

FACTORS BEHIND THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE TRANSMIGRATION PROGRAM

FAKTOR-FAKTOR DIBELAKANG PENCAPAIAN PROGRAM TRANSMIGRASI

Aleh Human Saleh

Program Studi Penyuluhan dan Komunikasi Pertanian, Fakultas Pertanian Universitas Mataram

ABSTRACT

This study was part of dissertation entitled 'Analysis of The Indonesian Transmigration Model and Some Policy Implications for Extension'. This study was heavily based on a review of existing literature and research related to the transmigration program. The Transmigration program was viewed as a combination of push factors that pressure migrants to seek better opportunities and pull factors that attract migrants to a particular location. There are three major components behind the achievements of the transmigration program, namely: government efforts as facilitating factors, potential migrants as push factors to leave the place of origin, economics and non economics factors as pull factors to come to the destination area.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini merupakan bagian dari disertasi yang berjudul 'Analisis Model Transmigrasi Indonesia dan Beberapa Implikasi Kebijakan Terhadap Penyuluhan'. Penelitian ini didasarkan pada review literatur yang ada serta hasil penelitian yang terkait dengan program transmigrasi. Program transmigrasi dipandang sebagai sebuah kombinasi dari faktor-faktor pendorong yang menekan migran untuk mencari kesempatan yang lebih baik dan faktor-faktor penarik yang memberikan daya tarik bagi migran ke suatu lokasi tertentu. Ada tiga komponen utama dibelakang pencapaian program transmigrasi yakni: usaha pemerintah sebagai faktor fasilitas, potensi migran sebagai faktor pendorong untuk meninggalkan daerah asal, faktor ekonomi dan non-ekonomi sebagai faktor penarik bagi migran untuk datang ke daerah yang dituju.

Key words: Transmigration Program, Push Factors, Pull Factors, Facilitate Factors

Kata kunci: Program Transmigrasi, Faktor Pendorong, Faktor Penarik, Faktor Fasilitas

INTRODUCTION

The literature on migration policy in developing countries has been dominated by studies that focus on policy outcomes. A comparative study prepared for ILO, entitled 'State Policies and Internal Migration' (Oberai, 1983) is the most comprehensive study on migration policy. In this volume, transmigration policy was viewed from a broader perspective of capitalist accumulation. Little attention has been given to the government context that determines and influences the making of migration policy. For example, a lack of analysis on the role of the competing interest groups behind policy formulation has significantly restricted understanding of the policy making process. The limited understanding of the social and economic implications of particular transmigration policies has made it difficult for governments to formulate clear and thorough policy recommendations.

Several scholars have written in detail on the history of emigration and transmigration (Pelzer, 1945; Sjamsu, 1960; Hardjosudarmo, 1965; Hardjono, 1977; Heeren, 1979, Swasono and Singarimbun, 1986; Hugo, *et. al.*, 1987). Such studies, however, were only concentrated on the problems of planning and implementation of the program, the profile of the settlers, their problems and their participation in community affairs. Hence, this is the strategic time to study transmigration in Indonesia in its totality, for within the next few years the decisions by farmers and migrant societies and by the Government will significantly influence the performance of migrants in particular and the Indonesian society in general.

The transmigration program in Indonesia is the biggest settlement program in the world. Based on figures from State Ministry of Transmigration and Population (SMTP, April 2000), the number of migrants have been moved by the program from 1950 up to November 1999 were 1,323,892 families from the target of 2,704,935 families. Expenditure per family settled reached nearly US \$ 12,000 and the direct cost to the development budget would add up to nearly US \$ 10 billion, or US \$ 2 billion per year (Arndt, 1983). It should be mentioned that public lands were distributed to settler beneficiaries of transmigration program without payment. These policies are still on going as far as the settlement program is concerned.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study, would draw on existing researchs focusing on the various factors that have shaped transmigration policies in Indonesia, a combination of push factors that pressure a migrant to seek better opportunities and pull factors that attract a migrant to a particular location. Hence, the epistemological method was chosen as the primary method of the research

For this research, cross-sectional and categorical indexing have been used because the data were predominantly text based and the analysis of documentary sources was a major method in the analysis of this research.

RESULTS

Facilitating Factors

Indonesia's Transmigration Program has been supported financially by the government and loans from multilateral development banks. Those financial supports were used to clear about 1.7 million hectares of forestland and built the infrastructures and other facilitating factors (Table 1).

Financially, the world Bank was the major player, part financing the official resettlement of more than 2.3 million migrants and catalyzing the resettlement of more than 2 million spontaneous migrants (Anderson and Spear, 1986). Although the World Bank financing did not exceed 10% of the budget of the transmigration program over the 1976-1989 period, a series of Bank loans totaling US\$500 million in that period was crucial in attracting tens of millions of dollars in further support from numerous other bilateral and multilateral sources. However, in 1992 the Bank disbursed another US\$220 million loan to support the "Second Stage Transmigration" which was meant to salvage the existing transmigration sites (World Bank, 1994).

Land clearing and resettlement in Indonesia deserves serious consideration for several reasons. It is by far the region's largest and most diversified country and at the same time loaded by the most severe population problems. Transmigration program resulted to forestland clearing of about 1.7 million hectares in the period of 1969 to 1994. The World Bank (1994: 51) claims that programs sponsored by the government (transmigration, estate crops, logging) explain 67% of all deforestation.

Although Transmigration has resulted in very little noticeable population relief on Java and Bali, it has had a marked effect on the target areas for migration and new settlement. Not only have large areas of land been opened up

but economic restructuring has led to an ethnic and social restructuring, which furthers "nation building" by integrating these newly settled regions more closely into the young and independent country.

Table 1. Financial and other support for the Transmigration Program

Factors	Quantity	Periode	Sources
Financial Support			
World Bank	US\$909 M	1964-1993	World Bank,
ADB	US\$491 M	1969-1993	1986.1994,1999, 2000.
ISDP Project	US\$ 41 M	1994-2000	Anderson & Spear, 1986
LAP Project	US& 140.1 M	1995-2000	ADB, 1997 2000.
Forestland Clearing	1.7 million hectares	1969-1994	Rich, 2000.SMTP April 2000. Sunderlin,1999 Fearnside,1997.
Infrastructure			
Villages	1931 new villages	1969-1994	Tjiptoherijanto, 1995
	4696.5 ha new settlements	1998-1999	Department Transmigration,
Housing	21,330 units	1998-1999	1999
Roads	5 000 km	1998-1999	Government of Indonesia,
	329.12 km	1969-1994	1994
Bridges	69 000 km	1998-1999	
	1,113 bridges		
Social Infrastructure	housing and home garden, land for agriculture purpose, public health, schools, religious amenities, and other basic need	1979-1999	Suratman & Guinness, 1977. Gardiner, 1992 Donner, 1987. Col chester, 1987
Institutional Support	Involved 4 ministries and 53 different government agencies	1979-1984	Ministry of Transmigration Staff (1991)
Type of Migrant	General migrant	1969-1994	Martono, 1983
	Spontaneous migrant	1973-1999	Hamdi, 2000
	Local migrant	1983-1999	

Source: The existing research on transmigration, 1977-2000

During the First Long Term Development Plan (PJP 1) the transmigration program successfully opened 1,931 new villages in 21 provinces outside Java island, constructed 55,000 km road, and 69,000 m bridges (The State Ministry for Population and Transmigration, 1999).

According to the transmigration policy, the transmigration authorities are supposed to provide certain good and services, such as housing and a home garden, land for agricultural purposes, roads to designated site, employment opportunities, a public health center, schools, religious amenities and other basic needs. In some places, however, the actual implementation of the policy is far from the intended standard.

The effectiveness of FELDA in Malaysia and the Mahaweli Authority in Sri Lanka (Oberai, 1983) suggests that settlement projects

succeed better if the projects are implemented by a stable and strong autonomous agency with a clearly identified plan and strategy.

Responsibility for implementation of the Transmigration Program, lies with the Head of Transmigration Office at the provincial (Kanwil) or regional (Kandep) level respectively. In contrast, that according to Operations Evaluation Department of World Bank (1994), local (district level) authorities were seldom involved in planning or implementing what was, in many places, a 50 percent increase in population and infrastructure. As a consequence, they were ill prepared to manage integration of the new implanted society at project completion.

There are three types of migrants controlled by the government namely. general transmigration, spontaneous transmigration, and local

transmigration. Each type has different facilities from government (table 2).

It seems that those allotments of agricultural land were made on the assumption that they would eventually be turned into wet rice fields by building irrigation systems. With irrigation systems, one family could cultivate

1.75 hectares of wet rice land without assistance from machinery or livestock and it would have been sufficient for a Javanese farmer's family. The problem is, however, that it usually takes many years before the projected irrigation networks are finally installed and the conditions of land are very different from place of origin.

Table 2. Differences in Facilities among Transmigration types

Type of Migrants	Government Facilities
General Transmigrant	Transportation, A house, Farming plot Infrastructures, Living allowances
Spontaneous Transmigrant (SP)	
Assisted SP	Supported by government and investors
Self supporting SP	Individually or group of people Both received a farm plot
Local Transmigrant	Migration within the same provinces sponsored by government
Schemes:	
<i>House</i>	A two rooms 36 square meters
<i>Farm plot</i>	
General migrant	
• A house and small garden	0.25 hectare
• A production food	0.75 hectare
• A perennial crop	1 - 3 hectares
• Size of settlements	About 500 families
NES (Nucleus Estate Smallholders)	
• Plantation land	2-3 hectares
• Labor payment	Cash payment
• Size of settlement	About 3 000 families
<i>Assistances</i>	12 - 18 months for food and farming needs: seeds and fertilizers Five years for extension advice

Source: Ministry of Transmigration, 1987

The Push Factors

In the classical economic or push-pull model of migration, focus is primarily on the individual and immediate factors that relate to migratory decisions. The primary assumptions of the model are on factors of push and pull, factors that either drive individuals away from their locale or attract them to another (Jackson, 1986:13). So there are a number of differences between places. These differences could be in the form of economic, social, and environmental factors both at an individual and at a community level (Bandiyono, 1997). Hence, push factors can be defined as a set of factors associated with the area of origin that drives individuals away from their locale. While pull factors is a set of factors associated with the area of destination that attract individuals to come.

The overcrowded living conditions in Java, Madura, Bali and Lombok is a structural strain that could motivate and push the potential

migrant to join the transmigration to the outer islands.

It is impossible to exaggerate Java's population problem. Together with the small and equally overcrowded islands of Madura, Bali and Lombok adjacent to it on the east and north, Java comprises only seven percent of Indonesia's land mass, yet contains some 59 percent of Indonesia's 210 million people (Arndt, 1988).

Contributing to the overcrowded conditions in Java, despite the family planning program and transmigration, is a steady influx of Indonesians from the outer islands. Ironically, these "migrants" come to Java because their own areas are so under populated that they cannot support the industrial facilities that increase employment and wages. Busy commercial and industrial cities in Java, such as Jakarta and Surabaya, provide jobs not only for the indigenous Javanese, but for countless people from other parts of the country, including North

and West Sumatra, North and South Sulawesi and the Moluccas.

Java has among the world's most fertile agricultural areas, but overcrowding has pushed its land capacity beyond its outer limits. The size of the average farm is now less than one hectare (2.47 acres), barely enough to provide subsistence living. Some two-thirds of Java's rural populations are tilling plots too small to meet subsistence needs (Donner, 1987). Absolute shortage of arable land forces Javanese seeking subsistence to extend cultivation to mountain slopes and forest reserves of the upland watershed (Hardjono, 1977).

Further impacts of population pressures in Java, Madura, Bali and Lombok include soil erosion, which has reached extremely serious proportions in the most densely populated areas of Java and Bali, particularly on the steeper slopes in mountain areas and along the upper slopes of river basins.

Natural disasters such as earthquakes, flooding or volcanic eruption, and also the construction of infrastructure such as dams could trigger the potential migrants to join the transmigration program and move to the destination areas.

Gany (1993) who studied transmigration notes that besides economic motivation which is the strongest factor in encouraging people to migrate, the other push factors that influenced people to migrate were natural disasters (floods and volcanic eruptions) and the closing of factories. Mantra (1992) corroborates this when he indicated that 2.5 percent of migrants from NTB were victims of droughts and natural calamities. In other provinces several events also has triggered the people to move to other places and join in transmigration.

Successful migration would also require special qualifications on the part of the migrant such as knowledge, skills, and other qualifications related to what the migrant might do in the destination areas. Although an important factor, this is likely to be the most difficult to satisfy.

Most of researchers mentioned that sponsor migrants tend to be from the poorer section of society, usually owning little or no land in the rural areas, and have little formal education, training, or skill beyond those of the agricultural laborer (Redecon, 1985; Gany and Halli, 1993; Yudohusodo, 1998.). Transmigration officials have great difficulty attracting migrants from urban centers where there is a greater range of possibilities for income generation.

The problem of landlessness seems to be the most specific motive to migrate, Lack of land for agricultural cultivation was evident

from the generally small size of landholdings and the growing number of landless farmers in Java (PeIzer, 1945; Donner, 1987). Poor harvest and inadequate housing and living conditions had also motivated people to join the transmigration program (PeIzer, 1945; Hardjono, 1977, Heeren, 1979, Fasbender and Erbe, 1990, Gany and Halli, 1993; Yudohusodo, 1998 and SMTP, April 2000).

Uncertainty about the future and the likelihood to improve one's welfare and well-being become the driving forces behind the decision to migrate. It is obvious that there is a close relationship between poverty and willingness to join a transmigration program.

If poverty is the main push factor crucial in motivating people to move, the high expectation to have a better life in the new land is the pulling factor. Therefore, it is natural that the migrants have a strong inclination to move to the centers of economic growth. Timber and oil extraction booms in East Kalimantan, for example, attracted the migrants, as proven by the steady increase in the number of voluntary migrants to East Kalimantan.

Pull Factors

Many migration studies indicate that migration occurs mainly because of economic reasons, that is to say, migration takes place because of opportunities to procure employment, earn income, and other related reasons such as social opportunities and political opportunities which are obtaining in the receiving area. Thus, it can be assumed that migration is an effort to improve the quality of life.

Positive economic factors available in the migration receiving areas are primary in influencing migration. This includes opportunities for better employment, high pay or high wages, and many others. Projects in the outer islands, such as tree-crop development in Nucleus Estate and Smallholder (NES) schemes, forestry, mining and industrial activities, tidal swamp projects, and services, are among the development projects that can serve as primary projects supported by the transmigration program's capacity to fill labor demand. Hence the target of the transmigration program is not the number of resettled people but their production, wages earned through employment in the project, and other benefits that may arise from income multiplier effects.

Often the sponsor transmigration projects seem to serve as bridgeheads from which spontaneous follow-up migrants searched for jobs and settlement opportunities in the neighborhood. Migrants from more distant places in Java such

as Central or East Java, who cannot afford seasonal commuting, usually go at first to places where other family members or former village members already live. Thus the sponsor transmigration program may also play an important role in the process of spontaneous settlement.

Thus, additional family income can be obtained and the migrants can adapt themselves with the environment where they live, an ability which is one of the most important capitals in developing settlements into full-scale villages. Evidently, they manage to create their own employment at the time the field products have not yielded adequately yet.

Living in a house they can call their own with just their own of procreation attracted potential migrants to join the transmigration program. Living with an extended family under one roof is a very common situation in the place of origin. This was rarity, if at all, if one joined the transmigration program.

As expected, the new settlers occasionally complained about the weather or the soil, but few of them returned to their native villages. When asked whether they wish to leave their new settlement and return to their old village, the answer, invariably was "No. I have a house and land of my own. We have a clinic. My children go to school. they will be better off. Why should I want to leave?" (Mantra, 1992). Sentiments such as these, expressed repeatedly by migrants throughout the islands on which they settled, are a better gauge of the program's success than all the statistics of income and production that are used to justify transmigration.

Social relation was established even more strongly in the destination area by migrants through.. (1) *gotongroyong* (mutual help), (2) *membership* in the community organization, and (3) membership in community organization initiated by UPT leader.

The political motive was another factor that attracted the potential migrant to leave their place of origin and join transmigration program. Since the era of new order government banned Indonesian Communist Party, many people made use of transmigration program for their own political ends. According to Hardjono (1977), there were 53 225 people moved in 1965 was the result of such politically motivated transmigration schemes.

Another political opportunity, which attracted potential migrant, was a position on the administration of settlement unit offer to potential migrants. But this opportunity was limited given to the informal leaders of the migrant as part of their responsibility to control

their community. There are several positions being offered to them with the government incentives in each settlement unit such as: head of settlement unit, two administrative assistants, and at least four people for operational task.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the premise of the push-pull theory on migration, there are three major components behind the achievements of the transmigration program, namely: facilitating factors, push factor to leave the place of origin, economics and non economics factors as pull factor to come to the destination area.

Facilitate Factors

1. Loans from multilateral development banks bankrolled the Indonesian transmigration program mainly during the 1980's. A total of US\$ 1.4 billion has supported the program from the loan, during the period of 1969 to 1993. Foreign financial assistance switched to support the second stage of transmigration, i.e. rehabilitate the existing resettlement projects.
2. Transmigration program resulted to forestland clearing of about 1.7 million hectares in the period of 1969 to 1994 resulting to about 67 percent deforestation in Indonesia.

Push Factors

1. The sharp economic and demographic contrasts between the places of origin and destination are among the structural strain that motivated and pushed potential migrants to join transmigration program. It was expected that the number of migrants would increase with time.
2. Major development projects on construction of dams and natural calamities such as flood and earthquake triggered movement of people to join the transmigration program.
3. Uncertainty about the future and the likelihood to improve one's welfare and well-being are the main personality factors in motivating people to migrate to outer island.

Pull Factors

1. Economic opportunities such as the availability of jobs, high pay or high wages, and additional incomes attracted migrants to go to destination areas. Moreover, project planners always expected farming (tree crops or annual crops) to provide almost all households income.

2. Social opportunities such as the status of owning the land and house and social relationships among migrants in destination areas became important forces to join the transmigration program. The activities such as gotong royong (mutual help) and community organizations were established in destination areas.
3. Political opportunities is one of the motives that attracted migrants to leave their place of origin during the period of Islamic rebel group and after the aborted coup of the Indonesian communist party in 1965.

Some Implications For Extension

1. Extension should be one of the dominant if not aggressive players in transmigration program particularly in the development of the appropriate agricultural production systems for the new settlers that would not only cover their basic subsistence needs but also generate sustained additional cash income. This would necessitate making consistent and systematic efforts to introduce agricultural production methods that cause least harm to the environment. There are short and long term efforts that the Indonesian agricultural extension service should make.
2. Agricultural extension must continues to have a role in the development program of most transmigration settlement in reducing poverty, in facilitating growth and in assuring food security through the development of human resources. Apart from these, agricultural extension will have to be involved in issues relating to sustainability in development, safeguarding the environment, increasing the effective role of the vulnerable groups and its important role in ensuring the nutritional well being of the migrants.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anderson J. & SPEAR J., (1986). World Bank Money aids in colonization. The Washington Post, 24 June 1986
- Arndt, Heinz, 1983. Transmigration in Indonesia, Working Paper No. 146, ILO.
- Arndt, H.W., 1988. *Transmigration in Indonesia*. In Land Settlement Policies and Population Redistribution in Developing Countries, A.S. Oberai (ed) New York: Praeger Publishers, pp. 48-88.
- Asian Development Bank, (1997). Impact Evaluation Study of Bank Operations in the Industrial Crops and Agro-Industry Sector in Indonesia, IES: INO 97010
- Asian Development Bank, (2000). Indonesia Country Assistance Plan 2000-2002. Jakarta
- Bandiyono, Suko. Migrasi permanen penduduk Timor Timur: pola dan selektivitas/Jakarta: Proyek Pengkajian Dinamika Sosial Budaya Dalam Proses Industrialisasi Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan
- Colchester, M. (1987). Program Slashed in Response to Transmigration Campaign. *The Ecologist* 17
- Donner, Wolf, (1987). Land Use and Environment in Indonesia. University of Hawaii Press, Honolulu
- Fasbender, K. & Erbe, S., (1990). Towards a new home: Indonesia's Managed Mass Migration. Transmigration Between Poverty, Economics and Ecology. Hamburg Institute for Economic Research, Verlag Weltarchiv, Hamburg
- Fearnside, P M., (1997). Transmigration in Indonesia: Lessons from Its Environmental and Social Impacts. *Environmental Management* Vo 1. 2 1, No. 4, pp. 5 5 3 -5 70
- Gany, A. Hafied A. (1993). *The irrigation Based Transmigration Program in Indonesia*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Mani-toba, Winnipeg, Canada.
- Gany, A. and Halili, S.S. (1993). Land Development and Transmigrant Farmers in Southern Sumatra, Indonesia. In *International Migration. Quarterly Review* Vol. XXXI No. 4, 1993. International Organization for Migration (IOM), PO Box 71, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland.
- Gardiner, P., (1 992). Development, human settlement, and pressure on forest resources in the Indonesian frontier. Paper presented at the Seminar on Population and Deforestation in the Humid Tropics, 30 Nov-3 Dec 1992, Sao Paolo
- Government of Indonesia, (1994) REPELITA VI: Indonesia's Sixth Five-Year Development Plan (1994/95 - 1998/99). <http://www.Indonesia.net/Com/>
- Hamdi, A., (2000). *Kebijakan dan Strategi Penyelenggaraan Transmigrasi dan Kependudukan-(Policy and Strategy in the Delivery of Transmigration and Population Program)*. Jakarta

- Hardjono, J. M. (1977) Transmigration in Indonesia. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.
- Hardjono, J. M. (1986) 'Transmigration; Looking to the Future', Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies, 22 (2), August: 28-53.
- Hardjosudarmo, S. (1965) *Kebijaksanaan Transmigrasi dalam rangka Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa di Indonesia* (Trans-migration Policy in the Context of Rural Development in Indonesia). Jakarta: Bhratara.
- Heeren, H.J. (1979) *Transmigrasi di Indonesia* (Transmigration in Indonesia). Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.
- Hugo, Graeme *et al.* (eds.) (1987) *The Demographic Dimension in Indonesian Development* Singapore: Oxford University Press.
- Mantra, Ida Bagus, (1992) "*Pola dan Arah Migrasi Penduduk Antar Propinsi, di Indonesia, Tahun 1990*" (The Pattern and Trends of Inter Provincial Migration in Indonesia in 1990), *Populasi*, No. 2, Vol.3: 39-59.
- Ministry of Transmigration Staff, (1991) *Planning for Population mobility: the Indonesian transmigration program*. Jakarta
- Oberai, A. S. (Ed.) (1983) *State Policies and Internal Migration: Studies in Market and Planned Economies*, Croom Helm and St. Martin Press, London, Canberra and New York.
- Pelzer, K. J., (1945) *Pioneer Settlement in the Asiatic Tropics*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations.
- Rich, B (2000). Still Waiting. The Failure of Reform at the World Bank. *The Ecologist*, Vol. 30, No. 6, September 2000
- Sjamsu, Amral. (1960) *Dari Kolonisasi ke Transmigrasi, 1905-1955 (From Colonization to Transmigration, 1905-1955)*. Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan.
- SMTP (March 2000). *Kebijakan dan Strategi Kantor Menteri Negara Transmigrasi dan Kependudukan*. Jakarta
- SMTP (April 2000). Press Release in response to Far Eastern Economic Review questionnaire. State Ministry of Transmigration and Population
- Sunderlin, W.D. (1999). The effects of economic crisis and political change on Indonesia forestry sector. Program on the Underlying Causes of Deforestation, Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor
- Suratman & Guinness, P. (1977) The changing focus of transmigration. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*
- Swasono and Singarimbun (eds.) (1986) *Sepuluh Windu Transmigrasi (The Eight Decades of Transmigration)*. Jakarta: University of Indonesia Press.
- The State Ministry for Population and Transmigration, (1999). *Control of Transmigration Program. Fiscal Year 1999/2000*. Bureau of Planning, Jakarta.
- World Bank (1986) *World Bank Transmigration Sector Review*. Washington D.C.
- World Bank (1988) *Indonesia: The Transmigration Program in Perspective*. Washington DC: The World Bank.
- World Bank (1994). *Indonesia Integrated Swamps Development Project: Staff Appraisal Report*.
- World Bank (1999). *Country Assistance Strategy Progress Report 1999*. Washington D.C.
- World Bank (2000). *Second Land Administration Project: Project Information Document*. Report No: PID 8915. Washington D.C.
- Yudohusodo, Siswono. (1998). *Transmigrasi, Kebutuhan Negara Kepulauan Berpenduduk Hetrogen dengan Persebaran yang Timpang*. PT Jurnalindo Aksara Grafika, Jakarta.