



ISSN: 2230-9926

Available online at <http://www.journalijdr.com>

IJDR

**International Journal of
DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH**

International Journal of Development Research
Vol. 06, Issue, 01, pp. 6577-6582, January, 2016

Full Length Research Article

REFLECTION OF LOCAL DEMOCRACY IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

^{1,*}Peribadi, ²Samsul, ¹Tanzil, ¹Jamaluddin Hos, ⁴Ruslan Majid and ⁵La Patuju

¹Departement of Sociology Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, UniversitasHalu Oleo, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia

²Departement of Cultural Science, Faculty of Cultural Science, UniversitasHalu Oleo, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia

⁴Departemen of Health Science, Faculty of Public Health, Universitas Halu Oleo, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia

⁵Departement of Law Science, Faculty of Law, Universitas Halu Oleo, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 26th October, 2015
Received in revised form
14th November, 2015
Accepted 18th December, 2015
Published online 31st January, 2016

Key Words:

Local Democracy,
Community Development,
SaranaWolio.

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to critically describe the value of "Local Democracy" in the Leadership and Governance System of the Sultanate of Buton with application to community development. This research used a qualitative approach in the context of the study of community centered onethnographical, historical, and comparative methods(Steward, 1950; Peribadi, et.,al. 2015). All of them were used eclectically, but were given more priority to the aspect of ethnographical method. The results showed that in addition to means of the Wolio as traditional institutions of the empire, it also reflects both portraits of Local Democracy that have been practiced in the area of government of the Sultanate of Buton in the past. It was shown concretely into social status symbols that look different to people outside the Sultanate area. Buton Sultanate has a social value that is unique, because it shows the behavior of people who feel very embarrassed if they did not achieve their goals and feel very guilty if they do not succeed in making people more prosperous. Therefore, when elected as officials in any government agencies, they strive to uphold the mandate given, so that deviant behavior in the form of Collusion, Corruption and Nepotism can be avoided. However, *SaranaWolio* in the view of the latest generation of Butonese, begins to be problematic, but it is still seen as the glue that reflects a unique political culture identity.

Copyright © 2016 Peribadi et al. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

The issues of democracy and human rights have been discussed in some studies of development, like Adamson (2010) and Davies and Rowe (2014). Goulet who examined the philosophy and ethics of development, for example, pointed out that the development process should result in (1) the creation of a new solidarity that encourage development with grassroots oriented, (2) maintaining the diversity of cultures and environments, and (3) upholding the dignity and freedom of human and society (Mardikanto, 2012). Accordingly, the nuances of local democracy on *SaranaWolio* in the Sultanate of Buton are interesting to study in order to find out a basic model of community development and implementation of development in various aspects.

*Corresponding author: Peribadi,

Departement of Sociology Science, Faculty of Social and Political Science, UniversitasHalu Oleo, Southeast Sulawesi, Indonesia.

A study focusing on "Local Democracy" implied in the Leadership and Governance System of Buton Sultanate and its effect on community development aims to explore the values and cultural norms, as well as specific rules as local knowledge, which has been applied from time to time by the local community to improve prosperity.

Review of Literature

The terminology of democracy culture in actuality is in keeping with the popular expression of Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of United States of America. He interpreted democracy as "government is by the people, from the people, and for the people". This paradigm explains that the people's political rights are the substance of the highest political authority no more on the hand of the king, aristocracy, and some oligarchic elites. This is in line with the concept of power that is offered by John Locke that the people are the ones who give the power to the ruler, the people give

some of rights to protect their property rights through their social contract (Surbakti, 1990; Kristiadi, 1996; Suaib, *et al.*, 2008). Regarding with that, the effort of dividing the variables of political culture from pragmatic and utopia values orientation, from the forms of political culture concerning the attitude towards the tradition and change in a transparent attitude or not. In the light of militancy degree, it can show a tolerant political attitude. Meanwhile, in terms of political role concerning the leadership pattern, it functions as the motivator of initiatives and creative freedom or the needs demander. Besides, in terms of mobility attitude, it points out the devotee on status quo or on mobility. At last, in relation with the decision, it seems to be economic or non economic oriented (Nashir, 2000; Jenks, 2013; Suaib *et al.*, 2015).

One of the important studies in Regional Public Election is "how is the behavior of electing? The activity of electing in Regional Public Election in actuality is the activity of decision-making. There are four important researches (in the context of Indonesia) that ever discussed about the conduct of voter, namely Gaffar (2004) with the topic of the electing conduct of Javanese persons, J. Kristiadi (1996) with the topic of the voter's conduct in Indonesia. It must be admitted that the the worriedness of the voters complicate us to know whether the choice taken based on self-consideration or because being asked for by the respected leader or because being threatened. If so, what factors influencing someone's choice? Surbakti (1999) offered four approaches to explain the electing behavior, namely demographical sociologic approach, rationalistic economic approach, social psychology approach and political approach. Demographical sociologic approach assumes that the electing conduct is described as the group decision or is influenced by the subculture and social attribute. The political awareness of individual behavior and intention is formed based on social experience. It is the social context that causes a stable deed and intention. The voters in electing the candidate perceives more the existence of the same interests, aspirations, and lucks.

Social psychology approach assumes that there is an attitude and tendency of individual to act or make the decision in the form that can be predicted before. The political knowledge and effort in calculating the possibility of acquisition from a choice alternative. The image of candidate according to the voters shows the result of the voter's evaluation towards performance, competence, experience, and so forth. Rationalistic economic approach assumes that a voter has rationality in decision-making. Rationality means considering the consequence of a decision before making the decision itself. Rationality is also seen as the conduct that is oriented on the purpose or capability of making decision when being faced to various alternatives. Political approach assumes that individual's life is not apart of institutional factor, social environment, governmental power, and of leadership. This approach claims that consciously or unconsciously, the electing deed of an individual is affected by a variety of institutional factors, i.e.: the nature and form of choice offered to them, the easiness of uneasiness of the above mentioned decision-making in social and law aspect, system of party affairs, competition of intercandidate, requirement and procedure of registration of the voters. By this approach, there is 'setting' where the voter is. In paternalistic society, the voters

give a special place to the respected and nobilized person because of their origins, service, and position. Meanwhile, in impaternalistic society, the voters give special place to the person based on the competency and someone's track record. The question that must be answered by the voters when using their choice is how far the success of the candidates or party that they vote in realizing the purposes of the above voters.

Every candidate or contestant that competes strives to convince the voters that their capable party to formulate collective kindness because the last decision depends on each individual to determine alternative choices that they regard to be rational. For that reason, according to Ritzer (2004) that theory of rational choice is "rational act' from an individual or actor to do an action based on a certain purpose and the purpose is determined by value or choice. Ritzer concentrates on his attention on individual's rational action. It, then, is continued on the problem of micro-macro relation or how the way of individual's action combination is to arouse the social system conduct. However, eventually, he focused on the aspect of micro-macro relation or the impact of individual's action towards the other individual's actions. Meanwhile, in accordance with Santoso (2002) that rational choice approach focuses his attention on the choice made by the person when being involved in political deed. Its basic assumption is that if someone is faced to some alternative actions, so the person will elect the action maximalizing the use of benefit that they expect. According to him, in case the theory of rational choice is not sufficient, in the research about political sociology can also use the theory of a better electing conduct by re-interpreting the concept of rational and cultural choice.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Approach

This research used qualitative approach in the context of community study centered on ethnographic, historical, and comparative methods (Steward, 1950). The three of them were used eclectically, but the aspect of ethnographical method was given more priority because it was expected to be able to describe vision, perception, and the conduct of local citizen in accordance with the subjectivity of the culture. However, the effort of deepening the history of local culture, so it was also employed the aspect of historical method. Likewise, in the effort of comparison, the comparative approach was important to be employed as well (Peribadi, *et al.* 2015).

Source of Information

In selecting informants, this study refers to Spradley (1997) and Benard (1994) that the informants selected must have ability to provide in-depth information of their culture. To get the informants, snowballing technique is used as proposed by Manase (1986). That is the researcher should firstly choose those who can provide initial information; from this initial information, the researcher decides who will provide further information in the field.

Data Collection Process

The techniques used in the data collection are participant observation techniques and in-depth interviews. Observation is

one of the techniques used in ethnographic methods, that is the researchers are directly involved in the field of research in order to understand deeply the culture investigated based on what is observed and felt during the direct involvement (Jorgensen, 1988; Bungin, 2007). In-depth interview technique emphasizes the importance of searching information from informants using interview guidelines (Spradley, 1997).

Data Analysis

The completed data is then qualitatively analyzed with reference to the theoretical and conceptual variants. The process of discussion can take place on a reciprocal basis; sometimes the interpretation is done first, followed by stating the cases or vice versa; express prior case then do the interpretation. Interpretation of data developed in accordance with Max Weber's term, "*verstehen*" in order to obtain a valid discussion about the subjective meanings of social action and rational actions (Johnson, 1986). Guide to do this research is come from Katorba (Suaib *et al.*, 2014), namely interpretive ethnographic to pose the same sort of challenge to interactionist to generate the same of response. Interpretive ethnographic is the major statement to date on the new writing.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Government Structure of Sarana Wolio

The Pattern and mechanism of the Government of the Sultanate of Buton, are not only describing the limits and scope of territory, but also showing the social stratification with its authority. These are explained comprehensively in the constitution which had always been applied during the Sultanate time, namely *MartabatTujuh* (the Constitution of Dignity Seven= Seven Values); State Ideology: *Bhinci-Bhincikuli*; State Motto: *Poramu Yindaasaangu Pogaa Yinda Akoolota*; Principle of State: *Man Arafa Arafa Nafzahu FaqadRabbahu*. (What are the 7 values?? You need to put an English translation after each term). Territorially, Buton Sultanate territories were divided into three structures. *First*, *Sara Wolio* or the Palace was the governmental center and the Islamic development center. Members were from two noble groups, the *Kaomu* group, descendents of the first king couple from the paternal line and the *Walaka* group, descendants of the founding fathers of Buton (miapatamiana). The groups were titled "La Ode" for men and "Wa Ode" for women. *Second*, the four small kingdoms and autonomous regions were called *Barata*: Kolisusu, Tiworo, Muna and Kalidupa. These four regions had their own government, but they remained subject to the authority of the central government in Wolio Palace, held by the *Kaomu* and *Walaka* groups. The Sultan, as the supreme ruler of the kingdom, was assisted by some top officials at the Palace and local officials (*Barata*). *Third*, *Kadie* areas were settlements outside the Palace (\pm 72 *Kadies*) resided in by commoners groups called *Papara*. But in Generally, the system and the bureaucratic process in the Sultanate of Buton were as follows:

- *Pangka* (top officials/rijksgraten) or self-government councils were held by *koumu* and *walaka* group, and consisted of: *Sapati* (kaomu), *Kenepulu* (kaomu),

LakinaSurowolio (kaomu); two *Kopitalao* (Jeneral): *KapitalaoSukanayo* and *Matanayo*(kaomu); two *BontoOgena* (chief minister): *BontoOgenaSukanayo* and *Matanayo* (walaka).

- *SaranaWolio* consisted of all *WolioBobato* (kaomu) and *Bonto* (walaka).
- *Siolimbona* was a chamber consisting of 9 people from the *Walaka* groups, who fully comprehended all matters of customs and cultures and were concurrently assigned to protect their continued existence.
- *SaranaHukumu*, was a council that was concerned with matters related to Islamic teachings and worship. They were *Lakinaagama* (Religious Supreme Leader), *Imamu* (Prayer leader) and *Hatibi* (preacher), they all were from *Kaumu*.
- Special Sultanate Staffs, included: *BontoInunca* or palace staff (Walaka), *BontonaLencinaKanjawari*; the staffs who assisted certain tasks of the Sultan (included *BontoIsana of Walaka*), Other staffs: *Juruba*(walaka), *Kapita*, *Sabandara* (koumu) were the port authority, *Tolombo* was the assistant of *BontoOgena* (chief minister) when delivering edicts and important announcements from the Sultan and *Pangalasan* who assisted *BontoOgena* in collecting *Weti* (taxes).

It is clearly find that the autonomy system (decentralization) had been well-known since the Sultanate of Buton, even it is more than the today's system, in which the mechanisms and processes of governance functionally and structurally patterned and applied peacefully and prosperously.

Development Patterns

In the reign of the Sultanate of Buton, three patterns of development had to happen before someone nominated to be a leader. First, *the informal development pattern* is an opportunity for potential leaders to develop and demonstrate their talent within the family and community. At the same time, the legislature (*Siolimbona*) would conduct ongoing monitoring of the candidate by recording all of actions. The results of this monitoring would be considered at the time of assessing the candidate. Consequently, individuals who behaved destructively, e.g. displayed dishonesty (cheating, lying, treason), tyranny and other mayhems, of course, would not be proposed as a leader. If they nominated, it would be challenged by other parties.

Second, *the formal development pattern* is a leader development pattern in which the candidate would play an active role in doing the tasks of state. Here, the nominated leader would directly learn by developing all leadership potentials in accordance with the mission entrusted to him, with the stipulation that when he successfully accomplishing the mission, his duties would be continued and would even probably be increased. However, when he was not able to achieve the goal assigned, he should resign wholeheartedly, or be dismissed. Suppose a person has chosen to be a leader then he should not refused it on the grounds of inability, but ought to first accept the mandate; although he should resign if he was indeed not capable. Therefore, for the position of being Sultan, a candidate was obliged to be recruited from those who had been trained as such from an early age. So that none of the candidates for Sultan was directly from the head of region

Kadie and *Barata* or from the former officials as well. Similarly, the position for the head of region (*LakiKadie* for example), the candidates should be from the village chief or the formers.

Third, *the non-formal development pattern* is a pattern of development in which a prospective leader had the opportunity to develop himself by direct apprenticeship in the Palace and experiencing the atmosphere of Palace protocol as *bhelobhamba* (for *Kaomugroup*) and *bhelobaruga* (for *Walakagroup*). This pattern was specifically targeted at youths aged between 10-12 years. A cadre acquired various knowledge and skills about the code of conduct and etiquette in the events of state, although their principal duty was only as servants.

Reflection on Community Development

The tradition of community development was well established in the Sultanate reign and was more effective than current legislation and bureaucracy as well as today's democratic party system; which apparently squander the public money. This past system has potential lessons for the present. Therefore, it is very important to have a look back to recover and to continually discuss these inherent strengths. In the Sultanate of Buton the concept of "MartabatTujuh" and "Sarana Wolio" described specific social elites who were assigned developmental tasks and responsibilities. Furthermore, "MartabatTujuh", not only described a social system that was systemic, structured and functional, but acted as a duplicate of legislation that regulated the development of society in all regions of the Sultanate. Although, practically there are differences in the use of concepts and approaches, essentially there was an integral, interdependent shared understanding of social norms and cultural values about governing for the good of society.

An ethos and philosophy of life in the community were implied in the customs, habits, thoughts, concepts, ideas, attitudes and behavior of individuals and their social actions. Accordingly, the religious leadership system that lasted for approximately 6 centuries in the Sultanate of Buton not only described the philosophically-arranged patterns of culture, but also contained typical *Tassawuf* teachings that reflected the collective consciousness (representative-collectives) which was fully believed by all members of the community in the Sultanate of Buton and surrounding areas. Now, the incredible religious behaviors are still practiced by the royal descendents of Buton as manifestation of the appreciation of the religious value system. But, one value that is never applied in today's life of Butonese people is the value of the system and mechanism of leadership election contained in "MartabatTujuh". Therefore, it will be very interesting if "MartabatTujuh" is reflected in the community development process. Of course not all of the components of "MartabatTujuh" are in accordance with the whole process of implementation of the current development. But at least, according to the results of this research, the study found some patterns or stages in the leader election process of the Sultanate of Buton which would be a very relevant design element in the development of modern society, especially for community empowerment in Buton.

Terms / Criteria of Leader

In this context, according to La Ode Zaenuthat the candidate must be a figure who has the following characteristics: be (1) mature in thinking; (2) competent in custom; (3) brave and honest in action; (4) not tempramental but gracious; and (5) Muslim. The "MartabatTujuh" mentioned several criterions for an Islamic leader (If These Words Mean "Mature In Thinking" Etc Put The Words After The English Words And Quote The Source As The "MartabatTujuh"). Basically, the criteria of leadership in Indonesia either for President, Governor, Regent/Mayor, or even for the leader of village, is "believe and devote to One Supreme God". But, in fact, it very often happens that the figures who succeed in our political elections are candidates who have bad *track records*, like had ever or are still suspected of or accused of certain illegalities.

Patterns and Mechanisms for Recruiting a Leader

Amazingly, the criteria for determining a leader in the Sultanate of Buton tracked since in the womb of the mother. Of course it is a very valuable lesson to consider the track record for all figures who want to be a candidate, so that we can successfully find a credible and competent leader. Though, based on the system of "authoritative democracy", because of its existence as a kingdom and sultanate, the concept of "Crown Prince" was unknown or not applicable in the leadership culture system in the sultanate of Buton, so that the following sultan was not absolutely from one of the sultan's son who was reigning. However, it still elected from among the aristocratic social groups. It can be proved that when the Sultan *OputaUmane* (man/husband) and Sultan *OputaBawine* (woman/wife) inaugurated as Sultan, as spouse they might not to have children any more. In this context, La Ode Amaluddin stressed that this is a sign that the Sultanate System of Buton did not apply the concept of crown prince. *Kaumu* group is the only social strata who entitled to be appointed as candidate of Sultan. And *Walaka* as the second stratum is the only group who has right to elect and determine the Sultan. While the third strata *Papara*, only allowed to be military personnel and workforce. However, the selection and appointment of candidate of Sultan must be approved by the four *Barata* as autonomy regions which cover areas of Muna, Tiworo, Kolisusu and Wakatobi.

They also entitled to propose candidates from their regions. Example, Sultan La Ode Falihi was from Ereke (Kolisusu) and Wanci (Wakatobi) and Sultan Murhum was from Muna. However, the most entitled to conduct the monitoring and the selection is *Walakagroup*. Moreover, they had been monitoring the candidates since in the womb of women of *Kaumu*. If *Walaka* had seen and believed of those who would be the potential candidates, when they had come of age, they would fully be handed over and entrusted to *Sara* (religious group) led by a Supreme Leader of Religion called "Lakina Agama" to have a process of teaching and training. Nonetheless, the candidates from the four *Barata* could remained be proposed. All candidates then handed over to the *Siolimbona Legislative Council*. The process of monitoring and selection were entirely entrusted to this council. However, the *Siolimbona* also still asked of views of other royal palace members. Among the nine members of the *Siolimbona*, then

three of them tasked with finding candidates from *KaomuTanailandu*, three others sought from *KaomuTapi-Tapi*, and three others looked for *Kaomukumbewaha*. In turn, of all the candidates who meet the criteria of leadership, they were then entrusted to two *Bontogena* (chief minister) to do further verification and selection. Then with the nine members of *Siolimbona*, the *Bontogena* determined three or four best candidates. Then, the *Siolimbona* Council held an in-depth discussion with all stakeholders or elites of Sultanate. Even, before this process, they had undertaken the verification through "Divine Management" called "Afalia".

The sequences of "Afalia" as follows: It used to be performed at the Great Mosque of Palace at 24.00. One of the *Siolimbona* members did prayer *istikhorah* (a Muslim prayer for asking the best choice among more than one choices). After that, he opened holly Koran and counted seven sheets randomly, on the right side of the seventh sheet (ie, eighth sheet), he counted the number of letter 'kha' (means good), and also counted the letter 'sy' showing "syarr" (means bad). The "Afalia" performed as many as the candidates. The candidate with the most letters 'kha', would be chosen as the best candidate. The results of "Afalia" then submitted to *Bontogena* and directly held a convention in *Baruga* (assembly hall) which was attended by all *SaranaWolio* (all stakeholders and officials of Sultanate). It was chaired by *Bontomarumpa* (a minister) and the final result would be delivered by whispering to two *kapitalau* (general) to be announced. Then, one *kapitalau* faced to the west and the other faced to the east with unsheathed sword. The *kapitalau* facing to the east announced "Attention! Ladies and gentlemen, the chosen Sultan of ButonisAnu (mention the name), to anyone who opposes this decision, come here and I'll kill you. The other *kapitalau* just said: "hore.. hore.. hore" 3 times. Moreover, the new Sultan was not directly inaugurated. He ought to pass a final test of his holiness at three sacred places, namely: (1) *MatanaSangie* located in *TanjungSampulawa* as a sacred place inhabited by Ghosts Sea; (2) *Rape Sangie* located at *Lowu-Lowu* river which sacred with its white crocodile; and (3) *Piri Muhammad* at *Ambon river* as the most sacred site. If he successfully passed this phase, then he was considered as a proper Sultan and would be inaugurated directly. So, it resulted in a fair, honest, wise and skilful leader. This kind of process need to be reflected in today's system of election, so we are able to result in a truly credible leader.

Deliberation Process

There are two fundamental things in the context of local democracy which are quite contextual connection with the implementation of direct local election.

First, deliberation is the main decision-making mechanism in the system of traditional leadership. According to one informant, La Ode Wahidin, the characteristic of deliberation in the reign of the Sultanate/Kingdom of Buton, was not on the basis of a majority vote. However, it was in the form of unanimous consensus. One example case, the election for the head of *WatumotobheKadie* (a village/sub-district) between the years of 1930-1940's, the candidate proposed by *Siolimbona* was La Ode Khutbah bin La Ode Saragha (Village Chief of Matarea'o) which had received the support of

majority members of the Legislative in Wolio Palace but failed in the end because he did not receive unanimous support from the officials of *Kenipulu* and *Lasalimu*.

Second, all stakeholders and officials in Buton Sultanate, did not arbitrarily used and took advantages of their position or power. For example, *Kaomu* as the highest stratum group used to involve other groups dealing with all interests of Sultanate. Moreover the Sultan often hold session with other leaders and the people in making decision that took place in an assembly hall called *Baruga*, it begun with an introductory session and then followed by full/formal session, so it did not take a long time. While today, the process of session is often preceded by a high-level lobbying that took place in luxury places to set up the session for their interest. As the result, the decision resulted in the session tends to be more subjective interest-oriented of any individuals or groups and spent much time and money.

Pattern Control

Siolimbona Council held big role and responsibility as mentioned in Constitution "MartabatTujuh" that *Siolimbona* function consists of 17 items that are summed in two main points:(a) Monitoring the three super groups of *kaomu* (Wolio: *AjaganiKamboru-mboruTalupalena*), those are: *Kaomutanailandu*, *Kaomukumbewaha* and *Kaomutapi-tapi* as the groups that preparing cadres for high functionaries and other important officials; dan(b) Monitoring inequalities, abuses and errors of implementation of the governance (Wolio: *ajaganikarunggaogenasarasarakidhina*). *Siolimbona* had demonstrated a very bright effectiveness in carrying out their functions. It can be known from historical proofs that some leaders had been sent to Court of *SaranaWolio* and got sentences like: *pasabu* (dethrone or dismissal), *papacy* (exile), *tatasipulanga* (revocation of the right from positions for seven generations) and *gogoli* (death penalty). Some cases:(a) The 11th Sultan of Buton, *Sultan La Tangkaraja Oputa Mosabunayi LakambauDiy ad-Qa'im* (1669-1680) was dethroned (*pasabu*) for culpability building a fort in *Lawela* area about 6 miles south of *Wolio* capital without coordinating with legislative council (*siolimbona*); dan(b) The 8th Sultan of Buton, *Sultan La CilaOputaGogoliyiyiLiwuto Sultan Mardan Ali* (1647-1654) was executed (*gogoli*) in 1654 on the island of Makassar (LiwutoMakasu) of his violating to custom and religion norms. On behalf of the people and the country, *Siolimbona* Council run its roles and functions professionally with high sense of responsibility by controlling the use of state financial and monitoring the attitude, behavior and acts of the leaders and all officials. Moreover, *BhontoOgena* (chief minister), those commonly were family of Sultan also run monitoring actively and directly to the Sultan, so that the Sultans who did violations could successfully be penalized. This shows us that deviant acts like collusion and nepotism can be avoided.

Conclusion

First, one cultural values that seems still fully internalized and practiced by people of Buton is *SaranaWolio* as local democratic culture. The value is in the term of figurative meaning to and motivation of the stakeholders in efforts to improve the welfare of the society. *Second*, reflection and

application of Cultural Value of *SaranaWolio* which had been practiced in the governmental area of Buton Sultanate in the past, was shown concretely into social status symbols that look different to people outside the sultanate area. *Third*, the application of *SaranaWolio* was apparent in the behavior of the people who felt very embarrassed if they did not successfully achieve the goals and who felt very guilty if they did not succeed in making people more prosperous. Therefore, when elected as officials in any government agencies, they strive to uphold the mandate given, so that deviant behavior in the form of Collusion, Corruption and Nepotism can be avoided. *Fourth*, *Sarana Wolio* in the view of the latest generation of Buton, either in the form of conception or practice begins to be problematic. *Fifth*, *Sarana Wolio* still exists as a glue to create solidarity in a fellowship due to the existence of sense of common dignity and self-respect. So that, on this basis, each person knows their rights and obligations to unite themselves in a common interest. With regard to the findings in this study showing that the values of *Sarana Wolio* are still exist in everyday life of Butonese People, then this research suggests that the values should gradually be integrated into education in order to encourage the development of democratic, especially in Buton.

REFERENCES

- Adamson, D. 2010. Community Empowerment Identifying the Barriers to "Purposeful" Citizen Participation, *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 30 (3/4):114-126.
- Benard, R. H. 1994. *Research Methods in Anthropology*. Sage Publications, London-New Delhi.
- Bungin, B. 2007. *Qualitative Research: Communication, Economy, Public Policy, and Other Social Sciences*, Kencana, Jakarta. (In Indonesia).
- Davies, E. and Rowe, E. 2014. From Research, Through Policy and Politics to Ractice: Learning from Experience" *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 34 (1/2): 35-46
- Gaffar, A. 2004. *Indonesian Politics: Transition towards Democracy*. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- Jenks, Chris, 2013. *Culture*, A Study of Culture, translated from the book of *Culture* by Erika Setyawati, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- Johnson, P., 1986, *Theory of Classical and Modern Sociology*, (Translation: Robert, M.Z Lawang). Gramedia Ltd, Jakarta.
- Jorgensen, D. L. 1988. *Participant Observation: A Methodology for Human Studies*. Sage Publicatins, London-New Delhi.
- Kristiadi, 1996. Public Election and Voter's Conduct in Indonesia, *Economic and Social Study Magazine* No. 3 in XXV March, 1996. Jakarta, Prisma.
- Manase, M., 1986, *Social Research Method*, Gramedia, Jakarta.
- Mardikanto, T. and Soebianto, P. 2012. *Empowerment of Society in Perspective of Public Policy*, Alfabeta, Bandung.
- Nashir, H. 2000 *Conduct of Political Elites of Muhammadiyah, Tarawang, Yogyakarta (Indonesia)*.
- Peribadi et al. 2015. Developmental Planning Meeting Based On *Kalosara*Culture, A Study of Community in Mainland Area of South East Sulawesi, *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Applied Science (IJSEAS)* - Volume-1, Issue-8, November 2015
- Ritzer. George, 2004. *Theory of Modern Sociology*, Sixth Volume. Jakarta. Prenada Media
- Santoso, T. and Supriyanto, Didik, 2004, *Supervising the Public Election, Guarding Democracy*, Murai Kencana, Jakarta.
- Spradley, J. P. 1997 *Ethnographical Methods*, Tiara Wacana, Yokyakarta.
- Steward, H. J. 1950. *Area Research, Theory and Practice*, Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17.
- Suaib Eka et al. 2008. Design of Implementing the Regional Public Election based on Cultural, Competing Grant, The Budget in 2007/2008 and 2008/2009, Jakarta (In Indonesia).
- Suaib Eka et al. 2014. *Buton Inheritance Values Toward Local Democracy Development* *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 8(10) July 2014.
- Suaib Eka et al. 2015. *Traditional Leadership And Local Democracy In Konawe Kingdom*, *International Journal of Art & Humanity Science (IJAHS)*, Volume 2 Issue 6, (Nov-Dec 2015).
- Surbakti and Ramlan 1990. *Understanding Political Science*. Gramedia Widiasarana, Jakarta.
- Surbakti and Ramlan, 1999. *The Result of Public Election in 1999 in the Perspective of Structuration Theory*, Result of Research. Surabaya, University of Airlangga.
