This research aims at identifying the social impacts of rice distribution program at Bsta in Panakukkang district in 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, but to fulfill other needs like clothes and shelter. The results also showed that there is no impact to sociocultural conditions of the recipients.
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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. Irvisn (19t0), Rei6m8 and Kleinpenning (19E9), Hall and Midgley (2@4) 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, FriednEn (1979) and Ellis (1994) views poverty as inequality of opportunity to
accumulate social power basis. Social power bascs irclude (but not limit€d to) _
productive capital (for instance land, housing equiprn€q hedth a.d so forth) sources of
financial social and political organization thEt can b€ used to achieve thc common
inter€sts, social networking to find a job, perhaps goodq knowledge, skills adequate and
useful information.

ln upthe! point of view, Sha+ dan Anscl (t9 ) tri€d to idemiry the causes of poverty
viewed fiom an economic standpoint. On thc micm level, the poverty arises because of
the inequality of resource o"icnt ii patterns which lead to an mequal distribution of
income. Poor pcone only have a limited number ofrcsourccs ard poor qudity-
Furthermorc, Sharp dan Anscl ( 1996) stafes that povcrty arises fiom the difference in thc
quality of human rsourcrs. Thc low qnlity of human rcsons indicae low productivity,
which in tum h8s implications for tte low incoim.

The low quality of human resources is caused by the lrk of education, the fact of the less
fortunate, discriminairion and heredity. SFrp a- Ansel (19%) also identified thd the
povery arises due to the differences in access in the cspital. The thrce causes of poverty
based on the viewpoint of Sharp dan Anscl ( t 996) led to the rheory of tbe cycle 9l
rnyr”rty (vicious circle of povcrty) pomposed by Nurkse ( l 953). The prEsence of
bsckwardness- lack of market perfectness and lack of capital rcsult in low productivity.
The low productivity resuls in lower income they receive. Low productivity resuls in
lower incomi they receive.

The low income will have implications for the low savings and investment, both human
and capital investment. Low investment results in backwardness and so on. According
to Nurks€ there arc two circles of poveny trap, for imtsnc. from thc supply sidc in which
inmni levels arc -low due to low productivity caused by the ability ofthc community to
seEve their moncy is low.

The low ability to savc their money results in Oe low levels of capital formationq the low
rate of capital formation which ceuscs a shortage of capitat. Therefore, Foductivity levels
bcome low. From the demand side, in poor counries the ability to invest is very low,
this is because thc vast mark€t for vrious typeJ of goods is limited due to very low
income communities. itr" tow income of the community is causcd by the low
productivity lcvels, as a manifcstation ofthelevel of the linit€d cspitEl fornution in the
past.

Capiral formadon is limitcd due to the lack ofincentivc to invest and so on. ?tt
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Chambers (1973) is the first expert of Village establishment to use the concept of integrated poverty.

Chambers assessed that poverty in developing countries, especially in society, because of some factors that are called imbalance and related to other. Five disadvantages cover people's lives or low-income families namely poverty, physical weakness, 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 1970s, some farmers and homeless people have benefited from land reform. However, Chambers used an empirical approach to making a sketch about low-income families.

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 first held in Makassar city in 1994. It is located in every district in Makassar.

In 2001, this program was given directly to every sub-district and received by poor people, especially in Baua subdistrict. This rice distribution program involves all sub-districts in Makassar and the rice is distributed evenly to each family for 15 kilograms per family. Baua sub-district is one of the sub-districts that receive rice at Panakkukang district of Makassar.

Topographically, the condition of Baua sub-district is different from other sub-districts in Makassar because some areas consist of dirty residences. This rice distribution program provides rice with the lowest cost for poor people. In other words, the poor people gain the dispensation but the social problem might appear.

Besides, this program can help poor people to spend their money or 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 their 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 progress made in poverty reduction in the absolute level all the time can be raced. 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 connection 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 Tewis (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, this hidden rebellion attitude towards individual and towards the community often occur.

On the other hand, there are also aesthetic 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 forge! especially if it is perceived as a burden for live which is root in their favor. This research focuses on the impact of socioeconomic that comes from the rice distribution program in Balua sub district in Panakukkang district, Makassar city.

This research is conducted to see the impact of socioeconomic in rice distribution program for poor people at Balua in Panakukkang district, Makassar city. In this research the researcher 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 Balu4 panakkukang district.

The sample of the research is selected randomly and 16 people are 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 and giving TEErin Trir / AnEi.rl.bura d Adkd SirEIZ|IT, 14 (a: 3)638 Dol : 10.331.7/ jld1e.2017.315.339 comments with t-table. The formula of the analysis is suggested by Ali (1965:1E4) as follows: \( \% = a-1 @ N \) Notes; \( O/o = \frac{\text{Percentage}}{\text{Total score}} \) The social implications of rice distribution for poor people can be seen from some aspects namely life standard other needs except the rice, productivity, conflict, 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 16 respondents, it is seen that 41 respondents (89.13%) said that improved and five respondents (10.87%) said that not improved. 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 food and other needs like clothes and personal hygiene. It can be seen whether income can be used to fulfill other needs except rice after the rice distribution. 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.

It can be seen whether or not the poor people were more relaxed to work after the rice distribution. From Table 3, 46 respondents (10.6) said that they were not relaxed to work after the rice distribution, 14 respondents (30.44%) said that they were not relaxed to work after the rice distribution.

Conflict Conflict occurs from the verbs 'configure' means that fight others. Sociologically, conflict is defined as a social process between two or more people (or groups) that try to dismiss another by destroying them.

Conflict is caused by different individual characteristics in an institution. The differences are a Table 1. The Distribution of respondents based on the improvement of living standard at Batut area LiG standard is improved after rice distribution.
Frequencies Percentage Yes No Total

With these features, conflict is due to the situation in society. There are some 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 integration work as cycles in society. If there is conflict, integration will be created. In other way, 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 41 residents (95.64%) who have conflict and 8 respondents who have no conflict. It revealed that rice distribution program did not cause conflict.

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%) who 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 neighbor who complain because they do not receive rice like the poor people. Social judo 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. Tbrin Talir / A Nei(1r. brri o, ApCid $tr2017, fl (a: 315-30 ml: 10 3ta'/.j.!!p.2017.33J.339 Income caa be used for other needs except rice Tselc 2.

The Distributbo of râspoodcrtrs bssed onl pttcrr or not inootrrc is uscd 6r othcr &Eds cxcpt rioc snrr dce distsibutior 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, 16 respondents (100/o) 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 Batus subdistrict. 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 Batus subdistrict so that they can be more prosperous. In the rice distribution, it is necessary to confirm that the program is not the program from Pium Bulog but also by other parties. Coordination 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. Acknowledgment This research is successfully conducted through PNBP Research Program Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Makassar in 2015.
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who receive rice from distribution program. Conflict frequency Percentages: 46. Table 5.
Distributed of the respondents on whether or not the poor people are jealous of the

Distribution of the respondents on whether or not the low-income family is categorized as
acc receivel: Mind Percentages: 4.35 95.65 100. From the Table 7, 16 respondents show
that there are 44 respondents (95.65%) do not mind if they are categorized as rice
receiver and 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.

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

Socially, economically, and culturally, this program does not affect community in
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