



ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

ANALYSIS OF CONSUMPTION BEHAVIOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LOCAL FARMERS AND
MIGRANT FARMERS IN JAYAPURA PAPUA

*Suwandi and Arung Lamba

Faculty of Economic and Business University Cenderawasih Jayapura Papua Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 26th August, 2015
Received in revised form
22nd September, 2015
Accepted 28th October, 2015
Published online 30th November, 2015

Key words:

Consumption behavior.

ABSTRACT

The aims of this research are; (1) long term purposes: to improve the food security for Papuan farmers, and reduce the economic gap between Papuan and the migrants population, since the socio-economic jealousy has been happening. (2) For the short term purposes are analyzing the differences between the consumption behavior of Papuan and the migrant farmers. The analysis method used is quantitative analysis. The results shows that there is the difference between the consumption behavior of Papuan farmers and migrant farmers in fulfilling the needs of food consumption. Papuan farmers' share of expenditure is 61.52%, while the migrant farmers' is 45.68%. When the income increased by 100%, the spending behavior of Papuan farmers decreased by 57.3%, and 33.7% decreased for the migrants. There is the difference of consumption behavior between the local farmers and the migrant farmers in fulfilling the needs of non-food consumption. The share of expenditure for local farmers only 38.48%, while migrant farmers is 54.32%. If the household income increased by 100%, the spending behavior of local farmers increased by 58.3%, and 29.2% decreased for the migrant farmers.

Copyright © 2015 Suwandi and Arung Lamba. 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.

Citation: Suwandi and Arung Lamba, 2015. "Analysis of consumption behavior differences between local farmers and migrant farmers in jayapura papua", *International Journal of Current Research*, 7, (11), 22911-22916.

INTRODUCTION

Development held in Papua since this region was integrated into Indonesia brings a lot of progress. Unfortunately, it also creates a very large gap between one group to another. It can be seen very clear from the life of local farmers and the migrant farmers in Jayapura Papua. According to Kaiwai (2007), an atmosphere of this gap is caused by the initial conditions of the two groups. The farmers, who are non-ethnic Papuans are mostly the migrants, get many facilities from the government, such as; a house, 1.75 hectares agriculture, production facilities, agriculture equipments, and the provision of bama for 12 months, so they live with good economic level. While the local farmers without those facilities still live with shifting cultivation, so their life does not show any significant change. According to Tarumingkeng, (1997), they can interact (on both sides) with the surrounding natural environment (atekologi cultivation). In accordance with Hans and Tarumingkeng the different starting point of the migrants and the local farmers in agricultural development programs that lead to social and economic gap between them.

The truth of the above opinion should be admitted, but from the researcher's observations there are other things that cause social and economic gap between them. It is the difference consumption behavior of the local farmers and migrants. Therefore, this issue needs to be analyzed in depth, to improve the food endurance and safety of the local ones, in order to eliminate the jealousy for the tranquillity and integrity of Indonesia.

Besides the transmigration which is funded by the government (such as government officials and the migrants) there is also a spontaneous migration, both happens in a large numbers since 1970s to the 1980s. Their arrival in a large number has created a social and economic gap between the migrants and the local people. That conditions makes some local people spread the issues about power resignation has not been completed (political status of Papua province). It causes the emergence of separatist movements known as Organisasi Papua Merdeka/ Organization of Papua Freedom (OPM).

After Papua was integrated with Indonesia, then it starts a lot of criticism towards the development activities, because it does not give a fundamental change for the people prosperity., the Central Government revealed the seriousness in implementing the development of Irian Jaya (Papua) in 1998. It can be seen by the granting of special autonomy (OTSUS), through the

*Corresponding author: Suwandi and Arung Lamba,
Faculty of Economic and Business University Cenderawasih Jayapura
Papua Indonesia.

Act number 21 of 2001 about Special Autonomy for Papua. Through the special autonomy, the development should be able to accommodate the indigenous people importance and increase their prosperity. In fact, it indicates the gap among the indigenous people.

This history shows that the development approach in Papua needs to be redesigned. The appropriate approach should be found to make the indigenous people able to be active in the development. From the previous failure experience, it expects to engage the indigenous people to be active in the development.

Literature Review

Several empirical research analyzed about the household consumption behavior. The comparisons that will be used in this research are: Quazi (2003) using the theoretical framework and econometric method in analysing the household and farmers consumption behavior in Bangladesh. With three types of commodity groups, they are: (1) agricultural-commodity, (2) non-agricultural and (3) leisure, which are used to analyze the elasticity of demand price towards the agricultural commodities, non-agricultural, and income-leisure choice of farmers' family. Then, the research of Benlage and Mendoza (2002) tested the implications and a farm household unitary and non-unitary model of household models, with an empirical test based on a survey of households in Cordillera Norther Luzon Philippines. In this analysis, the estate is treated as exogenous variables, which is used as an indicator of bargaining power. The statistical results showed the evidence of a specific effects of soil couples on participation in the labor market so it makes the doubt on the unitary farm household models.

Other researchers, Soberen and Wagner (1990), Paulin (1998), used the age, household composition and size as the variables. Then in research of Zhang and Norton (1995) used the type of work and level of education as the variables. It was also conducted by Dewese and Norton (1991). Those research indicate that the demand of consumption may reflect the level of household prosperity, which is influenced by many factors such as the level of demand and characteristics. Materer and Valdivia (2000) conducted the research in Bolivia to analyze the strategies used to ensure the farm household income and groceries consumption. In the research conducted over the past seven years, 45 farmer households surveyed consistently over three times and in 1993, 1995 and 1999. This research shows that there are five main factors that are important in ensuring the income and food ingredients are: human capital, traditional agricultural practices, business land, grazing fields, and remittances. The results of this research indicate that the five factors are important diversification strategies for households of farmers which was consistent during survey's period.

Agricultural Development Theory

The theory that tells about agricultural development is Mubyarto (1989) which divides the theories of agricultural development into four viewpoints: (1) sectoral point of view, it reviews agriculture as a sector dealing with other sectors in

national economy. (2) the point of view which see the problem of efficiency in the use of agricultural production factors. (3) the point of view dealing with the terms of commodity. (4) Approach point of view in terms of regional development. The grouping is based on the analysis done by looking at agriculture as an economic sector so it is called as sectoral point of view and analyze the development of the agricultural sector as a regional development strategy. This approach is referred to macro-economic approaches. Then, Mellor in Southworth and Johnston (1973) tells the theory of agricultural development with the following interrelated parts: (1) the role of agriculture in economic development. (2) traditional agricultural economy characteristics (3) process of economic agricultural modernization. Furthermore, many other experts give their reviews to explain how the role of agriculture as an economic sector in the overall economic development sector. They are: William Nicholls. H; (1963), Johnston and Mellor (1960 and 1961) thinks about the contribution or the role of the agricultural sector towards economic development. When the economic development starts, agriculture has a major contribution as a source of food, job creation, a source of capital and foreign exchange for the state revenue. The characteristics of condition which the agricultural development process or is the first step of development (initial condition) and also a determinant strategy for agricultural development, become the basic description of the role of the agricultural sector. A theory of agricultural development should emphasize its attention in increasing agricultural production in traditional agricultural structures and methods used and the consequences of the process of agricultural modernization.

Migration and Transmigration

Migration theory stems from the work of Revetein that emerged from the study of economic development. Then, this theory as a basic for other works such as: the work of Lee and Zelinsky which emphasize the economic motive as the cause of migration, then began to be learned in Indonesia since the 1950s such as; Firman's works in 1994, Papayungan in 2001 Hugo in 1991 and Heeren in 1995, catles in 1967, in (Eisenring 2006). In many books, migration is defined as mobility of the people from a place (village or small town) to another (big city) According to its types, it can be classified into 3 types: permanent migration, secular, and shuttle (Word Eisenring 1994 in 2006).

At first, Indonesia's transmigration program implemented to address the problem of uneven distribution of the population which is a popular issue at that time. Since most of the territory in the west part of Indonesia such as: Java, Madura and Bali as well as some places in Nusa Tenggara is a densely populated area, while the regions in Indonesia such as the island of Borneo, Sulawesi, Maluku, Papua is a region with a rarely population.

The objectives evolved, the transmigration program objectives recently are, region development, balanced development in all parts of Indonesia, providing jobs to the unemployed, the security and integrity of the nation (Harjono, 1988). Transmigration program has provided benefits for regional development purposes, it is also a development program that is

controversial, due to a number of debates associated with the program, such as the implementation of the resettlement program in Papua (formerly Irian Jaya) has been criticized by many people related with the following reasons: (1) Transmigrasi is Javanization form. In Colchester (1987) says that transmigration is the largest in the history of colonization program to transfer a large population of Java, Bali and Nusa Tenggara region to Sumatra, Kalimantan, Sulawesi and Papua. In his study, Colchester also says that the government's transmigration is a political tool to reduce ethnic differences (Colchester 1986). It is emphasized by Assman (1990) which says that culture and certain indigenous communities in Papua tends to shrink because of the placement of the migrants from Java in their territory. (2) Transmigrasi also can cause damage to the environment due to transmigration always use a wide development area. For example, to resettle 300 households in a residential unit in the dry land, at least 370 hectares of forest areas to be cleaned, plus 370 acres of land reserved for farming activities. It is particularly emphasized by Leinbach (1939) who tells that extensive forest clearance to land resettlement would disrupt environment divestasi. (3) Transmigration often does not respect the property rights of local communities. Aditjondro (1985) says that because of the transmigration program is a national program, it is customary rights land that belongs to indigenous Papuans must be voluntarily submitted for development purposes. And if it does not favor to the national program, it will be categorized as anti-development community and pro-separatist movements or well-known as Organisasi Papua Merdeka/ Organization of Freedom Papua (OPM). (4) Transmigration creates jealousy with local communities. Manning and Rumbiak (1989) says that infrastructure development in Irian Jaya and other public facilities in rural areas are generally built in units of transmigration settlement infrastructure and facilities built in rural areas generally as their units transmigration settlements. Despite the debate of the pros and cons of the transmigration program in Papua, but political decisions on development in Papua is still more strongly directed by the central government on that day, the national interest is the top priority.

Indigenous People Theory and Development Theory

The name or term for indigenous people in social analysis is fundamentally different from the terms of tribal, because each term refers to different aspects of traditional society. Definition of the term indigenous people are the same with native people. Indigenous people are the groups of native people who inhabit a particular area and living together with migrants or immigrants who come from outside the region (Burger, 1990; Brownlie; 1992). While the term tribal society means having a common language, culture, social organization and occupy a certain area (Winnick, 1960; Howar, 1986). However one thing in common that can be drawn from these two terms is that the term is related to the bad socio-economic situation and the political situation (Wrighton, 1976; Burger, 1990). Therefore, the term indigenous people and the term native people in this research can be used interchangeably.

Poggie and Lynch (1974) says that: from the indigenous people's point of view, the development process can be interpreted as changes in socio-economic conditions through

the introduction of new values and new technology from the people who live outside of their area. The "top-down" approach in development occurs for several reasons: (1) indigenous people as a political social group is a part of a country. (2) As part of the country, indigenous people usually have their own autonomy to decide what they desire, what to do, more than usual social and economic life they left behind, and in some cases they are not involved into development process carried out by the country. Ideally, as a subject in the development of a modern country should be able to enable indigenous peoples to improve their quality of life and well-being, and create justice through the development process. But there are several reasons why the people faced several difficulties to be involved in the development process. They are: (1) Most of indigenous people are not capable the knowledge and skills (Human Resources) compared with most migrants (Goodland, 1988). (2) Their aspiration are sometimes not well understood, and usually ignored by development planners (Tarumingkeng, 1987); and (3) The lack of respect or attention to the social characteristics of the unique culture of the indigenous people (Appel, 1977). Bodley (1988) suggests that there are some implications and the difficulty of indigenous peoples directly involved in the development process as follows: (a) the indigenous people usually reject the invitation to participate in the development process and they maintain their own way. (b) the indigenous people who have participated in the development, but something caused by certain conditions lead them out of involvement in the development process. (c) Several indigenous people are still forced to live politically and economically depressed.

Agriculture and Farmer Households System

Several studies concerning to the theoretical basis of agriculture and farm household system is intended to develop an analytical framework to analyze the structure of agricultural economics in the household level used in this research. As an analytical framework and approaches that have been developed to analyze the agricultural system proposed by how some experts such as: Checkland (1981), Dillon and Anderson (1990), Friedrich (1992), Norman (1980), Ruthenberg (1980), Shanner, Philip and Schmehl (1982). All artificial systems (including agricultural systems) are formed by the natural systems and social systems. Thus, farming systems depend directly on natural systems and social systems or directly dependent upon the social system and not directly on natural systems but through the social system. Agriculture and farming systems specifically classified in various ways (Ruthenberg, 1980). The basic of classification of ecological aspects and types of farming. Classification and hierarchy level of farming system proposed here is oriented farm management and farm household perspective (Dillon, and Anderson (1990) 1997). In Collinson (1983), Makeham and Malcolm (1986) says that there are two main goals of farm management, the profit maximization on market-oriented farming and subsistence on subsistence-oriented farming. Clayton (1983) illustrates the relative importance or relative motivation and various types of farm to two purposes, they are maximum profit motivation and motivation subsistence.

Theory of Consumer Behavior

In economics, every human being is always trying to maximize their satisfaction utility maximization and always act rationally (rational behavior) (Kaiway 2007). Someone will always try to spend their income at a certain price so he will get high satisfaction. According to Tian (2006), the characteristics of the consumers can be characterized by three important things, they are: Consumption set, which represents a collection of all possible alternative or consumption plan. Endowment, which describes the amount of goods owned and consumed or exchanged for other goods. Preference relation, which describes consumer taste or satisfaction for various items selected. To explain how consumer choose to consume a variety of goods with his earnings that can provide optimum satisfaction, then according Harjono, 1988; basic consumer theory is approached with the approach. (1) Cardinal utility theory, which suggests that customer satisfaction can be calculated by using a subjective unit (util). (2) Indifference-curve theory, which states that; consumer satisfaction can not be calculated, but can be ranked in the levels of satisfaction. Many factors influence consumption behavior, socio-cultural aspects, psychological aspects and economic aspects of consumer behavior. Analyzing the consumer behavior in depth by analyzing aspects of human psychology, social aspects, cultural aspects and economic aspects related to consumer income and the prices of goods consumed. Consumer behavior is described with a variety of models of both models that exist in psychology, social sciences, anthropology, and economics.

Research Methods

The population of this research is all farming communities in Jayapura, 14.854 families or 60 percent of the total households in Jayapura, 22.853 households (the results of the agricultural census 2008). Data collection method used is field survey, by using a system of direct observation, structured interviews using questionnaires, unstructured interviews and FGD (Focus Group Discussion). In this discussion will be done with descriptive method, paired sample t-test and Engel curve. Descriptive analysis will use frequency tables and descriptive statistics. Paired sample t tests were performed to test the difference of average characteristics and consumption behavioral differences variables, as well as measuring the ethnic and cultural influences on consumer behavior.

Discussion And Analysis

Through the descriptive analysis there are some important things that can be concluded: 1) the average total household consumption expenditure of local farmers is lower (Rp 816.640) than the consumption expenditure of migrant farmers (Rp1.240.065). 2). There is consumption behavior difference between indigenous people (local farmers) and migrant farmers, in fulfilling the needs of food and non-food consumption, which for local farmers have larger portions of food expenditure, 61.52%, from migrant farmers only have 45.68%. And for non-food consumption, local farmers is smaller portions of food expenditure, 38.48%, while 54.32% for migrant farmers. Engel curve estimation results with the

dependent variable of overall food consumption expenditure in the Working-Leser model shows a total expenditure regression coefficient of -0.573 for local farmers as the sample data, and the total expenditure regression coefficient of -0.337 for migrant farmers.

Based on the partial coefficient significance test with t test, it is known that the coefficients are highly significant. Both coefficients show this Engel curves model has a negative slope, it means that when the farm household income increases, the behavior of food expenditure decreased. Regression coefficient of -0.573 for the local and migrant farmers of -0.337 indicates that; negative relationship between total expenditure (income) local and migrant farmers with behavioral transmigration overall spending on food.

It means that if the household income of local farmers and migrant farmers increased by 100%, then the behavior of local farmer expenditure decreased by 57.3%, and 33.7% decreased for the migrant farmers. It is emphasized by the value of the food expenditure elasticity coefficient of determination for local farmers is 0.958, while for migrant farmers is 0.975. The coefficient of elasticity of less than 1 ($e < 1$) or inelastic shows that the percentage of expenditure on food decreases as income increases. Although the changes of opinion of the two farmers groups are equally negative towards overall food consumption behavior, but the effect on local farmers is much greater than the migrant farmers.

The condition above is a condition of overall food consumption behavior, but when it is seen one by one, then the consumption of eight types researched (Consumption of rice, corn, cassava, sago, fish, meat, eggs/milk and tobacco/betel) then there are various behavior differences, the details can be seen through the following table:

Table 1. Consumption Behavior Differences Between Local Farmers and Migrant Farmers for Food Expenditure Type

Types	Consumption Behavior Differences	
	Local Farmers	Migrant Farmers
Overall	-0,575	-0,337
1.rice	-0,045	-0,321
2.corn	-0,072	-0,047
3.Cassava	-0,134	-0,065
4.sago	-0,367	-0,062
5.fishes	-0,028	-0,131
6.Meat	0,059	0,024
7.eggs/milk	0,027	0,028
8.tobacco	-0,016	-0,010

Source: Research result in 2011

There are several interesting things from the figures above:

1. There are 2 (two) types of foods that have a positive relationship to the behavior of the two groups of farmers: meat and milk / eggs.
2. There are 2 (two) types of foods that the behavior of both the farmers a greater response to local farmers, while 6 (six) other large responses are bigger for local ones.

It can be concluded that the behavior of the two groups of farmers to the type of food expenditure, the response of the

local farmers is larger than the migrant farmers. This is consistent with the descriptive analysis and paired sample t-test in finding that there is a difference in consumption behavior between the indigenous peoples and migrant farmers in fulfilling the needs of food consumption, which for local farmers 61.52%, while the migrant farmers only 45.68%.

Engel curve estimation results with the dependent variable of non-food consumption expenditure in the Working-Leser model shows a total expenditure regression coefficient of 0.573 for the data sample of local farmers and total expenditure regression coefficient 0.292 for migrant farmers. Based on the partial coefficient significance test with t test, it can be seen that the coefficients are highly significant. Both curves Engel coefficient indicates this model has a negative slope, $\alpha < 0$, it means that when a farm household income increases, the behavior of food expenditure decreased.

Regression coefficient of 0.583 for the local farmers and for migrant farmers is 0.292 shows that; the existence of a positive relationship between total expenditure (income) of local farmers and migrant farmers population with behavior for non-food expenditure. It means that if the household income of local farmers and migrant ones increased by 100%, then the behavior of a local farmer expenditure increases by 58.3%, and 29.2% decreased for the migrant farmers,

Although the opinion of the two groups of farmers are equally positive about the behavior of non-food consumption, but these effects for local farmers is smaller than the migrants. It is emphasized by the coefficient of elasticity of food expenditure (ef) for the local farmers is 0.958, while for the migrants is 0.975. The coefficient of elasticity of less than 1 ($e < 1$) or inelastic shows that the percentage of non-food expenditure decreases as income increases. The condition above is a condition of the behavior of non-food consumption as a whole, but when it is seen one by one, then from the five (5) types conducted consumption expenditure (housing, clothing, health, education and party / custom) then there is a various difference behavior, the details can be seen through this following table.

Table 2. Consumption Behavior Differences Between Local Farmers and Migrant Farmers for Non-Food Expenditure Type

Jenis Barang Konsumsi	Perbedaan Prilaku Konsumsi Antara Penduduk Tani	
	Penduduk Asli	Transmigrasi
Secara Keseluruhan	0,583	0,492
1. Perumahan	0,042	0,194
2. Pakaian	0,094	0,079
3. Kesehatan	0,125	0,112
4. Pendidikan	0,117	0,101
5. Pesta/adat	0,153	-0,028

Source: Research result in 2011

There is interesting something from the figures in the table above, mostly types of non-food consumption behavior for migrant farmers consumption has lower responses than the local farmers.

It is the same with the descriptive analysis and paired sample t-test on the finding that for non-food consumption expenditure portion for indigenous people is smaller, that is only 38.48%,

while 54.32% for migrant farmers. The income has positive influence towards mostly types of expenditure except negative traditional party for the migrant farmers.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The difference of consumption behavior between the indigenous people and the migrants, in fulfilling the needs of food consumption, the expenditure portion of local farmers is 61.52%, while only 45.68% for the migrant farmers. If the income increased by 100%, the behavior of local farmer expenditure decreased by 57.3%, and 33.7% decreased for the migrants. The difference behavior consumption between the indigenous peoples and migrant farmers, in fulfilling the needs of non-food consumption, which expenditure portion for local farmers only 38.48%, while the migrants farmers is 54.32%. If the household income increased by 100%, the expenditure behavior of the local farmer rose by 58.3%, and 29.2% decreased for the migrants. This research provides the following recommendations: 1) Further research is needed on the factors that influence consumer behavior differences between indigenous peoples and the migrants. 2) The research about the influence of consumption behavior difference towards health, education, food endurance for the local people and the migrants in Papua. 3) Research about the standard pattern of consumption expenditure for the farmers. 4) Strategic research that can be used to build a farm community in Papua in order to make their food security better.

REFERENCES

- Aditjondro, 1985. Telex Director General & Feedback Ondoafi, news from the village, 18 (3) 43-46
- Appell, 1977. The Plight of Indigenous Peoples : Issues and Dilemmas Survival International Review
- Assman 1990. Die Transmigration in Indonesia Unter Besonderer Berucksichtigung des Etnish- Nationalen Aspekts; Asien, Afrika, Latenamerika Zeitschrift 18(6) 989-1010
- Bodley, 1988. Tribal peoples and Development Issues : A Global Overview. California Mayfield Publishing.
- Brownlie. I; 1992. Treaties and Indegenous Peoples, Oxford Clarendon Press.
- Burger, 1990. The Gaia Atlas of Frist Peoples : A Future for Indigenous World, Doubleday : Anchor Books
- Checkland P.B; 1981. System Thinking: System Practice, Weley Chichester
- Clayton, E. 1983. Agriculture, Poverty and Freedom in Developing Countries, Macmillan Press, London.
- Colchester, 1987. The Indonesian Transmigration Programme: Migrants to Disaster, Proceedings of the Conference on Forest Resources Crisis in The Third World, September 1986
- Collinson, 1983. Fram Management in Peasant Agricultur, Wesview Press, Boulder.
- DeWeese dan Norton 1991. Impact of Married Women's Employment on Clothing. *The Journal of Consumer Affairs*, 25(2), 235-257.
- Dillon dan Anderson, 1990. Farm Management Research for Small Farmer Development, FAO Farm Systems Management Series No. 6 Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

- Eisenring 2006 Migration In Economic Development In South Sulawesi, Lemlit Hasanuddin University, Makassar
- Friedrich K.H. 1992. Readings in Farming Systems Development, Food and Agriculture Organizations of the United Nations, Rome.
- Hans Kaiwai 2007. Farmers Indigenous Economic System In Papua, dissertation (S3) Unhas 2007
- Harjono, 1988. The Indonesian Transmigration in Historical Perspective. International Migration
- Howar Michael. 1986. Contemporary Cultural Antropology, 2nd ed., Boston: Little Brown and Company.
- Johnston Bruce dan Nielsen Soren, 1966. Agricultural and Transformation in a Developing Economy. Economic Development and Cultural Change.
- Leinbach, 1989. The Transmigration Programme in Indonesian National Development Strategy: Currnet Status and Future Requirement, Habitat International.
- Manning dan Rumbiak, 1989. Economic Development, Migrant Labour and Indigenaus Welfare In Irian Jaya,
- Materer dan Valdivia 2000. Hausehold Prodction Strategies In Climate Variable Zone
- Mendoza dan Benlag.e 2002. Testing for The Exsistence of Bargaining In Rural Haosehold
- Mubyarto, 1989. Introduction to Agricultural Economics, LP3ES, Jakarta.
- Nicholls William. H; 1963, An Agricultural Surplus as Factor in Economic Development, Journal of Poltical Economics, 71:1-29. Pebuari 1963
- Norman. DW. 1980. The Farming System Approach: Relevancy for the Small Farmer, Rular Development Paper No. 5 Michigan State University, East Lansing
- Norman. DW. 1980. The Farming System Approach: Relevancy for the Small Farmer, Rular Development Paper No. 5 Michigan State University, East Lansing
- Paulin G.D. 1998. A Growing Market: Expenditures by Hispanic Consumer. Monthly Labor Review
- Paulin G.D. 1998. A Growing Market: Expenditures by Hispanic Consumer. Monthly Labor Review
- Poggie John dan Lynch Robert; 1974 Rethinking Modernazation: Antrapology Perspectives. West Port: Greenwood Press.
- Quazi 2003. Consuption Behavior of Agricultural Hausehold in Rural Hausehold In Rural Bangladesh
- Ruthenberg, H. 1980. Farming Systems in the Tropics, 3rd edition, Oxford University Press.
- Shanner, Philip dan Schmehl, 1982. Farming Systems Research and Development Guidelines for Developing Countries Wesview,
- Southworth Herman M dan Johnston, 1973. Agricultural Development and Economic Growth, Cornell Ubiversity Pres
- Tarumengkeng, 1987. Scientific Research and Development Conception of Irian Jaya, Community Development Irian Jaya, Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan
- Tian, G. 2006. Microeconomic Theory, Lecture Notes, Department of Economics, Texas A & M Univesity College Station,
- Wagner dan Soberen, 1990. The Effect of Ethnicity on Selected Hosehold Expenditures. The Social Science Journal,.
- Wrighton, 1976. The Problems of Tribal Peoples, Survival International Reviw,1 (16) 12-13
- Zhang Z dan Norton M.T.J. 1995. Family Members' Expenditure for Clothing Categories. Family and Consumer Science Research Journal
