

Stereotype, Prejudice And Social Distance In Multiethnic Society

Muhammad Masdar^{1*}, Harifuddin Harifuddin²

¹ PPKn Department, Cokroaminoto Institut Pinrang Indonesia.

² Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Politic Sciences
Bosowa University, Makassar, South Sulawesi 90222, Indonesia.

*Corresponding Author:

Email: muhammadmasdar240571@gmail.com

Abstract.

Social harmony is embodied condition of their togetherness, shared values, shared expectations prevailing in social life. In that context, the symbol of interaction used to understand the process of how individuals primarily from various ethnic interpreted and give meaning to the symbols concerning the events and situations in everyday life interaction. In the process of inter-ethnic interaction, individuals influenced by their perceptions of other ethnic groups. The elements in the concept of the interaction of these perceptions are stereotypes, prejudices, and social distance. These three aspects are mental-creative dimensions and the basis of the ongoing process of interaction of quality and sustainable. Stereotyping is often also called "labeling" or a character attribute attached to something individuals, groups, ethnic, and tend to be negative. A consequence of prejudice arises from the stereotype. For example, the Javanese has a stereotype as a polite person, Makassar people considered character hard. These stereotypes born of prejudice, such as ethnic Java will prejudice soft polite when talking while ethnic Makassar prejudice speaks loudly. This condition raises two distinct social distances, for example to the Javanese tend to be more approachable because of his "bad" to be heard over the ethnic Makassar.

Keywords: Social Harmony, Social Interaction, Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Social Distance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Reality appears in Wonomulyo town shows that each ethnic group showed an open attitude towards other ethnicities. In a market setting, for example, an attitude of openness is evident from the familiarity of the various ethnic selling in the market. Javanese, Bugis, Mandar, and Toraja mingle without any distance between them. They accustomed to sitting side by side to sell at market, interact and communicate among themselves. Similarly, the buyers who come to the market to shop. There is no suggestion that they distinguish whom to shop, for example, they shop only with fellow ethnic. Interaction in a liquid current market, although people involved in these interactions from diverse ethnic. This situation is a manifestation of adaptation and social interaction between the diverse ethnic groups. This raises the openness atmosphere of cooperation in various fields of social life, economy, and culture. Ethnic Bugis and Chinese dominate the field of economy, trade, and transport, while ethnic Javanese, Toraja, and Mandar generally engaged in agriculture. In the market, although there are minor distinctions, such as the Javanese generally sell vegetables and agricultural products, the Mandar selling fish, Bugis sell mixed goods, but the communication and cooperation between them were peaceful. Drill down deeper to facilitate a lasting interaction and quality, it found a perception with its elements. The perception of the interaction, the perception of object interaction, and so accumulate in the aspect of so-called stereotypes or labeling, prejudice, and social distance. Three aspects of that are the mental foundation in the course of an interaction process (interethnic). Furthermore, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum suggest that the stereotype has at least two basic interrelated dimensions are dimensions of descriptive and evaluative dimensions.

Descriptive dimensional stereotype shows the contents of the form of the properties while the evaluative dimension indicates the assessment of these properties is in a positive or negative direction [1]. They also found more stereotypes essentially with respect to the description of social reality in dimensions, namely: consensus-dimensional, descriptive, evaluative, homogenate and distinctiveness [1]. Regarding prejudice, it is a negative attitude towards a group and the members of the group [2], [3]. Against the ethnic groups, the ethnic prejudice is the wrong antipathy based on generalizations or inflexible. Prejudice can feel or express. Prejudice can direct towards a group as a whole or against someone because he is a member of the group in question [4]. He also suggests that prejudice is a negative assessment of pre-existing on the race, religion, or other significant social actors, which held by not considering the fact that just the opposite

[4].Based on the descriptions above, the initial assumption that the author can take is that social interaction and inter-ethnic lasting quality is closely related to stereotypes, prejudices and social distance that each ethnic possess. Therefore, the problems in this study are (1) How is the description of stereotypes in inter-ethnic interaction in Wonomulyo town? (2) How is the description of prejudices in inter-ethnic interaction in Wonomulyo town? (3) How is the description of social distance in inter-ethnic interaction in Wonomulyo town? The answers to these questions will be useful for policy makers in building social harmonisation.

II. METHODS

This study classified as quantitative descriptive research, and survey approach [5], [6]. This research is located in Wonomulyo town, Polman Regency, West Sulawesi as a multi-ethnic city. The respondents are 376 people as the representation of 6 ethnics in Wonomulyo town. The respondents are Java people consist of 176 respondents, Mandar people 86 respondents, Bugis people 75 respondents, Toraja people 32 respondents, Makassar people 9 respondents, and Chinese 5 respondents. The collected data used questionnaire techniques that analyzed through the tabulation of frequency, and literature study. Data processing and analysis techniques use quantitative data analysis, namely frequency tabulation [7]. The results of this data analysis were then interpreted according to the problem formulation.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Stereotype in multiethnic interaction

Ethnic groups in the study site also have a stereotype each ranging from negative in nature to a positive stereotype. Stereotypes, among others the Bugis considered full of calculating, the Javanese are gentle, the Makassar considered rude, people regarded artisan emotions Mandar, Toraja people tolerant nature, and the Chinese are considered stingy. Regarding the stereotypes of each ethnic group can be seen in Table 1 below.

Table 1.The stereotypes of each ethnic group

Individual Personality	RANK						Individual Personality
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	
Honest	Javanese	Toraja	Mandar	Bugis	Chinese	Makassar	Cheater
friendly	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	Hostile
Not selfish	Javanese	Toraja	Bugis	Mandar	Makassar	Chinese	Selfish
Superior	Bugis	Makassar	Chinese	Javanese	Toraja	Mandar	inferior
conscientious	Chinese	Bugis	Javanese	Toraja	Mandar	Makassar	Careless
Watch Out	Chinese	Bugis	Javanese	Toraja	Mandar	Makassar	In a hurry
Loyal	Javanese	Bugis	Toraja	Mandar	Chinese	Makassar	disloyal
Rational	Chinese	Bugis	Javanese	Mandar	Toraja	Makassar	Emotional
Patient	Javanese	Bugis	Chinese	Toraja	Mandar	Makassar	Haste
saving	Chinese	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Javanese	Makassar	extravagant
Open	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	Closed
Persistent	Javanese	Bugis	Chinese	Tora	Makassar	Mandar	not persistent

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Inter-ethnic interactions colored by stereotypes element affecting the climate of social harmony among ethnic groups. In other words, a gesture that can understand from the table above are (1) that the elements of stereotypes affect the climate of social harmony but empirically found that the contribution or influence is small. Although small but stereotype element can be expressed as a positive factor supporting or strengthening the climate of social harmony, (2) although, it is a factor that pertained to facilitate the realization of social harmony, the distribution of the percentage of the value of inter-ethnic stereotypes obtained showed that in general stereotypes that exist between ethnic groups is quite varied. Variations among others are an ethnic group has a high value or positive stereotypes to one or several ethnic groups have a low or negative value to the other ethnic groups. The benchmarks used are the reference criteria or a range of values from one to five. If the larger average value shown means tends to be good or the positive stereotype, while the smaller the mean tends to be low or negative stereotypes.

Table 2. The average value of the ethnic groups in the element of stereotype.

Ethnic group	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	Amount
Javanese	2.40	1.40	1.80	0.90	0.80	1.00	100
Mandar	1.10	1.40	1.90	1.90	1.10	0.80	100
Bugis	1.40	1.66	2.40	1.00	0.70	0.84	100
Toraja	1.71	1.42	1.14	1.60	1.71	1.71	35
Makassar	1.66	1.33	1.66	1.66	2.00	0.80	30
Chinese	1.45	1.81	1.09	0.54	0.72	2.72	11
X	1.62	1.50	1.80	1.26	1.17	1.31	376 (100)

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

The average value of different ethnic groups in the stereotyped element as set forth in Table 2 that generally the average value of the element of stereotypes among ethnic groups in Wonomulyo City still tends to be low or negative. Although relatively low, but this element is not something that is a barrier to maintain the inter-ethnic climate of social interaction. However, if the trend is increasingly negative, it predicted that the stereotyped element will be the weaken factor of the barrier or climate of social integration. Friendly Attitude. This aspect describes the behavior of cooperation and mutual support between two or more social entities and describes a relationship that involves the knowledge, appreciation, and affection.

Table 3. Tendencies of friendly attitude to other ethnic

Ethnic group	The percentage of ethnic group selection based on the attitude of friendship						Amount
	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	
Javanese	88 (23,40)	5 (1,32)	4 (1,06)	3 (0,79)	0	0	100
Mandar	21 (5,58)	66 (17,55)	7 (1,86)	5 (1,32)	0	0	100
Bugis	31 (8,24)	9 (2,39)	55 (14,62)	5 (1,32)	0	0	100
Toraja	8 (2,12)	3 (0,79)	4 (1,06)	20 (5,31)	0	0	35
Makassar	11 (2,92)	3 (0,79)	5 (1,32)	2 (0,53)	9 (2,39)	0	30
Chinese	6 (1,59)	0	0	0	0	5 (1,32)	11
X	164 (43,61)	86 (22,87)	75 (19,94)	32 (8,51)	9 (2,39)	5 (1,32)	376 (100)

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Looking at the data description in Table 3 it appears that the friendly attitude shown by Javanese (43.61%) and it proved by the choice of other ethnic groups who consider that ethnic Javanese considered most have a friendly attitude. This is probably due to the distinctive character of the ethnic Javanese easy to get along with anyone let alone the language said that they have are able to make other people have a good impression on them. Contrary to ethnic Java considered the most friendly the ethnic Makassar and Chinese considered hostile by the four other ethnicities except by their own fellow ethnic. In fact, most of the study subjects from Chinese ethnic and Makassar ethnic recognize friendly attitude owned by Javanese. However, this does not indicate that the Chinese, Makassar ethnic and total unfriendly. Due to the lack of things that could make other ethnics interact with them as well as the lack of the number of their population in Wonomulyo city.

Table 4. The tendency of friendliness that belongs to other ethnic groups

Ethnic group of voters	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Javanese	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Mandar	Mandar	Javanese	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Bugis	Bugis	Javanese	Mandar	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Toraja	Toraja	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Makassar	Chinese
Makassar	Javanese	Makassar	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Chinese
Chinese	Javanese	Chinese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Summing up the above data, the selection of research subjects concerning the ethnicity of the sequence of a friendly attitude illustrated in Table 4 that the study subjects still feel their own ethnic neighbor has a friendly attitude. It naturally because of similarities of culture has always been a pull factor and unifier. However, there are also other ethnic groups namely ethnic Makassar and ethnic Chinese who just do not choose their ethnic itself as the first choice, but ethnic Javanese selected. As noted by an informant rickshaw puller who enjoys the Javanese because they are polite and well moreover it should be nice to everyone so that they have many becak costumers. Description of study subjects above indicated that the background work sometimes makes people have to be nice so that others will have a good impression and will continue an intertwined relationship. Based on the interview above, it can analyze that the high-intensity interactions tend to evoke sympathy or antipathy. What happened informants through interaction with Java, which raises a good impression so that it is a conclusion that the Javanese have a friendly nature. Familiarity. In addition to a friendly attitude, demeanor is qualities that are more familiar in a process of interaction. Familiarity indicates melting the boundaries that usually maintained in an interaction process. Wonomulyo familiarity ethnic outlined in Table 5 below.

Table 5. The tendency of familiarity another ethnic

Ethnic group	The percentage of ethnic group selection based on the attitude of familiarity						Amount
	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	
Javanese	67 (17,81)	12 (3,19)	13 (3,45)	8 (2,12)	0	0	100
Mandar	18 (4,78)	57 (15,15)	21 (5,58)	4 (1,06)	0	0	100
Bugis	19 (5,05)	17 (4,52)	49 (13,03)	8 (2,12)	3 (0,79)	4 (1,06)	100
Toraja	9 (1,32)	3 (0,79)	6 (1,59)	13 (3,45)	2 (0,53)	2 (0,53)	35
Makassar	9 (1,32)	3 (0,79)	4 (1,06)	2 (0,53)	10 (2,65)	2 (0,53)	30
Chinese	4 (1,06)	2 (0,53)	2 (0,53)	0	0	3 (0,79)	11
X	125 (33,24)	94 (25,00)	95 (25,26)	35 (9,30)	15 (3,98)	11 (02,92)	376 (100)

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Table 5 above described that humanely, people still feel more familiar with fellow ethnic. The percentage of the first choice is greater familiarity in their respective ethnic. For ethnic second choice, the choice of a large ethnic categorized Java (33.24%), while the ethnic selection of three and four each ethnic Bugis and Mandar ethnic. Regarding the ethnic choice about the attitude of familiarity, in the order shown in Table 6 that the Toraja ethnic, ethnic Makassar, the ethnic Chinese and Javanese choose in order to two, while the ethnic Javanese and Bugis ethnic Mandar set in the second that has a familiar attitude. The ethnic always considered to less familiar is the ethnic Makassar and ethnic Chinese.

Table 6. The tendency of familiarity of another ethnic

Ethnic group of voters	Attitude familiar of ethnic groups selected based on sequence					
	first	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Javanese	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Mandar	Mandar	Bugis	Javanese	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Bugis	Bugis	Javanese	Mandar	Toraja	Chinese	Makassar
Toraja	Toraja	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Makassar	Chinese
Makassar	Makassar	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Chinese
Chinese	Javanese	Chinese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Welcome Attitude. In the ongoing, the process of interaction must occur interrelatedness of acceptance of the advantages and disadvantages of each to enable the longevity of the relationship. For this, required open mutual between ethnic individuals so that no preconditions to complement deficiencies.

Table 7. The tendency in welcome to other ethnic

Ethnic groups	The percentage of ethnic group selection based on welcoming						Amount
	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	
Javanese	48 (12,76)	24 (6,38)	23 (6,11)	5 (1,32)	0	0	100
Mandar	26 (6,91)	60 (15,95)	7 (1,86)	7 (1,86)	0	0	100
Bugis	11 (2,92)	14 (1,06)	55 (14,62)	8 (2,12)	5 (1,32)	7 (1,86)	100
Toraja	5 (1,32)	3 (0,79)	5 (1,32)	19 (5,05)	2 (0,53)	1 (0,02)	35
Makassar	9 (1,32)	4 (1,06)	4 (1,06)	3 (0,79)	10 (2,65)	0	30
Chinese	4 (1,06)	2 (0,53)	3 (0,79)	0	0	4 (1,06)	11
X	101 (26,86)	107 (28,45)	97 (25,79)	42 (11,17)	17 (4,52)	12 (3,19)	376 (100)

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

In connection with the data on the openness of each ethnic interaction, Table 7 shows that ethnic Mandar considered the most welcome (28.45%), then the Javanese (26.86%) and Bugis ethnic (25.79%). Chinese (3.19%) and Makassar ethnic (4.52%) is exactly the opposite. When the data is broken down, it appears that the Javanese look more open attitude shown by Mandar ethnic and Bugis ethnic. Only Bugis ethnic who had seen the attitude of openness also for other ethnic groups even though the percentage is small. Precisely Mandar ethnic and Javanese does not see welcome in Makassar and Chinese, but for the Chinese, there is no welcome to ethnic Toraja ethnic and Makassar. Concerning the order of the existing welcome ethnic, presented in Table 8, which generally describes an attitude of welcome selection remains on ethnic respectively. The second option, Javanese, and Mandar considered the most open in their interaction, while third were Bugis ethnic, then Toraja ethnic, Makassar and to the last was ethnic Chinese.

Table 8. Tendency open attitude to other ethnic

Ethnic group of voters	Welcome attitude of ethnic groups selected based on sequence					
	First	Second	Third	Fourth	Fifth	Sixth
Javanese	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Mandar	Mandar	Javanese	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese
Bugis	Bugis	Mandar	Javanese	Toraja	Chinese	Makassar
Toraja	Toraja	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Makassar	Chinese
Makassar	Makassar	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Chinese
Chinese	Chinese	Javanese	Bugis	Mandar	Toraja	Makassar

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

What described in Table 8, that naturally, people would put the characters in their respective ethnic because people formed habits and characters. The second choice is always set about similarities Javanese cultural values that exist in it. The results of the study "The stereotype of interethnic relations in China and Java" Java strengthen their ethnic character of interaction which contains elements of the most loved by everyone. The characters include sociable, gentle, well-mannered, loyal, high tolerance.

Social prejudice in multiethnic interaction

Social prejudice is an attitude feeling of the people towards a particular human group, class, race, or culture that is different from the class of people who are prejudiced it. The social prejudice that consists of attitude-negative social attitude towards other groups, and influences its behavior towards other human groups earlier.

Table 9. The average value of the ethnic groups in the social prejudice

Ethnic group	The average value of social prejudice						Respondent
	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	
Java	3.26	1.60	1.72	0.40	0.05	0.06	100
Mandar	1.50	2.24	1.74	1.40	0.05	0.08	100
Buginese	1.92	1.76	2.70	0.48	0.03	1.20	100
Toraja	1.60	1.37	1.71	2.57	0.91	0.68	35

Makassar	1.60	1.33	1.33	1.06	2.33	0.06	30
Chinese	1.81	1.45	1.81	0.90	0.90	2.27	11
X	1.94	1.62	1.83	1.13	0.71	0.72	376 (100)

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Inter-ethnic interaction characterized by an element of social prejudices little influence in the climate strengthen social integration. Although the social prejudices that still exist on the individual, but the results showed 1) the structure of ethnic life in the city of Wonomulyo found that social prejudice interethnic little influence in the climate strengthen social integration; 2) there is a trend in which social prejudice interethnic strengthen the positive direction. This conjecture is based on the average value of ethnic groups in the element of social prejudice as set forth in Table 8 that the average value of social prejudice interethnic tend to be higher in the positive direction, a situation where the social life of ethnic runs within the boundaries of the low negative bias between groups ethnicity. The assessment criteria used as a reference with the range of 1 to 5, where the greater the value shown means the situation tends to be positive.

Social distance in multiethnic interaction

Inter-ethnic interaction in which is social distance or omission sense of intimacy between the various ethnic groups within will weaken the social integration of climate pharmaceuticals. Under these conditions, the social distance is factors that make it difficult for the social integration of inter-ethnic climate pharmaceuticals. What can understand from these conditions are (1) the structure of the life of the Wonomulyo city as the plural society. There are still social distance interethnic as a reflection of the weakness of feeling close or intimate between one ethnic group to ethnic group to another, (2) results The study shows even though people live close together geographically but culturally different, then there is the social distance between them. The results are consistent and support previous studies [8]. The figures in Table 10 below shows the average value of the ethnic groups in the element of social distance, where the distribution of the average value tends to be low. This situation means that the social distance between ethnic groups is relatively far or interethnic social intimacy level is low. Criterion-referenced assessment is the value range of 1 to 5 where the larger the average value shown significant social distance is getting close or intimate.

Table 10. The average value of the ethnic groups in the social distance

Ethnic groups	The average value of social distance						Amount
	Javanese	Mandar	Bugis	Toraja	Makassar	Chinese	
Javanese	1.36	1.36	1.08	1.02	1.28	1.20	100
Mandar	1.40	1.84	1.20	1.36	1.20	0.80	100
Bugis	2.00	1.80	1.68	0.72	0.90	1.04	100
Toraja	1.60	1.42	1.02	1.37	1.60	1.71	35
Makassar	1.80	1.33	1.80	1.06	0.80	1.33	30
Chinese	1.81	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.90	4.54	11
X	1.66	1.44	1.28	1.07	1.11	1.77	376 (100)

Source: questionnaire data, 2022.

Table 10 shows that the social distance of the level of intimacy in these ethnic groups generally tends to strengthen or near among the intra-ethnic groups, whereas against ethnic groups or between groups tend to weaken or away. Specifically, these tables show that generally ethnic groups tend to close or has an intimate feeling with the Javanese ethnic group.

Discussion

In the above studies illustrated that stereotypes and prejudices more positive social owned by ethnic Javanese. Not surprisingly, then, if in all aspects of life, all ethnic Javanese informants prefer as friends, neighbors, businesses and even families. This is what makes Javanese have a social distance so close to all ethnic. Conversely, in some particular ethnic stereotypes and prejudices are "poorly received" by the other ethnic groups. For example, in the character of the Chinese business considered "very calculating" or "miserly". In terms of character, Makassar ethnic considered "hard" and "angry" in the act, and so forth. This is by Brown argued that prejudice is a cognitive social attitudes or beliefs that are degrading, the expression of negative feelings or hostile or discriminatory actions against members of a group linked membership in

the group [9]. As the phenomenon of attitude, prejudice can be seen to have three main components, namely: (1) the affective component: contains feelings or negative emotions toward the group, (2) a cognitive component: includes the belief that is monovalent negative about the group, (3) behavioral component: which refers to the behavioral experience with the group [10]. Referring to that opinion, be acceptable reasons for choosing the Javanese as well; and put the ethnic Chinese and ethnic Makassar in the final selection. The negative evaluation of prejudice can come from associations that are emotional, from the need to justify the behavior or from negative beliefs called stereotypes [11]. Between stereotype and prejudice considered to have the same understanding. However, Allport confirms that the stereotype is not synonymous with prejudice because stereotypes can be positive evaluations. Allport also said that stereotypes change according to the intensity and direction of bias. The characteristic feature of the same stereotypes only words to describe it differently. At first, stereotype used words that are positive, while in the second stereotype used words that are negative according to intensity and direction of bias (Dewi & Sigit, 2014).

IV. CONCLUSION

Stereotyping, prejudice is a mental activity that occurs in individuals born from the internalization of the social interaction that built up. This aspect raised the social distance that individuals could be far or near. The existence of a good stereotype toward a specific ethnic or would otherwise prejudice are good also and necessarily social distance is getting closer. As a consequence, the social interaction will survive and persist that lead to social harmony or inter-ethnic harmony.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thank to everyone who have direct and indirect contribution to this successful research especially all respondent who provide data and information.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Ramos-Oliveira and A. Pankalla, "Negative stereotypes: an analysis of Social Cognition in different ethnic groups. Social cognition of stereotypes," *Psicogente*, vol. 22, no. 42, pp. 1–15, Jul. 2019.
- [2] Safrida, S., Tannady, H., Solissa, E. M., Sapulete, H., & Al Haddar, G. (2023). Strategic Leadership Analysis of School Principal to Improve Learning Quality. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kewirausahaan*, 11(2), 391-399.
- [3] D. G. Myers, *Social Psychology*, 10th ed. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1993.
- [4] M. Murizal, *Psikologi Sosial*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2022.
- [5] Lubis, H., & Pratama, K., Safrida, S. (2022). HR related antecedes to sustainability reporting in Indonesian public listed firm: The mediating role of employee committeemen. *Cuadernos de Economía*, 45(128), 87-97.
- [6] A. G. Greenwald, N. Dasgupta, J. F. Dovidio, J. Kang, C. A. Moss-Racusin, and B. A. Teachman, "Implicit-Bias Remedies: Treating Discriminatory Bias as a Public-Health Problem," *Psychol. Sci. Public Interes.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 7–40, May 2022, doi: [10.1177/15291006211070781](https://doi.org/10.1177/15291006211070781).
- [7] Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta, 2019.
- [8] Simamora, R. N. H., & Elviani, S. (2022). Carbon emission disclosure in Indonesia: Viewed from the aspect of board of directors, managerial ownership, and audit committee. *Journal of Contemporary Accounting*, 1-9.
- [9] L. P. Sinambela and S. Sinambela, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2021.
- [10] B. S. Suyanto, *Metode Penelitian Sosial: Berbagai Alternatif Pendekatan*. Jakarta: Prenada Media, 2015.
- [11] Siregar, Z., Tarigan, N. M. R., & Sahnann, M. (2022). Strengthening Human Resources Through Introduction and Stunting Prevention. *East Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(7), 1221-1228.
- [12] A. Espinosa, A. Tikhonov, L. M. Ellman, D. M. Kern, F. Lui, and D. Anglin, "Ethnic Identity and Perceived Stress Among Ethnically Diverse Immigrants," *J. Immigr. Minor. Heal.*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 155–163, Feb. 2018,
- [13] Tarigan, N. M. R., Syahputra, R. A., & Yudha, T. K. (2022). The Analysis of Quality of Work Life and Work Achievement in Department of Agriculture Simalungun Regency. *SIASAT*, 7(1), 55-70.
- [14] N. I. Marnani, I. S. Lubis, and P. I. "The A. D. F. Max, "Prejudice In 'The African Doctor' Film.," *J. Ilmu Budaya*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 849–869, 2022.
- [15] Sarkum, S., Syamsuri, A. R., & Supriadi, S. (2020). The role of multi-actor engagement. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(4), 176.
- [16] I. Rahmawaty, *Pengantar Psikologi Sosial*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 2022.

- [17] D. G. Myers and J. M. Twenge, *Exploring Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 2021.
- [18] Supriadi, ., Dalimunthe, R. F., Lumbanraja, P., & Tarmizi, H. B. (2021). The Antecedent Of Educational Staff Contextual Performance In Medan City Private Universities. *Archives of Business Research*, 9(2), 316–338. <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.92.9817>
- [19] N. Dewi and T. Sigit, “Fenomenologi: Tumbuhnya Prasangka Etnis di Yogyakarta,” *J. Ilmu Komun.*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 119–135, 2014.
- [20] O. Serrat, “The Sustainable Livelihoods Approach,” *Knowl. Solut.*, no. November, pp. 21–26, 2017.