



ISSN: 0975-833X

CASE STUDY

THE SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT OF POOR FISHERMEN'S DEFENSE (CASE STUDY ON THE POOR FISHERMEN FAMILY IN TANJUNGTIRAM VILLAGE NORTH MORAMO DISTRICT OF SOUTH KONAWA REGENCY)

***Jamaluddin Hos**

Sociology Department, Social and Political Sciences Faculty, Halu Oleo University Kendari 93232, Southeast Sulawesi Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 24th June, 2017
Received in revised form
12th July, 2017
Accepted 23rd August, 2017
Published online 29th September, 2017

Key words:

Defense, Socio-cultural
Context, Poor fishermen.

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to explore the socio-cultural context that underlying the defense of poor fishermen in Tanjung Tiram Village North Moramo District of South Konawe Regency. This research used qualitative approach that showed the poor fishermen were not in a vacuum world, but they were in a social habitat with full of values and norms that made as a reference to do an action. The socio-cultural context includes the economic resources aspect, the cultural aspect, and the structural aspect that gave feature toward the poor fishermen's defense. The economic resources aspect was about the ownership and control of limited production tools, low education and skills, and also the condition of coastal natural resources around the village that was declining. The cultural aspect was about habitual and lifestyle of fishermen society which highly depend on natural condition, values in going to the sea which put togetherness and harmony of nature rather than the encouragement of success in economic and life orientation of fishermen society who prioritized the safety than looking for benefit. The structural aspect was about an imbalance of economic access which gave rise the feature of vertical relationship between poor and wealthy fishermen, exploitative patron-client relationship, and some inadequate government policies. The socio-cultural context of fishermen with all various aspects gave the feature to the social practices of fishermen who were more reactive as a consequence of helplessness. This condition produced the structure which more suppressing and debilitating than giving opportunities or empowering fishermen.

Copyright©2017, Jamaluddin Hos. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Jamaluddin Hos.2017. "The socio-cultural context of poor fishermen's defense (case study on the poor fishermen family in Tanjungtiram village north Moramo district of south Konawe regency)", *International Journal of Current Research*, 9, (09), 57435-57441.

INTRODUCTION

The life of coastal communities are usually thick with poverty because their lives are highly depend on natural conditions. If the nature is disturbed, then their work activities are also disturbed. The poverty factors of fisherman are not only related to the fish season fluctuations, resource constraints, capital, exploitative production relationships to fishermen as producer, but also caused by the negative impact of fisheries modernization that lead to depletion of marine resources excessively. Such processes are still continuing until today and the further impact that felt by fishermen are the declining level of their income and the difficulty of getting the catch (Widodo, 2011:11). Tanjung Tiram village is one of the maritime villages which located on the coast of North Moramo, South Konawe Regency of Southeast Sulawesi Province. Most of the villagers are poor fishermen society.

***Corresponding author: Jamaluddin Hos,**

Sociology Department, Social and Political Sciences Faculty, Halu Oleo University Kendari 93232, Southeast Sulawesi Indonesia.

Powerlessness and misery, and also poverty become the farther problems for fishermen society which consisted of 34 families or 99 people (Hos, 2012:23). According to Kusnadi (2002:17), fishermen society is classified into several typologies. First, from the mastery of production tools aspect or fishing tools (boats, nets, and other tools), fisherman society is divided into fisherman owner and fisherman laborer. Second, from the capital investment rate scale, fishermen are divided into large fishermen and small fishermen. Third, seeing from the level of tools technology that used by fishermen, the fishermen are divided into modern fishermen and traditional fishermen. Based on that typology, generally poor fishermen do not have good resource (tools production), if they have the tools, it is a very simple technology (traditional), they do not have the capital that can be invested in a productive fishing business. Poor fishermen, although there is no clear definition and criteria as the opposed of prosperous fishermen, but usually it has quite dominant characteristics. First, the activities are more labor intensive even though they have used outboard motors with simple fishing tools. Second, the technology they use for processing of marine products is also simple.

Third, the level of education and skills they have is still very low. Fourth, it is about the high frequency of involvement of pre-age children and fishermen's wife in the household economic business (RatnaIndrawasih, 1993: 123-130). Every human being and society has a way to stay alive. Human works and constantly adapts to find the best strategies to stay alive. According to Scott (in Sugihardjo, 2012: 145-146), the traditional poor farmer's survival strategy is "priority/precedence safety" (*safety-first*). For poor farmer who are socially has susceptible economic, decline or even has failure harvest will bring negative impact for the lives of their families. In this condition, farmer avoids risk and focuses on the possibility of harvest decline, not on maximizing profits". The relation with the values and norms that affect the behavior of actors, according to Koentjaraningrat (1993:5), values and norms are one of the forms of culture that serves as a behavior that regulates, controls, and gives direction to the behavior and human actions in society. In this relation, Clifford Geertz (1992: 55) described that the role of culture in human life by affirming two things, first that the culture is best seen not as complexes of concrete patterns of behavior, such as customs, habits, traditions, but as a set of mechanisms control, namely: plans, recipes, rules, instructions to regulate the behavior. Second, the human is most depending on mechanisms control (cultural programs) to regulate their behavior. Therefore, actions even emotion such as the human nervous system is the product of culture, that is the products that created.

In line with Koentjaraningrat and Clifford, Sanapiah S. Faisal (1998: 18-19) in his research about the working culture of farmer society in Sumbawa explained that the purpose of farmers' production cannot be simplified for subsistence purposes in economic sense, since the concept of basic necessity itself is inseparable from social/cultural construction whose meaning goes beyond the notion of subsistence economically. The concept of work is a cultural phenomenon whose meaning depends on social construction and local culture and the scope is broader than economic context. Society wherever and whenever, including the fishermen society, there is always a culture that organizes the meaning and behavior of their everyday life. Culture for fishermen society is a system of ideas or cognitive system that serves as a guide of life, reference patterns of social behavior, as well as a means to interpret and sense the events that occurred in their environment. It became the focus of this research, namely the socio-cultural context that encompassed the lives of fishermen who later bring into the defense pattern. This research used the perspective of structural theory that developed by Anthony Giddens. This perspective did not see structure and agent as two dichotomous things so that social practices were born through the structural – agent dialectics, in which the structure was not in the determinant position of the individual or vice versa. Giddens stated that the main object of social science is the meeting point between the structure and the individual agent (agent) which mentioned as "social practice who is repetitive and also patterned in time and space (Herry-Priyono, 2003: 7).

Based on the paradigm of asionistic structure, structure and agent are dialectically and continuously related to the duality of structure (*duality of structure*) (Ritzer, 2004: 508). Structuralize is the link of structure with the social action. Agent and structure are interrelated and interdependent in human practice or activity. All social action requires structure and the whole structure requires social action. Therefore, the

relationship of social action to the structure cannot be explained by subordinating one of them. From the structural point of view, there are three major clusters of Giddens's main principles, namely signaling structure (*signification*) that involves symbolic schemes, meanings, mentions, and discourses; dominance structure (*domination*) that includes schemes of control over the people (politic) and things (economy); justification structure (*legitimation*) that involves the scheme of normative or legal regulation (Herry-Priyono, 2003: 24). In social practice, these three structural principles are related one another. The signification structure must always be understood in relation to domination and legitimation. Similarly, the dominance structure is always related to the signification and legitimation, and the structure of legitimation must always be associated with signification and domination.

While on the actor's side, there are three internal dimension of the actor related to the hierarchy of consciousness (Giddens, 1984: 7), namely *unconscious motivation*, *practical consciousness*, and *discursive consciousness*. Unconscious motivation is a desire that has a potential to do the direct action, but not the act itself. Practical consciousness refers to the cluster of practical knowledge that is rarely questioned and cannot always be explained. Discursive consciousness refers to the individual capacity in reflecting and giving detail explanation of his/her action. Among the three dimensions of person consciousness, practical consciousness is the key to understand the process of how various social action and practice gradually become structure, and how is the structure constrain and enable the social action/practice. Social reproduction takes place through the repetition of social practice that is rarely questionable again (Herry-Priyono, 2003: 29). Based on the above description about perspective of structural theory, the social practice of poor fisherman with the aim for their defense is seen not in the vacuum world. It is in a certain social habitat which is loaded with certain beliefs, values, and norms. In other words, it is always in a certain socio-cultural context that has been institutionalized in a society. People everywhere and whenever, they always have a culture that organizes the meaning and behavior of people in their everyday life. However, human in managing their lives is not mechanistic, but they involve subjective interpretation and judgment. Thus, the social reality of fishermen is also thick with subjective dimension. It is possible that diversity in behavior happened, including livelihood strategies in supplying their socio-economic need.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This research used qualitative approach, namely the type of research that was not only had ambition to collect data from the aspect of quantity and breadth of coverage, but also it was mainly trying to gain a deeper understanding behind the phenomenon that was recorded successfully. Referring to the concept of duality of structure, so the most important implication in this research was: observation and study focused on social practices that designed as regularity in everyday life; gave adequate attention to the aspect or dimension of a cultural aspect for understanding the beliefs system, values, and norms that are structured and enclose to the subjects of social practice; and put the actors of social practice (fishermen) as free agent and creative who constantly monitor their own thoughts and activities, and also their social and physical context. Therefore, this research was oriented for

understanding the defense of poor fishermen according to the *emic perspective*, in this case according to the fisherman's perspective as the subject of the cultural actor themselves. Based on this approach, the research put forward the use of data interpretation and giving meaning of analytical method (*verstehen*) by the own research subject toward various socio-cultural condition that underlies their defense as fishermen. The main characteristic of this approach was inductive, that was based on logical procedures that began from particular proposition as a result of observation and ended with a conclusion (new knowledge) hypothesis that was general; studying people in context and situation in which they are located; understanding human behavior from their own point of view; observation and in depth interview became the technique of data collection; and researcher himself as the main instrument of the research.

Data Collection

This research was conducted at TanjungTiram Village North Moramo District, South Konawe Regency of Southeast Sulawesi Province. As effort to gain a deeper understanding about socio-cultural context of poor fisherman's defense, it was done two main techniques of data collection, namely observation and in depth interview. Observation was done to the "tables of life" that expressed in social practices, habits, and expressions in their everyday life among fishermen, especially related to their livelihood strategies. In order to find out the meaning behind the "tables of life", the result of observation that required further understanding was explored by doing *in depth interview*, especially to the agent/subject of social practice itself. Testing the validity of data was done in the process of extracting data by applying data triangulation model and triangulation of data collection method, namely always checking the truth of the information from some informants and using some of data collection. So since the begging of data collection process, it did not take place in a linear, but "go and back", interactive and in a cycle. Methodologically, even this research was considered using the sample, namely it was called *snow-ball sampling* which was extracting data from various sources until the data reached the saturation of information. It meant that data collection was ended after the data obtained tent to be repetitive and there was no new things gained and has found the design of information or constant information.

Tabulation and Interpretation of Data

The process of collecting and interpreting data took place equally and simultaneously during the research process. Data tabulation was the process in organizing and sorting the data into patterns, categories, and units of basic description so that the theme can be found and can be formulated the interrelated meaning that eventually raised into a substantive theory (Moleong, 1994: 103). The process of tabulation and interpretation of data applied *interactive model* that developed by Miles & Huberman (1994). Process of data collection, data reduction, data presentation and data verification was the cycle process that took place simultaneously and interact each other. Data reduction was done through a selection process, focusing on simplification, abstraction, and transformation of "rough" data that appeared from written records in the field. Data presentation was a set of arranged information that gave possibility of drawing conclusions and taking action. A conclusion/verification was an attempt to search "the meaning"

of data that recorded about patterns, explanations, possible configurations, cause and effect plot, and proposition. Data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion / verification activity were activities that interrelated before, during, and after collecting data in authentic form.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Poor fishermen family was not in a vacuum world, but they were in a certain social habitat that is full with certain beliefs, values, and norms. So, it was important to explain about socio-cultural context that institutionalized in society and also influenced the livelihood strategies and socio-economic adaptation of the fisherman. The description of the socio-cultural context of fishermen's defense in TanjungTiram village contained description and analysis about the aspects that affected the fishermen's lifestyle which included economic resource aspect, cultural aspect and structural aspect. Economic resource aspect was included: the ownership of production tools in term of boat, trawl, fishing-rod; production cost; level of education; skills; skill of infestation/saving; and the condition of marine nature resource where they were fishing. Cultural aspect was included: cultural value system, mentality, tradition, living habits that shaped the pattern of fishermen's behavior. While structural aspect concerned with production relationship, sharing profit, access of the resources and about the government policies related to the fishermen's economic life.

The Economic Resource of Fishermen

The economic resource of fishermen here was about the ownership of the capital and production tools such as boat, fishing-rod, trawl, and also level of education and skills of fishermen in managing their production. Fishermen in TanjungTiram village were generally the traditional fishermen which did not have technical skills in developing their business which oriented to the business profit. The economic resources of fishermen in TanjungTiram village can be described as follow:

The Ownership of Production Tools

The ownership of production facilities such as boat and fishing gear that required for fishing activities of the fishermen in TanjungTiram village can be divided into several groups, namely first: fishermen who had a motorized boat (*katingting*). Those who entered this group, some of them were equipped with their own fishing gear, there was also a fishing gear prepared by other. Most of the fishermen ever had their own fishing tools. After it was damage, they preferred to be helped by the fish collector rather than buying themselves because inadequate financial reason. Second, it was fishermen who had non-motorized boat (*canoe*). Third, group of fishermen who did not have either motorized or non-motorized boat. They usually went to the sea by following a big ship or by borrowing their neighbor's boat that at the time did not go to the sea. The fishermen who did not have their own production tools can be said as a fisherman who was very depended on other people. The information was obtained from the headman of village in TanjungTiram that there were fishermen who usually followed a big ship as labor during going to the sea. Besides follow other ship, fishermen who did not have a boat sometimes they borrowed their neighbor's boat that at the time did not go to the sea. Generally, production tools that owned

by the fishermen was a small non-motorized canoe. Some of them had motorized boat (*katingting*) but it was not equipped with fishing gear. Besides that, those who had motorized boat (*katinting*) also felt the operational cost was quite expensive, especially diesel fuel oil so the capacity of them was very limited. The ownership condition of production tools was very influence toward the number of fish catch.

The Level of Education and Working Skills

From the result of interview, it was found that the level education of fishermen inTanjungTiram village was low category. The highest education was only senior high school graduation, while others did not finish or graduate their senior high school, junior high school, elementary school or SR (People School). There were not finishing their elementary school and even never going to school. The low level education of fishermen had an impact on the limitation in understanding the technology and their mindset in managing the work. Their economy activity was largely undertaken on a regular basis without planning and a better future orientation. It caused the result of quality and quantity of fish catch did not improve, even it was tended to decline with the development of fishing technology controlled by the owner of capital or rich fisherman. Besides catching the fish, fishermen in TanjungTiram village was also introduced to the seaweed cultivation. However, the fishermen did not have enough skill to cultivate the seaweed so it never getsa satisfactory result. Besides that, the limited access in getting the seeds also became the major problem. They were still depended on the seed came from government support, but it was never effective because the arrival of the seeds was not appropriate with the season. Besides working activities that explained above, some fishermen also had other skills that became as a side job to support their live. Among these jobs were: stone breaker, construction labor, gold miner, and gardener. These jobs can be said do not require technical skills and more depend on physical energy. The result of working that gained was depended on healthy condition and physical strength. It was certain that the fishermen did not have technical skill that can produce a service with appropriate cost. Their working cost was highly depended on others people who need their labor.

Saving Skill

Generally, informant found the difficulty to set aside their income that got from the result of fishing because it was very little, ranging from Rp 40.000 – Rp 50.000 each time they went to the sea. So, it was almost used to fulfill their needs in daily life, including supporting the needs of their children's school. The difficulty of saving money was caused by the working system of fishermen which not uncertain time because it was depend on the nature and weather condition. Nevertheless, some informants had a habit to set aside their income for saving. However, generally they did not come into the bank, so their habitual for saving money was only done at home or kept by their wife. In TanjungTiram village actually there was a cooperation institution, namely "Koperasi Nelayan InsanCita" but it was not running properly. The result of researcher's observation about this cooperation showed that there was no signs about this cooperation were active. The office looked like dirty that showed the place has not been occupied for a long time. By the condition of this cooperation, it was appeared that it cannot help the fishermen in their economic activities, especially in marketing of marine

products. Therefore, it was understood if the fishermen always deal with collector and middleman which economically unfavorable. Some of them had a desire to save the money even in small amount, but there was no institution to facilitate them which became the main obstacle.

Natural Resources Condition

The nature condition and season fluctuation as happened inTanjungTiram village did not allow the fishermen to go to the sea during the year. Fishermen society lived in hard atmosphere which always covered with uncertainty in running their business. This condition made the location or fish catch area of fishermen became not certainty. Fishing catches location of fishermen in TanjungTiram village was spread in several locations. The locations which often became a destination for catching the fish such as: the closest location around the TanjungTiram waters that can be reached about 15 minutes from the beach, Hari Island and Bokori Island were usually taken about one hour, Wanci waters was about 5 hours and the farthest was Labengki Island in Centar Sulawesi which was taken about 5 – 8 hours. Commonly, the fisherman was looking for fish around the beach of TanjungTiram village which only taken one night (they went in the evening at 06:00 p.m. and back home around 08:00 a.m. in the morning). The fishermen who looking for fish in far-off areas were usually fisherman laborer who employed by wealthy fisherman using motorized boat and modern fishing gear. They were usually in catching location for several days (for around Wanci Waters, they usually will be there for 2 days, while around Labengki Island was about 20 days). Based on the fishermen's recognition, the condition of natural resources around TanjungTiram village decreased that had consequence to the number of their catching fish was also decrease. Regarding to the fishermen activities, people known two kinds of seasons, namely quiet season and waving season (strong wind) and two kinds of sea water condition namely high water and low water. The ideal condition of catching fish for them was in quiet season with the high water. While the high water condition with the strong wind was as afamine for them because they could not go to the sea. The low water condition with the quiet season, they still did the fishing activities but it should be cover a far distance. Similarly, the low water condition with the strong wind, they could not catch the fish in the sea but they could look for crabs and shell-fish around the beach as substitute commodity to cover the needs of their daily live.

The Fishermen Cultural

Basically, this cultural aspect saw the poverty problem as a problem which arisen cause of the internal aspect of society itself that involved values or views of life and also living habits. Generally, it often said that poverty was caused by laziness, extravagant lifestyle, not thinking about the future, surrender to the situation, not have desire to the better live and other apathy attitude. In other words, poverty was the consequence of life that full of competition, so only them who had a power can escape form the poverty problems. Those who had access to the capital, knowledge, technology mastery and get information can be successful in the competition. The description of fishermen culture in TanjungTiram village was focused on three aspects, namely the habit and lifestyle of the people, the values in going to the sea, and the future orientation of life as describe below:

The Habit and Lifestyle of the People: For people in TanjungTiram village, fishing activity was a livelihood that has been long time occupied by them from generation to generation as a source of livelihood. Fishermen's activities which influenced by the geographical situation, for them it were considered to be sufficient and able to support their families. Besides, local fishermen considered that the income they got from their business at the sea was no more only for the needs of their daily meals. As fishermen, their daily lives had been following their work pattern. If the weather and wave condition supported, they went to the sea at 06:00 p.m. and back home around 07:00 a.m. in the morning. After that, they slept until 12:00 p.m. then after waking up and lunch time, they usually continued their activity to repair the fishing tools until the afternoon before getting ready to go to the sea again. Weather factor also influenced the fishermen activities in TanjungTiram village. If in the certain seasons (west and southeast wind season), it was generally the fishermen did not go to the sea. At this time, they did another activity which aimed for supporting the economic sustainability of their families. For example, there were gardening, breaking the stone, and becoming a construction worker. The habits and lifestyle of fishermen had become a routine that flows away without any planning and organizing properly to make changes for a better direction. For the fishermen society in this village, generally they assumed that the link between income with sufficiency or lack in providing the livelihood of their family was a destiny which already set by the God and must be passed. Therefore, most of the fishermen were comfortable doing their routines at home which was unfavorable and they had less effort for a better live especially for improving the quality of their own family's life. The habits and lifestyles of fishermen as describe above reflected the attitude of fatalistic life. This life attitude was very difficult to change even though having the potential and opportunity to change it. In TanjungTiram village, fishing job was not only the livelihood done by the fishermen, but also they can become the breaker stone, gardener, breed animals and so forth. However, the fishermen's economic life cannot be improved among others because their habitual activities and lifestyle which was not productive.

Values in Going to the Sea

Generally, the fishermen in TanjungTiram village were traditional fishermen, which can be seen from the types of tools that they used was still traditional. Besides that, the values that grow in their life were related to their job in the marine sector which influenced by the nature condition. The hard condition of nature and cannot be conquered caused of the limitation of knowledge and technology made the fishermen tend to keep the harmony with the nature and considered the luck as a destiny that should be accepted with a graceful. They were really appreciating the customs related to the fishing in the sea which approved hereditary, although economically it was no longer guarantees their prosperity. Feeling the power of nature that cannot be conquered, they expressed the attitude of accepting the destiny and weaken their creativity and innovation to move forward. Their working activities were carried out from generation to generation, lack of awareness of saving money and lack of work planning were reflection of this attitude. The values that promote togetherness, mutual cooperation, and harmony with the nature were standing out than the values that encouraged the successful in the economic side.

The belief about the income of every human being has been determined by the God made most of them always hope and work conventionally without followed by a hard work which full of planning and calculating. Looking for income for them was aimed to fulfill the needs of their family in everyday life, and then rest of that was the God's business. Attitudes that see everything had been arranged by God brought the hope of getting income without work hard which also then bring a consumptive lifestyle and gamble habits and also drinking.

Future Orientation of Life

Living condition as fishermen for some people did not give prosperity. It was caused by the limitation of production facilities, capital or lack of income that they got. However, their cultural value orientation still continued to fulfill of their livelihood's need at this time, rather than did the change planning toward the increasing income in the future. It was demonstrated by the absence of efforts to change the way of work that had been done from generation to generation and there was no effort to improve their skills in the field they did, and also the unwillingness of them to switch their work to another even though the potential around them was available.

Some of the result of interview showed that the hope for better life in the future was in the brain of the fishermen themselves. However, their hopes were not actualized to the real life behavior in increasing their knowledge, skills, creativity and innovation, and also the awareness of saving money/infestation. Most of the hopes were only as a "dream" with their expectation that there were people who help them like the government. So, although they had a desire for better life in the future but in the reality their attitude and work was still in contemporary orientation rather than the future orientation.

Fisherman was not interested in finding new strategies in their fishing business or other strategies outside their fishing business as a provision for the future. Although they used the famine time for working as a breaker stone (put the stones into the truck), gardener, and become a construction labor in the city, all of that were done only for getting the income to their life defense.

The Socio-Economic Structure of Fishermen

Imbalance of Economic Access: Poor fishermen family in TanjungTiram village had a limited access toward economic resources. It was effected the dependency of poor fishermen to the fisherman who had the capital, so it bring a vertical work relationship. The owner of the capital (rich fisherman) was a place where the poor fishermen dependent on gaining the capital and necessities of their life. There were two kinds of fisherman owner of the capital. First, the owner of the capital who had production tools (boat, fishing gear, and capital) but they did not go to the sea. They rent or lend their production tools to the poor fishermen who always followed by an agreement that the catch of their fish was sold to the owner of this capital. This kind of the owner of the capital also had another job outside the field of fishery. Second, the owner of the capital who participated in fishing with the fisherman labor so that the ownership of the catch was to the owner of the capital itself and the fisherman labor got the salary. This type was called as the marine skipper.

Poor fishermen in TanjungTiram village did not have enough access toward resources waters, especially in the fish catching location which had abundant potential. It was caused by the

limitation of production facilities such as boat and the simple fishing gears. While today, they had difficulty to get the fish in the waters around the area they lived. Similarly with the access of productive capital assistance, the fishermen were considered unable to develop their productive business because the low understanding toward supervision management and lack of technical skills that required for them. The low level of fisherman education caused the lack of understanding to the resource management and lack of management skills for business. Then, it influenced toward the limitation of accessing the economic resource. The policy of fisheries development which more oriented to the productivity for supporting national economic growth, partial and did not partial to the traditional fishermen became one of the factor fishermen's weak accesses toward the economic resources. Ineffective assistance of seaweed seeds was one of the examples of unproductive and unfavorable policies for the fishermen. The fishermen were provided with seaweed seeds which took their time, energy and mind to manage it which was finally also failed. The case of this seaweed seeds assistance was already confirmed by the local Field Agricultural Concealing (FAC) and recognized as a wrong assistance distribution. The assistance was distributed to the fishermen when the weather did not allow planting the seaweed. The distribution of this seaweed seeds was conducted in November – December, it was based on the consideration of the deadline in reporting the project budget at the end of the year. By the end of the year, the project should be reported with budgeted usage. So, it was not based on the interest of beneficiaries and the effectiveness of achieving target. Another policy which less beneficial to the fishermen community in TanjungTiram village was the penetration of mine entrepreneurs who came to the village and used the fishermen as the breaker stone labor without working agreement that regulated the rights of worker clearly and the power of binding law. This condition made the worker only depend on their physical energy without health insurance and protection. Similar with their salary, it never be appointed based on the mutual agreement between the entrepreneur and the worker, but it was appointed by the entrepreneur so the working relationship that happened was more vertical where the workers tend to be exploited.

Exploitative Patron-client Relationship

The social interaction of fishermen in working relationship was in the form of patron-client. Patron – client involved the relationship of an individual with the higher socioeconomic status (patron) who used his/her influence and resources to provide the protection and benefit for someone with the lower status (client). For the traditional fishermen in TanjungTiram village, patron-client relationship could be in the form of the owner of the boat – fisherman, collector/catcher – fisherman, or the owner of capital (fishing-rod, a large bow-net) / middleman – fisherman. They were also commonly called as “skipper” by the fishermen. Clients were a traditional fisherman who hanging up their live to their patron, especially when the high water happened. So, they did not allow going to the sea. During the unemployment period, usually “fisherman boss” guaranteed the daily life and families of traditional fishermen. The things that need by fishermen including fishing operational cost was also usually prepared by the middleman who can take before going to the sea and paid after coming back (*credit*). If in the fishing activities did not get many fishes, the payment will be did on the next opportunity. The easiness they got from middleman made the fishermen

“uncomfortable” brought their catch to other places, even though the price did not appropriate with the market price and was already set unilaterally by the middleman. Besides preparing money, the skipper fish also provided the fishing equipment in the form of fishing-rod, nets, and others fishing needs that can be obtained by fishermen with the requirement that they have to bring their catching fish to the skipper fish. The relationship between the fishermen and the owner of capital/skipper was getting stronger with there was no financial institution especially formal institution that could replace the roles of the skippers fish. By the conservative method that has been applied by the financial institution, that institution will always sustain various kinds of failures in giving access to the fishermen.

Conclusion

The socio-cultural context which contributed to the defense of poor fishermen in TanjungTiram village included: the limited economic resources aspect; the cultural aspect in term of lifestyle and the habitual of people who depended on the natural condition and value orientation that prioritized/preceded safety rather than finding profit; and also the structural aspect in term of the imbalance of economic access and the exploitative relationship between patron – client. Based on the perspective of structural theory, the poor fishermen's defense as a sociological reality can be understood as a result of structure or established social system and also as the result of poor fishermen's action which was autonomous and creative based on the level of consciousness, namely: *unconscious motivation*, *practical consciousness*, and *discursive consciousness*. The limitation of economic resources was impact toward inability of fishermen in bringing *the discursive consciousness* sufficiently which became the routine lifestyle and habitual that gradually became the structure of suppress and hinder the progress of fishermen's activities. The social practice of fishermen was more reactive as a consequence of helplessness. This condition brought the suppressing and debilitating structure rather than gave the opportunities or empowering the fishermen. The behavior of fishermen who have weak agency aspect was more directed to the *practical consciousness* and *unconscious motivation* rather than *discursive consciousness* as illustrated in the orientation of cultural values which were more dominant in the effort to fulfill the needs of their living today. If there was a discursive consciousness, it was only a reaction toward the defense live situation rather than the anticipatory attitude and behavior to make changes that lead in progress. The structural dialectic – agent of Giddens version was not running equally in the context of poor fishermen society in TanjungTiram village.

REFERENCES

- Dharmawan, AH. 2007. “Sistem Penghidupan dan Nafkah Pedesaan: Pandangan Sosiologi Nafkah (*Livelihood Sociology*) Mazhab Barat dan Mazhab Bogor”. *Sodality: Jurnal Transdisiplin Sosiologi, Komunikasi, dan Ekologi Manusia*. Agustus 2007: 169-192
- Faisal, Sanapiah S. 1998. *Budaya Kerja Masyarakat Petani. Kajian Strukturalistik: Kasus Petani Sumbawa*. Ringkasan Disertasi. Program Pascasarjana UNAIR. Surabaya.
- Geertz, Clifford, 1992: *Tafsir Kebudayaan*, Terj., Francisco Budi Hardiman, Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.

- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Polity Press. Oxford.
- Herry-Priyono, B. 2003. *Anthony Giddens Suatu Pengantar*. Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia (KPG). Jakarta.
- Hos, Jamaluddin dan Muh. Arsyad. 2012. *Faktor-Faktor Kemiskinan Keluarga Nelayan di Desa Tanjung Tiram Kecamatan Moramo Utara Kabupaten Konawe Selatan*. Hasil Penelitian. BOPTN Dikti. Universitas Halu Oleo. Kendari.
- Huberman, A. Michael & Matthew B. Miles, 1994, "Data Management and Analysis Methods". *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln (editors), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks London New Delhi.
- Indrawasih, Ratna. 1993. "Peranan Ekonomi Wanita Nelayan di Maluku", dalam *Masyarakat Indonesia*. Jilid XX, Nomor 1. Juni 1993. LIPI. Jakarta.
- Koentjaraningrat, 1993. "Aneka Warna Manusia dan Kebudayaan Indonesia dalam Pembangunan", dalam Koentjaraningrat (Ed.): *Manusia dan Kebudayaan Indonesia*, Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan.
- Kusnadi. 2002. *Nelayan: Strategi Adaptasi dan Jaringan Sosial*. Humaniora Utama Press. Bandung.
- Moleong, Lexi J. 1994. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. PT Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.
- Patriana, Ratna dan Arif Satria. 2013. "Pola Adaptasi Nelayan Terhadap Perubahan Iklim: Studi Kasus Nelayan Dusun Ciawitali, Desa Pamotan, Kecamatan Kalipucang, Kabupaten Ciamis, Jawa Barat". *J. Sosek KP*. Vol. 8 No. 1 Tahun 2013: 11-23
- Ritzer, George. 2004. *Teori Sosiologi Modern*. Prenada Media. Jakarta.
- Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin, 1990, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*, Sage Publication California.
- Sugihardjo, dkk. 2012. "Strategi Bertahan Dan Strategi Adaptasi Petani Samin Terhadap Dunia Luar". *SEPA* : Vol. 8 No. 2 Pebruari 2012 : 51 – 182
- Widodo, Slamet. 2011. "Strategi Nafkah Berkelanjutan Bagi Rumah Tangga Miskin Di Daerah Pesisir". *Makara, Sosial Humaniora*, Vol. 15, No. 1 Juli 2011: 10-20
- Wignjosoebroto, Soetandyo, 1995, "Grounded Research: Apa dan Bagaimana", dalam Suyanto, Bagong (Ed.) *Metode Penelitian Sosial*, Airlangga University Press, Surabaya.
- Zid, Muhammad. 2011. "Fenomena Strategi Nafkah Keluarga Nelayan: Adaptasi Ekologis di Cihauripan-Cisolok, Sukabumi". *Jurnal Sosialita*, Vol. 9 No. 1 Juni 2011: 32 - 38.
