

Reconciliation and Relational Continuity: Social Stabilization as a Conceptual Lens on Jingitui Communal Practices in Sabu Raijua

*Chandra Ikatyas Widiastuti Rohi¹, Izak Yohan Matriks Lattu²

Yusak Budi Setyawan³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana, Salatiga, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: chandrawidiastutirohi@gmail.com

Abstract

Formal or symbolic reconciliation does not necessarily ensure the durability of repaired relationships. Existing scholarship examines forgiveness, intergroup contact, structural constraints, social reintegration, and everyday peace, but the maintenance of repaired relationships is addressed across rather than integrated within these bodies of literature. This article examines how documented Jingitui communal practices in Sabu Raijua, Indonesia, can inform the analysis of relational continuity and develops social stabilization as a provisional analytical category. The study combines qualitative document analysis with an integrative conceptual review of reconciliation and peacebuilding scholarship and ethnographic, historical, and community-based documentation on Jingitui beliefs, ritual practices, customary authority, and communal life. The comparative analysis identifies four documented features potentially relevant to relational continuity: continuing customary authority, repeated communal participation, collective memory, and a shared moral framework. These features provide a context-bound basis for considering how recurring institutions, practices, and systems of meaning may support relational continuity. They do not establish a standardized Jingitui reconciliation procedure or causal effects on long-term peace. Social stabilization is therefore proposed as a heuristic lens rather than a confirmed chronological stage or measured outcome of reconciliation.

Keywords: *Reconciliation; Relational Continuity; Social Stabilization; Jingitui; Customary Authority*

A. Introduction

Reconciliation is commonly understood as a transition from conflict toward renewed coexistence. Yet the formal conclusion of a dispute does not necessarily ensure that repaired relationships will remain stable in everyday life. This issue is particularly important in the sociology of religion because religious traditions can shape collective identities, moral vocabularies, social boundaries, and the legitimacy of communal institutions. Studies of religious diversity indicate that the relationship between religion and social cohesion is conditional

rather than uniformly positive (Ezzy et al. 2020). Religion may support cooperation and peace, but it may also reinforce social division when religious authority becomes entangled with exclusionary political interests (Jatau and Maza 2023). An analysis of reconciliation in a religious community must therefore consider not only how a dispute is resolved but also how restored relationships are maintained within a shared moral order.

Contemporary reconciliation scholarship approaches this process from several complementary perspectives. Psychological research has examined forgiveness and emotional recovery following interpersonal harm, although the outcomes of forgiveness interventions primarily concern individual well-being rather than the durability of collective relationships (Akhtar and Barlow 2018). Interactive problem-solving approaches emphasize communication, perspective-taking, and the reconstruction of mutual understanding between conflicting parties (Demirdöğen 2011). Other scholarship draws attention to structural conditions that may continue to constrain reconciliation even after interpersonal contact or political settlement has occurred. Hughes (2018), for example, argues that approaches centered on individual agency can overlook structural segregation and the unequal social environments in which reconciliation takes place. Together, these perspectives explain important dimensions of relational repair, but they also show that reconciliation cannot be reduced to forgiveness, dialogue, or formal agreement.

Empirical studies further demonstrate that peaceful coexistence may conceal persistent relational distance. Research in Northern Ireland shows that intergroup separation can remain embedded in the everyday spaces and activities of communities despite the formal reduction of conflict (Dixon et al. 2020). In northern Uganda, self-reported social reintegration did not fully correspond to behavioral evidence of willingness to cooperate with former combatants (Osborne, D'Exelle, and Verschoor 2018). Research on displaced populations in Colombia similarly emphasizes the importance of personal networks and community relationships in rebuilding social cohesion (Maya-Jariego et al. 2019). Experimental evidence also indicates that intergroup contact may influence behavior without necessarily eliminating prejudice (Scacco and Warren 2018). These studies caution against assuming that the cessation of hostility automatically produces durable relational integration.

This distinction directs attention to what occurs after reconciliation has been formally acknowledged. Concepts such as social cohesion, reintegration, and peace maintenance address solidarity, inclusion, and the continuity of peace, but they do not always isolate the everyday mechanisms through which repaired relationships are repeatedly enacted and socially reinforced. Moreover, critiques of emotion-centered reconciliation demonstrate that relational change must be considered alongside power differences and structural conditions (Vollhardt and

Sinayobye Twali 2016). This article uses the term *social stabilization* as a provisional analytical category for examining the maintenance of relational order after a formal or symbolic reconciliation process. The term does not replace existing concepts; rather, it focuses the analysis on how communal participation, moral legitimacy, ritual continuity, and recurring social interaction may help sustain restored relationships.

The Jingitiu belief tradition of the Sabu community in East Nusa Tenggara offers a relevant context in which to explore this problem. Existing studies describe a religious order in which humans, ancestors, the natural environment, and the sacred realm are understood as interdependent. The Hole ritual, for example, connects agricultural life with obligations toward the Creator, ancestors, and the ecological order, while also performing social functions related to solidarity and communal regulation (Rondo and Hudayana 2023). Research on the Tolak Balak ritual similarly documents the continuing importance of ritual authority, collective participation, and shared meals in maintaining Jingitiu religious life amid social change (Mustolehudin et al. 2025). These studies do not directly measure the long-term outcomes of particular reconciliation cases, but they identify social and ritual structures through which communal relationships are organized and reaffirmed.

Within this religious order, the Mone Ama constitutes an important form of customary and ritual authority. Studies and community-based cultural documentation associate the Mone Ama with the regulation of ritual calendars, customary responsibilities, and the continuity of Jingitiu practices (Rondo and Hudayana 2023; Setiawati et al. 2024; Sooai and Qisty 2021). Rather than treating these materials as direct evidence of a standardized reconciliation procedure, this study reads them interpretively to identify communal mechanisms that may be relevant to the maintenance of relational order. This distinction is necessary because the present research is based on published ethnographic studies and cultural documentation, not on the author's direct observation of reconciliation events or longitudinal changes in post-conflict relationships.

Accordingly, this article examines three related questions: why does the formal achievement of reconciliation not necessarily ensure durable social relationships; how can documented Jingitiu practices be interpreted as mechanisms for maintaining communal order; and what can these mechanisms contribute to the conceptual development of reconciliation studies in the sociology of religion? Through a comparative conceptual analysis of reconciliation scholarship and documentation concerning Jingitiu communal life, the article proposes social stabilization as an analytical extension of reconciliation theory. It argues that the durability of reconciliation may depend not only on changes in individual attitudes but also on the continuing presence of morally legitimate institutions, repeated communal practices, and shared systems of

meaning. This argument is conceptual and context-bound; it does not claim to establish causal effects or to represent every form of reconciliation practiced within the Sabu community.

B. Methods

This study used qualitative document analysis combined with an integrative conceptual review to examine how documented Jingitui communal practices may inform the analysis of post-reconciliation relational continuity. Document analysis is appropriate for examining recorded social practices, institutional descriptions, and cultural narratives without treating those materials as direct observations by the researcher (Bowen 2009). An integrative review also permits dialogue between bodies of scholarship that use different concepts and forms of evidence, provided that the selection and interpretation of sources are stated transparently (Snyder 2019). The unit of analysis in this study was therefore not individual Jingitui participants or directly observed reconciliation events, but published claims and documented descriptions concerning reconciliation, communal rituals, customary authority, and the organization of Jingitui social life.

The documentary corpus comprised two categories. The first consisted of academic literature on reconciliation, conflict resolution, forgiveness, social reintegration, social cohesion, peacebuilding, and the religious dimensions of communal order. These sources were identified through purposive searches of ScienceDirect and Google Scholar using combinations of the terms “reconciliation theory,” “post-conflict reconciliation,” “social reintegration,” “social cohesion,” “everyday peace,” “religion and reconciliation,” and “religious peacebuilding.” The second category consisted of scholarly studies and cultural documentation concerning Jingitui beliefs, rituals, customary institutions, and communal life in Sabu Raijua. This category included journal articles, ethnographic and historical studies, and the community-based educational text *Kepercayaan dan Kebudayaan Jingitui di Kabupaten Sabu Raijua*, which was accessed through the Jingitui community documentation platform. Sources were selected according to their identifiable provenance, substantive relevance, and contribution to at least one of the study’s analytical concerns: ritual continuity, communal participation, customary authority, moral legitimacy, or the maintenance of social relations. Community-based documents were used to identify locally documented categories and practices; they were not treated as peer-reviewed evidence of the effectiveness or long-term outcomes of reconciliation.

The analysis proceeded in four stages. First, reconciliation scholarship was examined to distinguish approaches centered on psychological change, interpersonal contact, structural conditions, social reintegration, and the

everyday maintenance of peace. Second, the Jingituu materials were reviewed to identify documented descriptions of ritual organization, communal participation, the Mone Ama, customary norms, and relationships among human, ancestral, natural, and sacred domains. Third, these categories were compared to determine which aspects of Jingituu communal organization could reasonably be interpreted as relevant to the maintenance of relational order. Fourth, the concept of *social stabilization* was formulated as a provisional analytical category connecting formal or symbolic reconciliation with the continuing reproduction of social relationships. Interpretive credibility was supported by comparing claims across available sources and by distinguishing documented descriptions from the authors' conceptual interpretation. Because the study did not include fieldwork, interviews, direct observation, or longitudinal evidence, it does not establish a standardized Jingituu reconciliation procedure, measure the effectiveness of particular practices, or demonstrate causal effects on long-term peace.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Reconciliation and the Problem of Relational Continuity

The documentary comparison identified two related issues in reconciliation scholarship. First, reconciliation is addressed through several analytical traditions that emphasize different dimensions of relational repair. Psychological approaches examine forgiveness, emotional recovery, and changes in individual responses following interpersonal harm (Akhtar and Barlow 2018; Balkin et al. 2016). Interactive problem-solving and contact-based approaches focus on communication, changes in perception, and the possibility of constructive interaction between conflicting groups (Demirdöğen 2011; Grady et al. 2023; Scacco and Warren 2018). Structural approaches, by contrast, caution that interpersonal change may coexist with segregation, unequal power relations, and institutional conditions that continue to reproduce division (Hughes 2018; Vollhardt and Sinayobye Twali 2016).

These approaches do not support the claim that contemporary reconciliation theory uniformly treats agreement as the end of conflict. They do, however, show that the relationship between relational repair and its maintenance is distributed across different concepts and levels of analysis. Psychological studies can identify changes in forgiveness or well-being without establishing whether collective relationships remain stable. Contact-based interventions may change behavior without eliminating prejudice, as demonstrated by Scacco and Warren (2018). Grady et al. (2023) found broader changes in attitudes, security, and contact in communities exposed to an intergroup intervention, but the effects did not extend uniformly to all forms of

cooperative behavior. Such findings caution against using one indicator as sufficient evidence of reconciliation.

Second, research in post-conflict settings reveals a gap between formally improved relations and everyday social interaction. In Northern Ireland, Dixon et al. (2020) found that intergroup contact remained constrained by the segregation of everyday activity spaces. Taylor et al. (2022) similarly showed that trust, forgiveness, social identity, and support for a peace process represent related but distinct dimensions of post-accord relations. In northern Uganda, Osborne, D'Exelle, and Verschoor (2018) found that the apparent social integration of former combatants in self-reported accounts did not fully correspond to behavioral willingness to share or cooperate. Research in Colombia also indicates that community cohesion and network density do not automatically remove trauma or the effects of residential segregation (Maya-Jariego et al. 2019).

These studies indicate that the cessation of overt hostility, the restoration of communication, and the maintenance of relational order should not be treated as identical outcomes. Mac Ginty's (2014) concept of everyday peace already directs attention to routine practices through which people navigate conflict and social division. Social reintegration examines participation and acceptance after conflict, while social cohesion addresses patterns of attachment, solidarity, and collective belonging. The present analysis therefore does not claim to discover an entirely neglected concern. It identifies a narrower conceptual question: how might repaired relationships be sustained through recurring communal mechanisms after reconciliation has been formally or symbolically acknowledged? Table 1 summarizes the relationship among these concepts.

Table 1.

Analytical Relationship between Reconciliation and Relational Continuity			
Concept	Primary question	Relevant evidence	Relationship to social stabilization
Psychological reconciliation	How do forgiveness, emotional recovery, and attitudes change after harm?	Akhtar and Barlow 2018; Balkin et al. 2016	Explains individual and interpersonal change but does not by itself establish collective durability
Contact-based reconciliation	Can communication and intergroup contact change attitudes or behavior?	Grady et al. 2023; Scacco and Warren 2018	Identifies conditions for improved interaction, although effects may vary across outcomes
Structural reconciliation	How do segregation, power differences, and institutions	Hughes 2018; Vollhardt and	Establishes structural conditions that

	constrain change?	relational	Sinayobye Twali 2016	relational maintenance must address
Social reintegration	Are excluded conflicting accepted included community	formerly or actors and in life?	Maya-Jariego et al. 2019; Osborne, D'Exelle, and Verschoor 2018	Examines inclusion and cooperation after conflict
Everyday peace	How do practices people to division and escalation?	routine enable navigate avoid	Mac Ginty 2014	Directs attention to recurring practices and local agency
Social cohesion	What forms attachment, solidarity, or collective connect a society?	of or belonging	Ezzy et al. 2020	Provides a broad account of collective attachment but may carry contested normative assumptions
Social stabilization	How might relationships be maintained through recurring communal mechanisms?	repaired be through communal	Conceptual synthesis developed in this article	Focuses on the possible maintenance of relational order after an acknowledged process of repair

Source: Authors' conceptual synthesis of the cited literature.

Within this framework, *social stabilization* refers to the continuing maintenance of relational order through recurring institutions, practices, and systems of meaning. It is not presented as a measured outcome in the present study. Nor does it imply that social stability is always desirable, because stable arrangements may preserve inequality or exclusion. The category is used to examine the mechanisms through which a community may reproduce accepted patterns of relationship after a disruption. This qualification is consistent with critiques of social cohesion that warn against equating cohesion with equality or justice (Ezzy et al. 2020).

2. Documented Features of Jingitiu Communal Order

The second part of the analysis examined whether documented Jingitiu institutions and practices contain features that can be interpreted as relevant to relational continuity. The sources do not document a standardized reconciliation procedure or follow particular parties after a dispute. They nevertheless describe a communal order organized through shared cosmological understandings, ritual obligations, customary authority, and recurring participation.

The first documented feature is a relational religious order connecting humans, ancestors, the Creator, and the natural environment. Sooai and Qisty (2021) describe Deo Ama as the highest sacred authority within Jingitui belief and identify spiritual beings associated with the earth, sea, and sky. They also note that customary observance is directed toward maintaining balance between humans and the natural environment. Rondo and Hudayana's (2023) study of the Hole ritual similarly identifies relationships among humans, ancestors, the Creator, and the environment as central to Jingitui ritual life. This evidence supports the existence of a shared cosmological framework. It does not establish how members interpret every conflict or whether they consistently understand wrongdoing as a disruption of cosmic balance.

The second feature is the continuing authority of the Mone Ama. Sooai and Qisty (2021) identify the Mone Ama as the customary council that leads many ceremonies and establishes the applicable Uku. Rondo and Hudayana (2023) also describe the Mone Ama as responsible for regulating the performance of the Hole ritual according to the customary calendar. These studies provide evidence of ritual coordination and customary authority. They do not establish that the Mone Ama serves as a neutral mediator in every dispute, conducts a uniform reconciliation forum, or monitors formerly conflicting parties after a settlement.

The third feature is the repetition of collective ritual practices. Rondo and Hudayana (2023) report that the Hole ritual performs spiritual and social functions, including the reinforcement of family relationships, education, solidarity, and social control. Mustolehudin et al. (2025) document customary leadership, collective ritual activity, prayer, offerings, and shared food in the Tolak Balak ritual. Dachlan et al. (2025) further describe ritual continuity, performing arts, and communal adaptation as factors in the persistence of Jingitui tradition. These findings indicate that Jingitui religious life is reproduced through repeated participation rather than through belief alone. However, none of these studies measures whether ritual participation prevents renewed conflict or produces durable post-reconciliation relations.

Historical and ethnographic scholarship adds a fourth feature: the role of genealogy and oral tradition in the organization of social identity and memory. Duggan (2009) examines the genealogical model through which Savunese social relationships, ancestry, and identity are organized. Duggan and Hägerdal (2018) document the broader historical and oral traditions of Savu. These works support the relevance of collective memory and inherited social categories to communal life, but they do not directly examine the effectiveness of reconciliation. Table 2 distinguishes the documented material from the interpretation developed in this article.

Table 2.
Documented Jingitiu Features and Their Interpretive Relevance

Documented feature	Supporting source	Permissible interpretation	Evidentiary limitation
Mone Ama leadership in ceremonies and the establishment of Uku	Rondo and Hudayana 2023; Sooai and Qisty 2021	Customary authority provides continuing ritual and normative coordination	Does not establish that the Mone Ama mediates every conflict or supervises post-reconciliation relations
Ritual calendar and collective participation in the Hole ritual	Rondo and Hudayana 2023	Repeated participation may reinforce shared obligations, solidarity, and social control	The source concerns an agricultural ritual, not a longitudinal reconciliation process
Relationships among humans, ancestors, Deo Ama, and the natural environment	Rondo and Hudayana 2023; Sooai and Qisty 2021	Jingitiu cosmology provides a shared framework for interpreting communal order	Does not directly document how particular disputes are understood or resolved
Collective ritual activity, prayer, offerings, and shared food in Tolak Balak	Mustolehudin et al. 2025	Shared ritual participation may reproduce belonging and collective identity	Shared food is not documented as evidence of post-conflict reintegration
Continuity of ritual practices amid social change	Dachlan et al. 2025; Mustolehudin et al. 2025	Ritual continuity may sustain institutional legitimacy and collective memory	Cultural continuity is not equivalent to durable peace
Genealogical and oral organization of Savunese identity and memory	Duggan 2009; Duggan and Hägerdal 2018	Inherited narratives may provide a stable framework for social identity	These sources do not measure reconciliation outcomes
Community-produced educational documentation	Setiawati et al. 2024	Provides locally documented terminology and descriptions of Jingitiu cultural categories	Community documentation is not peer-reviewed evidence of causal effects or long-term outcomes

Source: Authors' analytical synthesis of the cited scholarly and community-based documentation.

This source mapping changes the status of the argument. The Jingitiu materials should not be presented as observations of a completed reconciliation process. They provide documented elements of communal organization that can be interpreted in relation to reconciliation theory. The distinction matters because an agricultural ritual, a ritual for protection from misfortune, and a customary council cannot be reclassified as reconciliation mechanisms without direct evidence. Their analytical value lies instead in showing how religiously grounded authority, repeated participation, shared memory, and moral obligations are embedded in communal life.

3. Mone Ama, Ritual Continuity, and Potential Stabilizing Mechanisms

The continuing presence of the Mone Ama differs analytically from a temporary mediation arrangement. The available sources indicate that the council's authority operates across ritual cycles through its role in ceremonies and the establishment of Uku (Rondo and Hudayana 2023; Sooi and Qisty 2021). This continuity permits the Mone Ama to be interpreted as a source of normative coordination. The analysis does not establish that it exercises coercive social control or that members automatically comply with its decisions. Those questions require direct research with customary leaders and community members.

A first potential stabilizing mechanism is therefore moral and institutional continuity. A repaired relationship may be more durable when it is situated within a normative order that remains recognizable after the formal conclusion of a dispute. In the Jingitiu context, the continuing ritual position of the Mone Ama and the authority of Uku provide a possible institutional reference for communal obligations. This interpretation is consistent with scholarship showing that reconciliation cannot be separated from structural and institutional conditions (Hughes 2018; Vollhardt and Sinayobye Twali 2016). It remains a conceptual inference because the available Jingitiu studies do not compare disputes involving and not involving the Mone Ama.

A second potential mechanism is repeated communal participation. Hole and Tolak Balak occur through organized ritual activity involving customary leaders and members of the community (Mustolehudin et al. 2025; Rondo and Hudayana 2023). Repetition may create opportunities for relationships and obligations to be enacted publicly rather than remaining abstract. This interpretation has an affinity with everyday peace, which directs attention to routine practices and local agency (Mac Ginty 2014). It also differs from contact-based explanations because ritual participation cannot be assumed to produce the same effects as structured intergroup contact. Evidence from contact research shows that participation may change some behaviors or attitudes without changing others (Grady et al. 2023; Scacco and Warren 2018).

A third potential mechanism is the reproduction of collective memory and identity. Genealogy, oral tradition, and ritual narratives situate individuals within a longer communal history (Duggan 2009; Duggan and Hägerdal 2018). Such narratives may provide continuity after social disruption, but collective memory is not necessarily reconciliatory. It can preserve belonging, yet it can also reproduce boundaries or unequal interpretations of the past. The analysis therefore treats memory as a mechanism through which relational order may be maintained, not as evidence that harmony has been achieved.

A fourth potential mechanism is the repeated affirmation of a shared moral framework. Jingitiu documentation describes an ordered relationship among humans, sacred authority, ancestors, and the environment (Rondo and Hudayana 2023; Sooai and Qisty 2021). This framework may give communal obligations a legitimacy that extends beyond an immediate agreement between individuals. Religion, however, should not be treated as an inherently peaceful force. Research shows that religious institutions can support moral accountability and peace while also being mobilized for exclusion or political conflict (Jatau and Maza 2023). The possible stabilizing function of Jingitiu institutions must therefore be examined empirically rather than inferred from their religious character alone.

This caution also addresses the risk of romanticizing local institutions. Paffenholz (2015) argues that scholarship on local peacebuilding can construct an overly unified image of “the local,” overlook differences in power, or assign positive effects to traditional institutions without sufficient evidence. The present analysis does not assume that all Sabu residents share the same relationship with Jingitiu authority, that ritual participation is free of hierarchy, or that customary stability necessarily corresponds to justice. The cited sources document religious and cultural continuity, but they do not provide sufficient evidence concerning dissent, gendered authority, generational differences, or the experiences of people who do not follow Jingitiu.

4. Social Stabilization as a Provisional Analytical Category

The conceptual contribution of social stabilization lies in connecting three levels that are often studied separately: the initial repair of relationships, the structural conditions surrounding that repair, and the recurring practices through which an accepted relational order may be reproduced. In this formulation, social stabilization does not replace reconciliation, social reintegration, social cohesion, or everyday peace. It identifies a question that runs across these concepts: what maintains relationships after an acknowledged process of repair?

The Jingitiu materials suggest four candidate mechanisms for examining this question: continuing customary authority, repeated communal participation, collective memory, and a shared moral framework. These mechanisms are not

reported as measured effects. They are analytical categories derived from comparison between reconciliation scholarship and documented features of Jingituu communal life. Their empirical operation remains to be tested through observation of actual disputes, interviews with the parties involved, and longitudinal examination of relationships after settlement.

For this reason, social stabilization should be treated as a heuristic phase rather than a confirmed chronological stage. A heuristic sequence may distinguish the cessation of overt conflict, relational repair, and the subsequent maintenance of relationships. Actual reconciliation processes may not follow these stages linearly. Repair and stabilization may overlap, fail, or move backward, while the institutions that preserve order may also reproduce unequal relations. The concept therefore concerns the maintenance of relational order, not proof of justice, equality, or universal harmony.

This formulation makes a limited contribution to the sociology of religion. It directs attention to religion not only as a source of beliefs or conciliatory values but also as a possible institutional environment in which authority, memory, ritual repetition, and communal obligation are reproduced. The Jingituu case is analytically useful because the documented religious order connects customary institutions with recurring communal practices. It does not establish that Jingituu produces more durable reconciliation than other religious or secular arrangements.

The evidentiary boundary remains decisive. The present study is based on secondary scholarship and community documentation rather than direct observation of reconciliation events. It cannot establish the prevalence of the proposed mechanisms, determine how community members evaluate them, or measure whether relationships become more stable over time. The concept of social stabilization should therefore guide subsequent empirical research rather than be treated as a conclusion already demonstrated by the Jingituu case.

D. Conclusion

This article examined the conceptual distance between the formal or interpersonal achievement of reconciliation and the continuing maintenance of social relationships. The comparison of reconciliation scholarship shows that forgiveness, contact, trust, reintegration, structural conditions, and everyday interaction address different aspects of post-conflict relations. Documentary sources concerning Jingituu do not establish a standardized reconciliation procedure or demonstrate long-term peace. They do, however, identify a communal order organized through customary authority, ritual continuity, collective participation, genealogy, and a relational cosmology. These documented features provide a basis for considering how religious institutions

and recurring communal practices may be relevant to the maintenance of relational order.

On this basis, the article proposes *social stabilization* as a provisional analytical category rather than a universally established phase of reconciliation. The concept focuses on how repaired relationships may be sustained through continuing authority, repeated participation, collective memory, and shared moral frameworks. Because the analysis relies on secondary and community-based documentation, it cannot determine whether these mechanisms operate consistently in actual Jingitiu disputes or produce durable relational outcomes. Future research should examine specific reconciliation cases through direct observation, interviews with conflicting parties and Mone Ama members, and longitudinal analysis of post-settlement relationships. Such research is also needed to assess dissent, unequal authority, generational differences, and the possibility that stable customary arrangements may preserve exclusion as well as social order.

References

- Akhtar, Sadaf, and Jane Barlow. 2018. "Forgiveness Therapy for the Promotion of Mental Well-Being: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 19(1):107-122. doi:10.1177/1524838016637079.
- Balkin, Richard S., Michelle Perepiczka, S. M. Sowell, K. Cumi, and P. B. Gnilka. 2016. "The Forgiveness Reconciliation Model: An Empirically Supported Process for Humanistic Counseling." *Journal of Humanistic Counseling* 55(1):55-65. doi:10.1002/johc.12024.
- Bowen, Glenn A. 2009. "Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method." *Qualitative Research Journal* 9(2):27-40. doi:10.3316/QRJ0902027.
- Dachlan, Muhammad, Mustolehudin, Wardiah Hamid, Fauziah, Novita Siswayanti, and Amiruddin. 2025. "The Sustainability of the Jingitiu Belief Tradition in Indonesia: Challenges and Future of the Ancestral Religion of the Sabu Tribe in East Nusa Tenggara." *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change* 10(2):903-917. doi:10.64753/jcasc.v10i2.1713.
- Demirdöğen, Ülkü D. 2011. "A Social-Psychological Approach to Conflict Resolution: Interactive Problem Solving." *International Journal of Social Inquiry* 4(1):215-227.
- Dixon, John, Colin Tredoux, Gemma Davies, Jonny Huck, Bree Hocking, Brendan Sturgeon, Duncan Whyatt, Neil Jarman, and Dominic Bryan. 2020. "Parallel Lives: Intergroup Contact, Threat, and the Segregation of Everyday Activity Spaces." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 118(3):457-480. doi:10.1037/pspi0000191.

- Duggan, Geneviève. 2009. "The Genealogical Model of Savu, Eastern Indonesia." *Journal of Indonesian Social Sciences and Humanities* 2:163-177. doi:10.14203/jissh.v2i0.27.
- Duggan, Geneviève, and Hans Hägerdal. 2018. *Savu: History and Oral Tradition on an Island of Indonesia*. Singapore: NUS Press.
- Ezzy, Douglas, Gary Bouma, Greg Barton, Anna Halafoff, Rebecca Banham, Robert Jackson, and Lori Beaman. 2020. "Religious Diversity in Australia: Rethinking Social Cohesion." *Religions* 11(2):92. doi:10.3390/rel11020092.
- Grady, Christopher, Rebecca Wolfe, Danjuma Dawop, and Lisa Inks. 2023. "How Contact Can Promote Societal Change amid Conflict: An Intergroup Contact Field Experiment in Nigeria." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 120(43):e2304882120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2304882120.
- Hughes, James. 2018. "Agency versus Structure in Reconciliation." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41(4):624-642. doi:10.1080/01419870.2018.1381340.
- Jatau, Victoria, and Kangdim Dingji Maza. 2023. "Democracy, Peace, and Religion in Nigeria: Can Religion Be Used to Consolidate or Undermine Democracy and Peace?" *Religions* 14(10):1305. doi:10.3390/rel14101305.
- Mac Ginty, Roger. 2014. "Everyday Peace: Bottom-Up and Local Agency in Conflict-Affected Societies." *Security Dialogue* 45(6):548-564. doi:10.1177/0967010614550899.
- Maya-Jariego, Isidro, Adriana De La Peña-Leiva, Claudia Arenas-Rivera, and Deniza Alieva. 2019. "Personal Networks, Social Media, and Community Cohesion in the Strategies of Peace-Building Agents in Colombia to Counteract the Segregation of Displaced Populations." *Journal of Community Psychology* 47(6):1300-1312. doi:10.1002/jcop.22173.
- Mustolehudin, Wardiah Hamid, Muhammad Dachlan, and Israpil. 2025. "Tolak Balak Local Traditions of Sea Rituals in the Sabu Tribe of East Nusa Tenggara in the Midst of Modern Culture." *Indigenous Southeast Asian and Ethnic Studies* 1(2):187-202. doi:10.32678/iseaes.v1i2.19.
- Osborne, Matthew, Ben D'Exelle, and Arjan Verschoor. 2018. "Truly Reconciled? A Dyadic Analysis of Post-Conflict Social Reintegration in Northern Uganda." *Journal of Peace Research* 55(1):107-121. doi:10.1177/0022343317729011.
- Paffenholz, Thania. 2015. "Unpacking the Local Turn in Peacebuilding: A Critical Assessment towards an Agenda for Future Research." *Third World Quarterly* 36(5):857-874. doi:10.1080/01436597.2015.1029908.
- Rondo, Anderias, and Bambang Hudayana. 2023. "Fungsi Spiritual dari Ritual Hole dalam Pertanian di Masyarakat Adat Liae Suku Jingtiu." *Ideas: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sosial, dan Budaya* 9(2):589-598. doi:10.32884/ideas.v9i2.1343.
- Scacco, Alexandra, and Shana S. Warren. 2018. "Can Social Contact Reduce Prejudice and Discrimination? Evidence from a Field Experiment in

- Nigeria." *American Political Science Review* 112(3):654–677. doi:10.1017/S0003055418000151.
- Setiawati, R., J. Lamont, and M. F. Oktaviani. 2024. *Kepercayaan dan Kebudayaan Jingitui di Kabupaten Sabu Raijua: Buku Teks Pendamping bagi Pendidik*. Edited by J. H. Fernando. Vol. 1. Sabu Raijua, Indonesia: Yayasan Masyarakat Menuju Sejahtera (Marungga). Retrieved July 30, 2026 (<https://jingitui.com/buku/>).
- Snyder, Hannah. 2019. "Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines." *Journal of Business Research* 104:333–339. doi:10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039.
- Sooai, Ivana Pascalia, and Syifa Naufal Qisty. 2021. "Sistem Religi dan Kepercayaan Jingitui di Kabupaten Sabu Raijua." *Tornare: Journal of Sustainable Tourism Research* 3(1):40–46. doi:10.24198/tornare.v3i1.29840.
- Taylor, Laura K., Dean O'Driscoll, Christine E. Merrilees, Marcie Goeke-Morey, Peter Shirlow, and E. Mark Cummings. 2022. "Trust, Forgiveness, and Peace: The Influence of Adolescent Social Identity in a Setting of Intergroup Conflict." *International Journal of Behavioral Development* 46(2):101–111. doi:10.1177/01650254211066768.
- Vollhardt, Johanna Ray, and Michelle Sinayobye Twali. 2016. "Emotion-Based Reconciliation Requires Attention to Power Differences, Critical Consciousness, and Structural Change." *Psychological Inquiry* 27(2):136–143. doi:10.1080/1047840X.2016.1160762.