

Culture Of Shame-Heart And Social Solidarity Of Kaitetu People Central Maluku District, Indonesia

Abdurachman, Andi Dody May Putra Agustang, Andi Agustang

Abstract: The culture of shame heart and social solidarity is a social behavior of the people of Kaitetu that has been going on for generations. This study was an effort to analyze the culture of the Kaitetu community of shame-heart and social solidarity. A series of qualitative studies with an important ethnographic approach was carried out with three research methods; cultural observation, in-depth interviews with several Kaitetu communities and focused group discussions. With the three approaches employed above, the findings showed that the formation of a culture of shame heart as well as social solidarity in the Kaitetu community starting with the socialization of the family structure as a small unit of society. Until now the culture is still maintained as a heritage. That state continues as the people of Kaitetu believe that a culture of shame-heart and community solidarity has been able to minimize conflicts and social problems in society. In addition, in the society of Kaitetu social solidarity also has been formed and implemented in the form of Nahulima culture (joint responsibility) and Masohi culture (mutual cooperation). Moreover, the attitude of solidarity of the Kaitetu community has encouraged the growth of a sense of ownership and communal responsibility, thereby strengthening cooperation in maintaining cohesiveness and mutual interests.

Index Terms: Embarrassed Culture, Social Solidarity, Kaitetu Community, Qualitative Study, Introduction

1. INTRODUCTION

Maluku Province is a miniature of Indonesia with geographical characteristics of the islands. The entire territory of Maluku Province consists of seas and small islands. Overall the area is 712,479.69 km², consisting of 93.5% of water area (666,139.85 km²) and 6.5% of land area (46,339.80 km²). The total number of islands identified was 1,340 islands with coastline length reaching 10,630.10 km (DKP Maluku, 2017). Historians say that at first the inhabitants who inhabited the archipelago lived and lived in coastal areas. Then they form communities on the basis of types of occupation and ethnicity. Maluku Province has a pluralistic society. The diversity can be seen from the diversity of ethnicities, languages, and communities. A community has characteristics that can distinguish it from other communities. One community that exists to maintain local wisdom is the Kaitetu Community. Sociologically, the community is seen as a collection of people who have a bond between one another, arises a sense of mutual ownership between members, and mutual trust that members' needs will be met as long as community members commit to continue together (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). The community is a group of people who live in the area, have geographical boundaries and have ties in the area. This makes individuals who are members of a community have the same fate and have a relationship with one another (Kuling 2008). According to Arbon et. al., (2013) community is a group of people who share problems, concerns, or hobbies about a topic and deepen their knowledge and expertise by continuously interacting with each other.

A community will not be separated from a change both changes that have been planned and that come suddenly so that interaction between members and community resilience is needed. Members of a community are said to live together if there is strong and regular social interaction between members in an area. Therefore, a community tends to have a homogeneous nature because it is based on the same fate. This can be seen clearly in rural communities that have a lot in common because in rural activities carried out mostly only on general matters such as the same work, interests, common share that resulting community members have the same responsibilities. Rural communities have stronger collective action than other communities (Mcmanus et al., 2012). Social solidarity is interpreted as a concern from fellow community members (Ciambele et al., 2015). There are several aspects to knowing the existence of social solidarity in a community. The solidarity of the people of Kaitetu is based on a mechanical system that has existed for generations from their ancestors. Ciambele (2015) argues that social solidarity is closely related to actions developed by communities that are able to have a positive or negative impact in relation to all other community members. Social solidarity is needed in a community so that the community can overcome various problems experienced by the community (Carrol 2005). This study aims to analyze the Culture of Shame-Heart and social solidarity of kaitetu community In Central Maluku District.

2. METHODS

This research was conducted to analyze the culture of embarrassed and social solidarity of the people of Kaitetu in Central Maluku Regency, Maluku Province. To be able to analyze the above issue, this study used a qualitative method. The qualitative method is a research procedure that data can be in the form of speech or writing and behavior. These data can be observed from the people (subjects) themselves. Therefore, this qualitative research was carried out in the form of historical case studies. The unit of analysis in this study was the social groups within it. Data collection was done by observation, in-depth interviews and focused group discussions (FGD). The interview was done to a number of informants who have been deliberately chosen. Data analysis techniques were firstly data collection then analysis involving coding, revising and combining into the themes. Lastly data

- Abdurachman, *Study Program of Sociology, Makassar State University, Indonesia, Email: aufa.madani@gmail.com*
- Andi Dody May Putra Agustang, *Makassar State University, Indonesia E-mail: andidodi044@gmail.com*
- Andi Agustang, *Makassar State University, Indonesia, E-mail : andiaugust63@gmail.com*

presentation, and drawing conclusions (Cresswell,2007)

3. RESULTS

3.1 Shame Heart Cultural Reproduction in the Kaitetu Society

Culturally the people of Kaitetu in Central Maluku Regency have strong religious ties, which include social organizing systems, value systems, and social laws/ norms, kinship patterns, social cooperation systems. Communities have togetherness and a high sense of tolerance in carrying out various activities. Individuals act according to a set of norms and values that are internalized and learned especially in the family through socialization. The process of investing in value begins with the family. The people of Kaitetu have never had conflicts with neighboring countries because they have a culture of embarrassment. This comes from the word shame and heart which are combined into an adjective phrase so that it becomes an everyday expression before becoming a culture. For the people of Kaitetu, the culture of shame is the culture of giving in and refraining from other people's social actions for peace and togetherness. With this culture in case of conflict or social problems, the leaders of Kaitetu are so easy to control their youth. This culture has continued for generations from their ancestors to the present. This research found that the process of working in a culture of shame begins with the family by teaching social values to family members at certain times that are considered by their parents at the right time. There are five times that are considered effective in teaching these values, namely family mealtime, travel time, extended family gathering time, relaxing time and time before bed. As for the values taught are the values of patience, succumbing to the interests of others, feeling ashamed of others if fighting, not interfering in other people's personal affairs, not being able to eat food that is not their right, respecting parents and elders, feeling shame if not attending social events, like helping others in need, feeling brother to the entire community in the country and also neighbouring countries and other positive social values. Second, the community has a high sense of togetherness and tolerance in carrying out various activities including fishing activities. Kaitetu people have customary relationships, traditions, and institutions that are believed to be inherited by their ancestors from generation to generation, and effectively regulate the way of life of society from ancient times to these days. Traditions and institutions are the rules regarding a community activity carried out namely the tradition of helping to help. The community has a resource management platform that is based on an inseparable relationship between humans and nature and humans and God. One of the things that shows this is the natural protection system (sasi, maintenance, preservation).

3.2 Solidarity in the Community

Solidarity is seen as something important in community life because with solidarity the reciprocal interaction in a community will be even higher (Grootaert C. 2001). The process of strengthening the social solidarity of the Kaitetu community is based on the strengthening of values in the family through exemplary values in the family and community leaders who have certain criteria. These criteria include being strict, brave, good behavior, broad-minded, willing to sacrifice for the benefit of others. Social solidarity is carried out in the

form of Nahulima culture (joint responsibility) that is when there are members of the community who die all the need to take care of the corpse and all needs related to the ceremony are borne together with citizens of one area. And also if there are community members whose children want to get married then the need for marriage is shared by the whole community. As an addition, social solidarity also occurs when there are traditional events and religious ceremonies where the whole community intervenes to work together to help each other with unconditional awareness. In carrying out social life, the people of Kaitetu have a high level of social solidarity in the form of Nahulima, masohi culture and various activities in the form of traditional and religious ceremonies. Nahulima is a culture of joint responsibility when a family experiences social problems or has a purpose that involves the public both in grief and in joy. Its implementation in families who experience difficulties such as when a family member dies or someone wants to get married, the whole community will help each other to meet the needs associated with it. Masohi culture is also a culture of cooperation and mutual cooperation in resolving community events related to public and family facilities. Public facilities and private facilities such as the construction of houses of worship and private homes are usually done in a masohi way involving unconditionally involved communities. Social solidarity is also constructed in every traditional and religious ceremony in a certain momentum. The people of Kaitetu hold traditional and religious ceremonies such as the qurban ceremony, evening tale ceremony, marriage ceremony, death ceremony, coronation ceremony for the king, rehabilitation ceremony for the roof of the mosque and so on. All the ceremonies are carried out together in accordance with the specified time. Social relations that are built and strengthened by the trust that presenting trust in a community will subsequently form social solidarity (Durkheim, 1986). Communities with rural typologies generally develop solidarity with a mechanistic function. Social solidarity has become a culture that has worked so deeply and continues from their ancestors. In the social solidarity journey, it takes place very dynamically. In line with this, Kelliher (2016) argued that a dynamic sense of spatial and temporal development of relationships will strengthen mutual solidarity. A culture of solidarity can contribute to helping each other. Several things can be used to find out social solidarity in the community through daily assistance, helping community members who need when they are in a disaster, and helping people who are sick. Social solidarity for citizens to provide information and share experiences (Rusu, H. 2012). The solidarity that is formed and underlies these economic actions is not solely based on the calculation of economic gains and losses, but rather because of the ethics of collectivism to overcome shared problems. Solidarity based on strong values and beliefs inherent in the people of Kaitetu community fosters attitudes in daily life. The attitudes that appear in the Kaitetu community so far are differences in high family attitudes, empathy, generosity, help, mutual cooperation, cooperation, mutual assistance, mutual assistance, mutual help, responsibility, and care and the natural surroundings. The attitude of solidarity among the people of the Kaitetu community has encouraged the growth of a sense of belonging and shared responsibility, thereby strengthening cooperation in maintaining cohesiveness and protecting shared interests.

4. CONCLUSION

Kaitetu people have customary relationships, traditions, and institutions that are believed to be inherited by their ancestors from generation to generation, and effectively regulate the way of life of society from ancient times to the present. The formation of the culture of shame in the Kaitetu Society begins with the socialization of the family structure and is still maintained as an ancestral inheritance. The culture of shame has been able to minimize conflicts and social problems in society. Kaitetu society has formed social solidarity and implemented in the form of Nahulima culture (joint responsibility) and masohi culture (mutual cooperation). The attitude of solidarity of the Kaitetu community has encouraged the growth of a sense of belonging and communal responsibility, so as to strengthen cooperation in maintaining cohesiveness and maintaining common interests.

5. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to the Governor of Maluku, the Regent of Central Maluku and the District Head of Leihitu for granting research permission in the country of Kaitetu. Thank you also goes to Mr. Raja Kaitetu Upu Itu Yamin Lumaela and all informants who have provided information related to this research. And to all those who support this research, especially to Mr. Hamid Titaputy with his family who have helped this research a lot, I thank you, may Allah Almighty give a double return of all kindness.

6 REFERENCES

- [1] Arbon P, Cusack L, Gebbie K, Steenkamp M, Anikeeva O. 2013. How do we measure and build resilience against disaster in communities and household?. Adelaide (AU): Torrens Resilience Institute.
- [2] Carrol J M, Rosson M, Zhou J. 2005. Collective Efficacy as a Measure of Community. CHI 2005 Portland, Oregon, USA.
- [3] Ciambele J, Jose R, Fernada A, Victor P. 2015. Solidarity and Community Resilience in a Disaster Situation: An Understanding of Communitarian Ergonomics. Melbourne [AUS].: <http://www.iea.cc/congress/2015/1347.pdf>
- [4] Cresswell JW. 2007. Research Design, Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches. Saga Publications. California.
- [5] Durkheim, E. 1986. The Rules of Sociological Method New York: Free Press.
- [6] Grootaert C. 2001. Does Social Capital Help the Poor?: A Synthesis of Findings from the Local Level Institutions Studies in Bolivia, Burkina Faso and Indonesia. The World Bank: Social Development Family Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Development Network. Local Level Institutions Working Paper No. 10, June 2001
- [7] Kelliher, 2016. Constructing a Culture of Solidarity: London and the British Coalfields in the Long 1970s. Antipode 49 (1)
- [8] Kulig J, Edge D, Joyce B. 2008. Understanding community resiliency in rural communities through multidimethod research. Journal of Rural and Community Development 3(3) : 77-94.
- [9] McManus, Walmsley J, Argent N, Baum S, Bourke L,

Martin J, Pritchard B, Sorensen T. 2012. Rural Community and Rural Resilience: What is important to farmers in keeping their country towns alive. journal of rural studies, 28 (1) :20-19

- [10] McMillan, D.W. Chavis, D.M. 1986. Sense of community: A definition and theory. American Journal of Community Psychology, 14 (1), 6-23.
- [11] Rusu, H. 2012. Measuring Social Solidarity. Some Research Notes. Social Change Review, 10 71-90