tradition of peace (*Hambor*) in local culture, they also cannot escape from specific problems, such as conflicts in the family, fighting between different groups, or the murders. Conflict and competition are parts of the social field. They show superiority (*toto rang*) before others. Sometimes, such problems are to be resolved through favorable legal in courts. The victims typically bring the case quickly to the court according to the positive law but at the same time disregard the traditional way (*adat*) of resolving the problems peacefully.

Hambor is an act of forgiveness that opens the door for perpetrators and victims to be reconciled and offers the same opportunity to restart the praxis

of living in harmony again. Without forgiveness, anger or hatred will continue to overflow. Essentially, hatred destroys humanity. No one is fully human unless he/she relates to others naturally, peacefully, and harmoniously. *Hambor* embraces reconciliation, peace, togetherness, friendliness, and respect for others. *Hambor* is an essential life philosophy that flows within every Manggarai people.

In a conflict situation, the people define peace as involving subjects rather than an automatic result. This process is not only the perpetrator and the victim but also the villagers (*ase kae ca beo*), the ancestors (*empo/wura agu ceki*), and the Creator (*Ata Jari agu Dedek, Mori Kraéng*). Therefore, *Hambor* involves the connection between human beings and spiritual power, including the spirits of the dead, human life, and the Source of life. Hence, *Hambor* identifies the existence of human being in society as collective beings rather than isolated. This collectivity binds people together to making peace and to maintaining harmony. *Hambor* needs the right ways to healing the conflicting parties. *Hambor* inspires all people to maintain unity and integrity (*nai ca anggít, tuka ca léléng*), stand together and sit together as brothers (*hesé cama-cama, lonto cama-cama*).

The success of the *Hambor* process is inseparable from the significant role of traditional leaders, such as *tu’a golo*. Every village usually has only one *tu’a*

golo. Generally, position of *tu'a golo* position has a generative character and come from one lineage. 'Tu'a golo' is seen as the centre (*pakep*) of determining and implementing essential decisions, especially those related to villagers' position in the village. He is the correct figure to sit and lean on the central pole (*siri bongkok*). *Siri bongkok*, also called 'molas poco' (a beautiful girl from the forest), is placed in the centre of the *mbaru gendang*. *Siri Bongkok* is interpreted as tenderness, wisdom, motherhood, affection, love and care. When 'tu'a golo' leans on the pole, he is tying himself with wisdom, gentleness, truth, and firmness. Therefore, in solving problems, 'tu'a golo' listens more, does not talk too much (*baé pisik toé baé*) because every word he says is considered a ritual.

Personally, *tu'a golo* has cultural and social capital in the adage 'ata ongko do, nipu riwu'. 'Ongko do' means having the capacity to unite many people, while 'nipu riwu' means he knows very well the proper resolution of conflicts between villagers. 'Tu'a golo' is 'ata mesé wéngké tiwu léwé'. 'Mésé wéngké' means he can coil long rope too short. It symbolizes the ability to unite many people with many characters in one heart and one soul. He can summarise the suggestions from the villagers (*ata ngancéng pongos toambo, ujungs curup*), 'tiwu lewe' means he can secure the drink or food needs of many people. 'Tu'a golo' is

'ata manga lewing mésé kebor lewe' (*lewing mésé* means having a big pot to cooking and *kebor lewe* means having a long stirrer). Which means that he can accommodate many people). *Tu'a golo* must become 'luni rombu' (large trash container, where many people spilt their problems). In the context of conflict resolution, *tu'a golo* has a big responsibility to resolve conflicts accompanied by blasphemy, anger, and hatred. For him, these capitals become support him in making peace, harmony, and correct decisions.

Hambor as Peace Building

Hambor becomes the spirit of peace for all people who live in the Manggarai regency. Many people come from different cultural, ethnic, and religious backgrounds. *Hambor* embraces them in one peace and one harmony. The openness of *Hambor* for the other cultures also shows the affirmation of little narratives and plurality. *Hambor* process having modifications because of other values of peace, such as from religions. In this case, *Hambor* promotes intercultural or interreligious dialogue that involves many people. Plurality idealizes mutual respect for differences. People related to one another, having good ways to living together, negotiate differentiation, exchange opinions, and discover the interconnectedness of the institutions they create. Implicitly, the encounter in plurality reveals the strengthened plurality itself.

People back to cultural values as spirit in their life together. Life together is never free from many conflicts. Conflicts will be part of the social field. What needs to be done is to manage conflict. Here the conflicting parties are free from the burden of the past, for Manggarai people and all people who come to Manggarai regency. They sit together as brothers and sisters with equal and same dignity. They also have the same existence to speak and express their ideas from various perspectives. They must get rid of any kinds of exclusivist attitudes, primordial tendencies, and stereotypes. It involves a different confronting argument, but the main goal is to find the shared values that guarantee a peaceful community. They are open to listen to each other and learn from each other without negating the differences (*cama-cama lewang ngger pé'ang, cama-cama po'é ngger oné*). It is crucial to building up the communication to make some agreements (*bantang cama, réjé léléng*). The agreement should be based on the maturity in thinking and acting on the significance of reconciliation and peace. The agreement shall not be one-sided but need to be in balance (*néka gégé lélés*).

Hambor is not discriminatory or racist. It does not have many conditions or calculations to reverse oppression or violence by pressing back the perpetrators as a form of revenge. Indeed, the most logical route

for victims of violence is revenge. However, this route only positions them on the same level as the people they hate. Using violence to solve problems only justifies the logic of the perpetrators.

Hambor inspires the stakeholders (traditional leaders, cultural leaders, academics, government, parents, youths, and communities) to care for peace with a big responsibility. What is built is cultural awareness to maintain good traditions. There are many ways to do this. For example, the continuous inheritance of the values of *Hambor*, especially during 'lonto leok' or during the implementation of certain rites, continuous publication of peace in the local context, regional regulations that emphasise *Hambor* as one of the foundations of plurality in Manggarai. They can also found 'cultural institutions' that accommodate local values in legal considerations.

The concept of 'inter-religious *Hambor*' comes from awareness of the significance of peace between religious adherents in Manggarai. They make *Hambor* as a substance of harmony that allows dialogue without domination and violence. Currently, young Manggarai Muslims have formed *JELITA* (Bridge of Brotherhood Cross Faith) as a space for dialogue and activities with young people from other religions. Another familiar group is *FKUB* (Religious Harmony Forum) which continuously carries out activities with

inter-religious nuances. The primary purpose of these groups is to maintain peace in differences. However, 'the inter-religions *Hambor*' is related to the awareness of the essence of human dignity and the outside reality. According to Sofjan, in his analysis of the correlation of Pancasila as the basis of the state with human dignity, we as humans must realize that 'dignity should be properly accorded to God, nature and the entire created species on the planet, including humankind'. [58]

The inheritance of *Hambor* values is a crucial factor in developing and sustaining social and cultural capital. *Hambor* as social capital depends on the quality and quantity of learning in social life. Here, *Hambor* emphasizes the significance of the social relationship. The continuity of the inheritance of *Hambor* indicates good cultural capital in the future. *Hambor* is a cultural identity that managing conflict and peace situations in the plural society of Manggarai.

Conclusion

Exploring *Hambor* tradition as the little narrative of the peace opens up a public discourse about the diversity of backgrounds. *Hambor* has legitimacy in plurality. In an inclusive spirit, Manggarai people can arise polemics or confront ideas, but the intention is to find constructive and empowering values. They establish communication to produce agreements. This agreement

comes from the maturity of thinking and acting about the significance of reconciliation and peace. Thus, *Hambor* has a transformative projection, personal and communal harmony, and fulfillment of human values.

Hambor internalizes and externalizes the number of values. When this term is disclosed, the Manggarai people will return to their existence as humans who live in peace and harmony. They show their authenticity as human beings with equal dignity. The equality of dignity appears in the pattern of relationships in society. It is a tradition that brings people to sit in a circular shape and have the same opportunity to express their problems honestly. In other words, the tradition known as *Hambor* is a kind of golden bridge that reconnects both sides of the broken road. *Hambor* embraces peace, togetherness, hospitality, harmony, and respect for others. *Hambor* plays a vital role, significant meaning, and meaningful influence for the constellation of peace in Manggarai. Therefore, *Hambor* should be placed at the heart of the people, individually and socially. []

References

- [1] Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- [2] Klempe, Sven Hroar. 2018. "Postmodernism and Crises in Psychology. *Human Arena*. 1: 373-385. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42087-018-0038-2>
- [3] Gartman, David. 2012. "Bourdieu and Adorno: Converging Theories of Culture and Inequality". *Theory and Society*, 41 (1) 41-72. DOI 10.1007/s11186-011-9159-z
- [4] Davies, Scott & Jessica Rizk. June 2018. The Three Generations of Cultural Capital Research. *A Narrative Review. Review of Educational Research*. 88 (3) 331-365. DOI: 10.3102/0034654317748423
- [5] Odabas, Meltem & Fikret Adaman. 2018. Engaging with Social Networks. *The Bourdieu-Becker Encounter Revisited. Forum for Social Economics*, 47 (3-4) 305-321. DOI: 10.1080/07360932.2014.970568
- [6] Forchtner, Bernhard & Christian Schneickert. 2016. Collecting Learning in Social Fields: Bourdieu, Habermas, and Critical Discourse Studies. *Discourse and Society*. 27 (3) 293-307. DOI: 10.1177/0957926516630892
- [7] King, Hannah, Stephen Crossley, & Roger Smith. 2021. Responsibility, Resilience and Symbolic Power. *The Sociological Review* 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038026120986108>
- [8] Lee, Kangjae Jerry, Rudy Dunlap & Michael B. Edwards. 2014. The Implication of Bourdieu's Theory of Practice for Leisure Studies. *Leisure Sciences*, 36 (3) 314-323. DOI: 10.1080/01490400.2013.857622
- [9] Grenfell, Michael. 2014. *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (2nd edition). New York: Routledge
- [10] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1998. *Practical Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- [11] Bourdieu, Pierre & Loic J.D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [12] Bessant, Judith, Sarah Pickard & Rob Watts. 2020. Translating Bourdieu into Youth Studies. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 23 (1) 76-92. DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2019.1702633
- [13] Collyer, Fran M, et al. 2015. *Healthcare Choice: Bourdieu's Capital, Habitus and Field*. *Current Sociology Monograph*. 63 (5) 685-699. DOI: 10.1177/0011392115590082
- [14] Croce, Mariano. 2015. The Habitus and the Critique of the Present: A Wittgensteinian Reading of Bourdieu's Social Theory. *Sociological Theory*, 33 (4) 327-346. DOI: 10.1177/0735275115617801.
- [15] Edgerton, Jason D., Lance W. Roberts and Tracey Peter. 2013. Disparities in Academic Achievement: Assessing the Role of Habitus and Practice. *Social Indicators Research*. 114 (2) 303-322. DOI 10.1007/s11205-012-0147-0
- [16] Inghilleri, Moira. 2005. The Sociology of Bourdieu and the Construction of the 'Object' in Translation and Interpreting Studies. *The Translator*, 11 (2) 125-145. DOI: 10.1080/13556509.2005.10799195.
- [17] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1991. *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [18] Silva, Elisabeth B. 2016. Habitus: Beyond Sociology. *The Sociological Review*, 64, 73-92. DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12345
- [19] Chopra, Rohit. 2003. Neoliberalism as Doxa: Bourdieu's Theory of the State and the Contemporary Indian Discourse on Globalization and Liberalization. *Cultural Studies*, 17 (3-4) 419-444. DOI: 10.1080/0950238032000083881

- [20] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- [21] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990b. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [22] Schindler, Sebastian & Tobias Wille. 2015. Change in and through Practice: Pierre Bourdieu, Vincent Pouliot, and the End of the Cold War. *International Theory*, 7(2) 330-359. doi:10.1017/S1752971915000068
- [23] Power, Elaine M. 1999. An Introduction to Pierre Bourdieu's Key Theoretical Concepts. *Journal for the Study of Food and Society*, 3 (1) 48-52. DOI: 10.2752/152897999786690753
- [24] Binder, Geoffrey. 2012. Theory(zing)/Practice: The Model of Recursive Cultural Adaptation. *Planning Theory*, 11 (3) 221-241. DOI: 10.1177/1473095211433570
- [25] Schlerka, Sebastian Matthias. 2019. It's Time for a Change: A Bourdieusian Approach on Social Change. *Time and Society*, 28 (3) 1013-1038. DOI: 10.1177/0961463X18778459
- [26] O'Brien, Stephen & Mairtin Ó Fathaigh. 2005. Bringing in Bourdieu's Theory of Social Capital: Renewing Learning Partnership Approaches to Social Inclusion. *Irish Educational Studies*, 24 (1) 65-76. DOI: 10.1080/03323310500184509
- [27] Mu, Guanglun Michael. 2021. Sociologising Resilience through Bourdieu's Field analysis: Misconceptualisation, Conceptualisation, and Reconceptualisation. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 42 (1) 15-31. DOI: 10.1080/01425692.2020.1847634
- [28] Atkinson, Will. 2021. Fields and Individuals: From Bourdieu to Lahire and Back Again. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 24 (2) 195-210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431020923281>
- [29] Nentwich, Julia C., Mustafa F. Ozbilgin & Ahu Tatli. 2015. Change Agency as Performance and Embeddedness: Exploring the Possibilities and Limits of Butler and Bourdieu. *Culture and Organization*, 21 (3) 235-250. DOI: 10.1080/14759551.2013.851080
- [30] Cahill, Kevin M. 2016. The Habitus, Coping Practice, and the Search for the Ground of Action. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, 46 (5) 498-524. DOI: 10.1177/0048393116654664
- [31] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990a. *In Other Words. Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*. California: Stanford University Press.
- [32] Zahle, Julie. 2017. Ability Theories of Practice and Turner's Criticism of Bourdieu. *Journal of General Philosophy of Science*, 48, 553-567. DOI 10.1007/s10838-016-9355-7
- [33] Decoteau, Claire Laurier. 2016. The Reflexive Habitus: Critical Realist and Bourdieusian Social Action. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 19 (3) 303-321. DOI: 10.1177/1368431015590700
- [34] Greenfell, Michael. 2010. Being Critical: the Practical Logic of Bourdieu's Metanoia. *Critical Studies in Education*. 51 (1) 85-99. DOI: 10.1080/17508480903450240
- [35] Pileggi, Mary & Cindy Patton. 2003. Introduction: Bourdieu and Cultural Studies. *Cultural Studies*, 17 (3-4) 313-325. DOI: 10.1080/0950238032000083863
- [36] Schatzki, Theodore. 2018. Theory and Conceptual Centrality in Bourdieu. *Anthropological Theory*, 18 (4) 502-508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1463499618811721>
- [37] Husu, Hanna-Mari. 2013. Bourdieu and Social Movements: Considering Identity Movements in Terms of Field, Capital and Habitus. *Social Movement Studies*, 12 (3) 264-279. DOI 10.1080/14742837.2012.704174
- [38] Udasmoro, Wening & Saeful Anwar. 2019. Contesting the Social Spaces: Gender

Relations of Literary Communities in Yogyakarta and Surakarta. *Indonesian Journal of Geography*, 51 (3) 346-356. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22146/ijg.44165>

- [39] Ancelovici, Marcos. 2021. Bourdieu in Movement: Toward a Field Theory of Contentious Politics. *Social Movement Studies*, 20 (2) 155-173. DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2019.1637727
- [40] Goldberg, Chad Alan. 2013. Struggle and Solidarity: Civic Republican Elements in Pierre Bourdieu's Political Sociology. *Theory and Society*, 42 (4) 369-394. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-013-9194-z
- [41] Julien, Chris. 2015. Bourdieu, Social Capital and Online Interaction. *Sociology*, 49 (2) 356-373. DOI: 10.1177/0038038514535862
- [42] Hess, David J. 2011. Bourdieu and Science and Technology Studies: Toward a Reflexive Sociology. *Minerva*, 49 (3) 333-348. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-011-9178-y
- [43] Huang, SiaoWei. 2019. Understanding Bourdieu – Cultural Capital and Habitus. *Review of European Studies*, 11 (3) 45-49. doi:10.5539/res.v11n3p45
- [44] Ivana, Greti-Iulia. 2017. Fake It Till You Make It: Imagined Social Capital. *The Sociological Review*, 65 (1) 52-66. DOI: 10.1111/1467-954X.12368
- [45] Lo, Ming-Cheng Miriam. 2015. Conceptualising “Unrecognized Cultural Currency”: Bourdieu and Everyday Resistance among the Dominated. *Theory and Society*, 44:125-152. DOI 10.1007/s11186-015-9249-4
- [46] Barrett, Timothy. 2015. Storying Bourdieu: Fragments toward a Bourdieusian Approach to “Life Histories”. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1-10. DOI: 10.1177/1609406915621399
- [47] Jæger, Mads Meier. 2011. Does Cultural Capital Really Affect Academic Achievement? New Evidence from Combined Sibling and Panel Data. *Sociology of Education*, 84 (4) 281-298. DOI: 10.1177/0038040711417010
- [48] Samuel, Chris. 2013. Symbolic Violence and Collective Identity: Pierre Bourdieu and the Ethics of Resistance. *Social Movement Studies*.12 (4) 397-413. DOI: 10.1080/14742837.2013.823345
- [49] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1986. “The Forms of Capital”, in J. Richardson (Ed.). *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- [50] Udasmoro, Wening. 2018. When the Teens Narrate the Selves in Indonesian Literature: Gender, Subject, and Power. *Lingua Cultura*. 12 (1) 53-60. DOI: 10.21512/lc.v12i1.1961
- [51] Carré, Louis. 2021. An “Enchanted” or a “Fragmented” Social World? Recognition and Domination in Honneth and Bourdieu. *Critical Horizons*, 22 (1) 89-109. DOI: 10.1080/14409917.2019.1616481
- [53] Bourdieu, Pierre. 1993. *Sociology in Question*. London: Sage Publications.
- [52] Loyal, Steven & Stephen Quilley. 2017. The Particularity of the Universal. *Critical Reflections on Bourdieu Theory of Symbolic Power and the State*. *Theory & Society*, 46:429-462. DOI 10.1007/s11186-017-9298-y
- [54] Swartz, David L. 1997. *Cultures and Power: The Sociology of Pierre Bourdieu*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- [55] Matthäus, Sandra. 2017. Towards the Role of Self, Worth, and Feelings in (Re-) Producing Social Dominance. Explicating Pierre Bourdieu's Implicit Theory of Affect. *Historical Social Research*, Vol. 42 (4) 75-92. DOI: 10.12759/hsr.42.2017.4.75-92

- [56] Maton, Karl. 2008. "Habitus", in Michael Grenfell (ed.). *Pierre Bourdieu, Key Concepts*. Durham: Acumen.
- [57] Kaunang, Hendrikus. P. & Maksimilianus Jemali. 2018. "Local Culture as a Peace Instrument: Lonto Leok Philosophy and Harmony Among Religious Adherents in Manggarai, East Nusa Tenggara" (Proceeding Book of International Symposium on Religious Life (ISRL) 2018: Religion in a Divided, Multicultural World: Moderation, Fragmentation and Radicalization).
- [58] Sofjan, Dicky. October 2018. Pancasila and the Dignity of Humankind. *International Journal of Interreligious and Intercultural Studies*, 1 (1), 1-3. <https://doi.org/10.32795/ijiis.vol1.iss1.2018.82>
- [59] Venn, Couze. 2020. Historicity, Responsibility, Subjectivity. *Subjectivity*, 13, 5-38. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41286-020-00090-0>
- [60] Ignatow, Gabe & Laura Robinson. 2017. Pierre Bourdieu: Theorizing the Digital. *Information, Communication & Society*, 20 (7) 950-966. DOI: 10.1080/1369118X.2017.1301519
- [61] Skinner, Robert. 2020. Contesting Forms of Capital: Using Bourdieu to Theorise Why Obstacles to Peace Education Exist in Colombia. *Journal of Peace Education*, 17 (3) 3346-369. DOI: 10.1080/17400201.2020.1801400