

Original Research Paper

The Social Impacts of Rice Distribution Program for Poor People

Thamrin Tahir

Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Article history

Received: 28-07-2016

Revised: 12-01-2017

Accepted: 17-02-2017

Email: thamrin.tahir.io@gmail.com

Abstract: This research aims at identifying the social impacts of rice distribution program at Batua in Panakukkang district, Makassar city. This research is a kind of survey research. In this research, the technique of data analysis is a qualitative descriptive that explores research results descriptively. The research results showed that there is no impact economically, because the distribution is only enough for food, not to fulfill other needs like clothes and shelter. The results also showed that there is no impact to sociocultural conditions of the receivers.

Keywords: Social Impact, Rice Distribution, Poor People

Introduction

There are different perspectives among the sociologists about the poverty problems in society. The sociologists see the emergence of poverty in the society is related to the culture in society. In other words, poverty is often related to the lack of work ethic in society. It indicates that poverty depends on diligence, whether a person is diligent or not to work or to process available natural resources. If a person is diligent to work, the person will have enough money to live.

Levitan (1980), Reitsma and Kleinpenning (1989), Hall and Midgley (2004) see poverty as a condition of material and social deprivation that causes people to live under adequate standard of living, or a condition in which individuals experience relative deprivation compared with other individuals in the community. Meanwhile, Friedman (1979) and Ellis (1994) views poverty as inequality of opportunity to accumulate social power base. Social power bases include (but not limited to) productive capital (for instance land, housing, equipment, health and so forth) sources of financial, social and political organization that can be used to achieve the common interests, social networking to find a job, perhaps goods; knowledge, skills adequate and useful information.

In another point of view, Sharp dan Ansel (1996) tried to identify the causes of poverty viewed from an economic standpoint. On the micro level, the poverty arises because of the inequality of resource ownership patterns which lead to an unequal distribution of income. Poor people only have a limited number of resources and poor quality. Furthermore, Sharp dan Ansel (1996) states that poverty arises from the difference in the quality of

human resources. The low quality of human resources indicates low productivity, which in turn has implications for the low income. The low quality of human resources is caused by the lack of education, the fate of the less fortunate, discrimination and heredity. Sharp dan Ansel (1996) also identified that the poverty arises due to the differences in access in the capital.

The three causes of poverty based on the viewpoint of Sharp dan Ansel (1996) led to the theory of the cycle of poverty (vicious circle of poverty) proposed by Nurkse (1953).

The presence of backwardness, lack of market perfectness and lack of capital result in low productivity. The low productivity results in lower income they receive. Low productivity results in lower income they receive. The low income will have implications for the low savings and investment, both human and capital investment. Low investment resulted in backwardness and so on.

According to Nurkse there are two circles of poverty trap, for instance from the supply side in which income levels are low due to low productivity caused by the ability of the community to save their money is low. The low ability to save their money results in the low levels of capital formation, the low rate of capital formation which causes a shortage of capital. Therefore, productivity levels become low. From the demand side, in poor countries the ability to invest is very low, this is because the vast market for various types of goods is limited due to very low income communities. The low income of the community is caused by the low productivity levels, as a manifestation of the level of the limited capital formation in the past. Capital formation is limited due to the lack of incentive to invest and so on.

Chambers (1983) is the first expert of Village establishment that use the concept of integrated poverty. Chambers assessed that poverty in developing country, especially in society, because of some factors that are called as imbalance or disadvantages and related each other.

Five disadvantages cover people's life or low-income family namely poverty, physical weaknesses, susceptibility, insulation and powerlessness. Chambers admits that the sketch of the low-income family is based on the five disadvantages and far from a perfect sketch. It means that someone should not live with the five disadvantages. Not all of poor people have physical weaknesses and powerlessness. In the 1960s, we could see some farmers and homeless people have battled for land reform. However, Chambers used an empirical approach to making a sketch about low-income family.

The population of poor people is high and the poor people are difficult to fulfill their needs especially for food because of crisis. Thus, the government launched the rice distribution program for poor people. This program is for the low-income family, so they can get good access to fulfill their needs.

This rice distribution program is first held at Makassar city in 1994. It is located in every district in Makassar. In 2001, this program was given directly to every sub-districts and received by poor people, especially in Batua sub-district.

This rice distribution program involves all sub-districts in Makassar and the rice is distributed evenly to each family for 15 kilograms per family. Batua sub-district is one of the sub districts that receive free rice at Panakkukang district of Makassar. Topographically, the condition of Batua sub-district is different from other sub districts in Makassar because some areas there consist of dirty residences.

This rice distribution program provides rice with the lowest cost for poor people. In other words, the poor people get the dispensation, but the social problem might appear. Besides, this program can help poor people to spend their money for other needs, but this program might influence the diligence level to work in order to fulfill their daily needs like rice.

Rice for poor people is a food subsidy program as an effort of the Government to improve food security and provide protection to poor families through the distribution of rice expected to reach poor families. The purpose of this program is to provide assistance and to increase or to open food access of poor families in order to meet the needs of rice as an effort to increase food security at the household level through the sale of rice to the beneficiary families in which the predetermined prices are subsidized to reduce the burden of household expenditure target by fulfilling their most basic food needs in the form of rice.

The goal is that poor families access to rice that has been recorded by a certain quantum in accordance with

the results of village meetings and has been subsidized can be opened. Therefore, it can help to improve the food security of poor families so that absolute poverty can be overcome. Absolute poverty is the inability of people with earned income to provide for the basic minimum required for daily living. The minimum requirement is translated in the size of the financial (money). The minimum value is used as the edge of poverty. The poverty line is set at a constant level in real terms, so that the progress made in poverty reduction in the absolute level all the time can be traced.

However, on the other hand it can have an impact on increasing cultural poverty. Cultural poverty is poverty caused by lifestyle, behavior, or the culture of individuals or groups that encourage poverty. Cultural poverty is indicated by the behavior of living lavishly, inadequacy work and a low savings rate, as well as their attitude towards the environment resigned toward poverty. This poverty model has a correlation with the culture of "accepting" poverty which happens to the individual and is not responded to the efforts of others who helped out of poverty.

According to Lewis (1969), cultural poverty consists of values, attitudes and patterns of behavior that are adaptive to the environment of deprivation that produces discrimination, fear, suspicion and apathy. In poor communities, the hidden rebellion attitude towards individual and towards the community often occur. On the other hand, there are also apathetic attitudes to the own fate and surrender and to those who have the economic and social power. Therefore, it is easy to follow but it is easy to forget, especially if it is perceived as a burden for live which is not in their favor.

This research focuses on the impact of socioeconomic that comes from the rice distribution program at Batua sub district in Panakukkang district, Makassar city.

Materials and Methods

This research is conducted to see the impact of socioeconomic in rice distribution program for poor people at Batua in Panakkukang district, Makassar city. In this research, the writer uses survey research. This research is restricted in the efforts to explore the problems or the original condition. The results are expected to give the real facts objectively. The population of the research is 153 families from all poor people at Batua, panakkukang district. The sample of the research is selected randomly and 46 people were the sample. The samples were selected based on poor households that receive subsidized rice with the lower middle class family.

In this research, the technique of data analysis is qualitative descriptive to explain the research results. The data is collected from observation and then the data is analyzed by describing, explaining and giving

comments with *t*-table. The formula of the analysis is suggested by Ali (1985:184) as follows:

$$\% = \frac{\pi}{N} \times 100$$

Notes:

- % = Percentage
- π = obtained score
- N* = Total score

Results and Discussion

The social implications of rice distribution for poor people can be seen from some aspects namely life standard, other needs except the rice, work intensity, conflict, social jealous, social status and action.

Life Standard

After receiving the distributed rice, the life standard of the poor people rose and it can be seen in Table 1.

From 46 respondents, it is seen that 41 respondents (89.13%) said that improved and five respondents (10.87%) said that not improve. It shows that rice distribution program did not improve the life standard of the poor people as expected. It is seen after the distribution. The poor people only fulfill their daily needs for foods but other needs like clothes and place to stay.

Other Needs Except Rice

It can be seen whether income can be used to fulfill other needs except rice from this Table 2.

From Table 2, 46 respondents showed that 32 respondents (69.56%) said that they can buy other needs except rice after the rice distribution, 14 respondents (30.44%) cannot buy other needs except rice after the distribution. It shows that the rice distribution program relieves the burden of the poor people.

Work Intensity

It can be seen whether or not the poor people are more relax to work after the rice distribution from the Table 3.

From the Table 3, 46 respondents (100%) said that they were not relaxed to work. It shows that the rice distribution program did not influence the work intensity of the poor people because they should work to fulfill their needs.

Conflict

Conflict comes from Latin verbs 'configure' means that fight each other. Sociologically, conflict is defined as a social process between two or more people (or groups) where one of them try to dismiss another by destroying them.

Conflict is caused by different individual characteristics in an interaction. The differences are a

physical characteristic, cleverness, knowledge, culture, beliefs and others. With these features, conflict is due to the situation in society. There are no people who never have conflict among the groups or with other groups. The conflict will disappear with the society itself.

Conflict is contrary with integration. The conflict and the integration work as cycles in society. If the conflict is controlled, integration will be created. In otherwise, imperfect integration can create conflict. The Table 4 showed whether or not the poor people have money to buy cheaper rice from rice distribution program.

From the Table 4, 46 respondents showed that there are 44 respondents (95.65%) who have conflict and there are two respondents who have no conflict. It revealed that rice distribution program did not create conflict.

Social Jealousy

In social life, there is always conflict happened. Social jealousy is one of the conflicts among individuals, siblings, between children and parents and among friends on the economic side and another side. Social jealousy is a situation where someone is hard to socialize with others, introvert, not open-minded, consider something from another side, selfish and think anything selfishly.

There is Table 5 that shows whether or not the poor people are jealous of the others who did not receive rice:

From the Table 5, it shows that 40 respondents (86.95%) are not jealous of the others who did not receive rice. There are six respondents (13.05) that are suspicious. It shows that the rice distribution program does not cause social jealousy to the others who did not receive. The form of jealousy is usually about the neighbors who complain because they do not receive rice like the poor people.

Social Status

Every people have a specific measure to appreciate something. The people will appreciate more highly or more lowly depending on how the people assess something. Religious people are considered with high status. This fact shows that socioeconomic status is still in great position. It describes that the people tend to be materialistic. The Table 6 shows whether or not the poor people mind if they are categorized as rice receiver.

Table 1. The Distribution of respondents based on the improvement of living standard after rice distribution to the poor people at Batua area

Life standard is improved after rice distribution	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	5	10.87
No	41	89.13
Total	46	100.00

Table 2. The Distribution of respondents based on whether or not income is used for other needs except rice after rice distribution

Income can be used for other needs except rice	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	32	69.56
No	14	30.44
Total	46	100.00

Table 3. The Distribution of respondents based on whether or not the poor people are more relax to work after the rice distribution

More relax	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	0	0
No	46	100
Total	46	100

Table 4. Distribution of the respondents on whether or not there is conflict among the poor people who receive rice from distribution program

Conflict	Frequency	Percentage
Often	0	0.00
Sometimes	2	4.35
Never	44	95.65
Total	46	100.00

Table 5. Distribution of the respondents on whether or not the poor people are jealous of the others who did not receive rice

Jealous	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	6	13.05
No	40	86.95
Total	46	100.00

Table 6. Distribution of the respondents on whether or not the low-income family is categorized as rice receiver

Mind	Frequency	Percentage
yes	2	4.35
no	44	95.65
Total	46	100.00

Table 7. Distribution of the respondents on what the rice receivers do if they still have rice at home

Action type	Frequency	Percentage
Still take	46	100
Total	46	100

From the Table 6, 46 respondents show that there are 44 respondents (95.65%) do not mind if they are categorized as rice receiver there are also two respondents (4.35%) mind if they are classified as rice receiver. It shows that the most people do not mind to be classified as rice receiver.

Action

The action is an attitude, behavior or action done by people in their lifetime to reach something. For example, someone takes an English course to master English skill. Not all of actions are considered as social action.

Therefore, the action is called as social action in which action is done by rice receiver. If there is still rice at home, the result can be seen in the Table 7.

From the Table 7, 46 respondents (100%) said that they still take rice although they still have rice at home. It shows that rice distribution is important for poor people. However, there is still some of them who sell back their rice to others.

Conclusion

The impact of rice distribution at Batua related to the economic impact has no influence on the rice distribution because the income of the poor people is only enough to buy their food needs, but not enough to buy other needs like woods and clothes.

Another impact after rice distribution is sociocultural impact where the program does not influence the sociocultural condition of the people at Batua sub-district. The rice distribution program does not cause conflict among the poor people and does not cause social jealousy. However, some people sell back their rice to other people because the price is lower than the rice in the market. The government should provide more rice for poor people, in particular for people at Batua sub-district so that they can be more prosperous. In the rice distribution, it is necessary to confirm that the program is not the program from Perum Bulog but also by other parties. Cooperation with local government is essential. Thus, socialization is necessary to continue and transparency is necessary for poor people, so the rice distribution is obvious and easier. The assessment team is also needed to evaluate and monitor the rice distribution program, so there is no problem with the implementation.

Acknowledgement

This research is successfully conducted through PNBPN Research Program Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Makassar in 2015. Therefore, the researcher would like to thank all parties who have contributed to the completion of this article namely, rector of Universitas Negeri Makassar; Chairman of the Institute of Research, Universitas Negeri Makassar; Dean of Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Makassar; village head and society of Batua.

Funding Information

This research article was successfully completed through funding of PNBPN Research Program, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Makassar in 2015.

Ethics

This study aimed at determining the socio-economic impacts that occurs in the distribution of rice for the poor

program in Kelurahan Batua, Panakkukang Makassar. Socially, economically and culturally, this program does not affect community in Kelurahan Batua. Therefore, a continued policy of the parties concerned to solve problems that arise is required. The results is an original idea of the author which are free from the aspect of plagiarism.

References

- Ali, M., 1985. Penelitian Kependidikan: Prosedur dan Strategi. 3rd Edn., Angkasa, Bandung, pp: 215.
- Chambers, R., 1983. Rural Development: Putting the Last First. 1st Edn., Longman, ISBN-10: 0582644437, pp: 246.
- Ellis, G.F.R., 1994. The dimensions of poverty. Soc. Indicator Res., 15: 229-253.
- Friedman, J., 1979. Urban Poverty in America Latin, Some Theoretical Considerations. Kuntjoro-Jakti, D., (Ed.), Kemiskinan di Indonesia, Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Hall, A. and J. Midgley, 2004. Social Policy for Development. 1st Edn., SAGE, London, ISBN-10: 0761967141, pp: 288.
- Levitan, S.A., 1980. Programs in Aid of the Poor for the 1980's. 4th Edn., J. Hopkins, Baltimore, ISBN-10: 0608150010, pp: 169.
- Lewis, O., 1969. The Culture of Poverty. Ritzer, G. (Ed.), Issues, Debates and Controversies, Allyn and Bacon, Boston.
- Nurkse, R., 1953. Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries. 2nd Edn., Oxford Basis Blackwell, Oxford, pp: 163.
- Reitsma, H.A. and J.M.G. Kleinpenning, 1989. The Third World in Perspective. 2nd Edn., Van Gorcum, Assen, ISBN-10: 9023224442, pp: 435.
- Sharp dan Ansel, M., 1996. Economics of Social Issues. Richard D. Irwin, Chicago.