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**Abstract**

One of the elements of social capital existence in society is the presence of confidence (trust). Trust has a very important practical value. It is a major lubricant for the smooth working of a social system. This study aims to see how the implementation of confidence (trust) element in the community of Kuri 'Ca'Di hamlet, Nisombalia Maros Baru village. The study lasted for two (2) months using a research method that combined two instruments, which were questionnaires and interview guidelines (mix method). Data were gathered through in-depth interviews with four informants, later corroborated by data extracted quantitatively by random techniques (simple random sampling) on ​​40 respondents. The results showed that the community of Kuri Ca'Di had a strong bond of trust or in this case referred to the high-trust between the community members. This was evidenced by the attitude of people who easily gave aid in the form of manpower and material that was based on trust (trust). The high sense of trust led to the birth of strong solidarity among the community members so as to create a harmonious relationship and avoid the feeling of mutual distrust. Environmental security grew out of a sense of trust between the residents.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Most individual, in the current era, tends to be an individualist by being selfish as well as introvert and care more about their personal interests. The community becomes competitive and pursues profit for wealth. As a social being, an individual will need other individuals in their life and the interwoven bond becomes a brace between them. The strong bond could create a strong social solidarity. Regarding organic solidarity in a rural community (Arisandi, 2015:57), Durkheim explains that it is formed based on understanding and norms as well as mutual faith or trust. Hence, it is not uncommon if one neighbor has a close relationship with other neighbors as often see in a rural community’s life. The rural community still holds on to the traditional natures in their life and encourages by the feeling of the same boat, they often help each other in living their life. In contrast to those in urban society, we often found a thick intimacy atmosphere and high kinship at the village due to their caring feeling and high solidarity as well as trust to each other.

Trust has a very important practical value. It is a major lubricant for the smooth working of a social system. It creates efficiency and retrenches a lot of troubles to obtain a fair reliability on words of others. Unfortunately, it is not a commodity that can be easily bought (Fukuyama, 2002:222).

A community that has mutual trust is a manifestation of rural community. Mutual trust is the basic of their close relationship. Social capital has important elements regarding community development. One of the elements is trust. Trust is a hope emerges in a community that behaves normally, honest and cooperative based on common norms for the sake of other community members (Fukuyama, 2002: 36).

Due to the importance of trust element, this research tries to observe the trust element in rural community in the daily life; hence, it is important to know how the implementation of the trust element in fisherman community of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet in Nisombalia Village.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The research method used was a mix method by combining qualitative and quantitative analyses. The emergence of mix method was initially as an effort to combine qualitative and quantitative data in one time (Creswell, 2010:22). The research took place for two (2) months at Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet, Nisombalia Village, Marusu Sub-district, Maros Regency. The hamlet was selected due to the characteristic of the people who were mostly worked as a fisherman. The intended community was all population of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet who worked as a fisherman as well as a collector. Data collection used two instruments, namely: questionnaire that consisted of questions and in-depth interview with community figures who were considered as capable and acknowledge the community condition of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet to equip and strengthen the questionnaire. 40 people were selected as the research sample using random sampling method to fulfill or answer the questionnaire. It was supported by four (4) respondents selected purposively as a representation and they were suitable to the research characteristics, namely: one collector, one fisherman, one fisherman’s wife, and one woman worker.

**RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

High-trust level could encourage the occurrence of high solidarity. The established social relations and strengthened by the presence of trust in a community would lead to the formation of social solidarity (Durkheim in Sakaria, 2013). It can be stated that the higher the trust in a community, the higher the social solidarity. Discussion about trust will closely related to social capital. Coleman and Putnam were two people who defined trust as a component of social capital. Francis Fukuyama went further by defining trust as an element of social capital. Social capital is a capability that occurs from an eternal trust among the societies or in a certain part of the society.

**Trust between Communities (Intra-community)**

**Trust related to Mutual Assistant (Reciprocity)**

The trust of the hamlet community could also be seen in providing assistances in form of goods and services to the neighbors who held a celebration. According to the community, if one of the villagers held a ceremony others would help during the preparation by, for example, setting up a tent, arranging chairs, and washing dishes. It was based on their belief that their neighbors would also help them when they have their own ceremony. In addition, they also borrowed each other stuffs. The high goods borrowing activities indicated that the assistance provided by the community was not limited to service but also goods. They were pleased to lend their stuffs that were needed. For example, when a neighbor held a ceremony, they will lend their stuffs, such as plates, spoons, and glasses as well as cookware. Women would provide assistance by cooking dishes for the ceremony.

The established trust between the community members became their guarantee in lending and borrowing. They stated that they had less worry to lend each other stuffs since they had the sense of kinship among them. Moreover, they would not angry on the loaned goods that were damaged after the ceremony because of the kinship foundation. On the other side, attending a ceremony of other communities was also supported by a trust level in which if we attend their ceremony, they will attend ours if we have our own.

The above suggested that the trust had encouraged the occurrence of solidarity among the community of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet. They helped each other wholeheartedly due to the brotherhood feeling. The thoughtfulness built would create a harmonious relationship among them. This reciprocity among the community members was also related to collective consciousness as stated by Durkheim in a study about solidarity. Durkheim stated that there is collective consciousness that encourages the community to help each other. Durkheim argued that a primitive community has a stronger collective consciousness, which is a mutual understanding, norm, and trust. In a community formed by mechanical solidarity, the collective consciousness that includes all communities and members is strongly believed, very rigid, and more religious in content ( Ritzer, 2010: 92)

It was supported by information from the informants stating that if there is a community member of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet who holds a ceremony, other members would directly help without asking. As stated by informant (J) regarding the ceremony:

 “*In this hamlet, if one person holds a ceremony, others would directly help. They don’t wait for the host to ask them. Everyone would go to the host’s home to help them. Everyone in this community is family. Therefore, if there is someone who is suffering, others will surely help)*

*(Interview, May 28, 2016)*

It is different to fishermen who always set aside some of their income for saving or to be collected together. The common term used for the activity was “*Mappasibantu”.* The term means that every fisherman will set aside a small amount of their income of Rp. 10,000 or Rp. 20,000 for saving. The money would be used to help Kuri’ Ca’di residents who encountered some difficulties such as fisherman who had broken ship or broken fishing gear. Every fisherman at the hamlet believed that they would not always in a good condition forever. Some studies also stated similar condition. For example, a research by Salman (1999) in Abdullah (2004) illustrated that collective work result by utilizing the existing social capital was not only increased income but also gave rise of critical awareness on the importance of collective work between them in problem solving process. The condition corresponded to *Mappasibantu* activity by fisherman indicating critical awareness on the importance of mutual assistance between them in dealing with problems. The action was driven by a high-trust level to their partners that gave impact on the relationship based on a strong trust.

Many experts and theories brought up mutual assistance. One of the theories was a theory of exchange stated that relationship arrangement between a landlord and a tenant, just like other relationship arrangement between humans, will be considered as exploitative or independent from whether or not the arrangement meet the reciprocity norm. Essentially, there is a moral contained in it that people should repay kindness on the basis of gratitude and a compatible exchange, therefore, defines a decent relationship arrangement. According to the opinion, the landlord-tenant relationship indicated by a balanced reciprocity generates gratitude and legitimacy, whereas, imbalanced reciprocity that benefiting the landlord could cause moral anger and injustice.

The research implied a reciprocity between the fishermen where there was a moral contained in the relationship, which was they should help each other. A thick sense of brotherhood created a good reciprocity relationship based on gratitude. When one person had trouble to fulfill their food needs the others should help. The fishermen believed that the condition could also happen to them; thus, other people would surely help them if they face the same condition in the future. Mutual assistance relationship-based reciprocity relationship became the foundation of *mappasibantu* activity formation (Scott, 1981: 247).

**Community Trust related to Borrowing Money**

Uncertain financial condition in Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet was the main reason for lending and borrowing system occurred in the community. Community who experienced difficulty would borrow to those who had more when they were in a critical condition. This reality of the lending and borrowing money in the community was aimed to be used as fishing capital and to fulfill daily needs. The uncertain fishing condition and catch left them no choice than to borrow money. If the catch was abundant; they could fulfill their need until the next fishing period. On the other hand, if the catch was less, they were forced to borrow and they would repay it when they had more income. There were only a few fishermen who still borrowed for fishing capital purpose since fishermen at Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet were independent fishermen and they had their own boat; thus, they required less capital. Regarding those communities who borrowed money to fulfill their daily needs it was due to the increase in staples price; therefore, they needed more fund for shopping.

The fishing capital needed by the fishermen at the hamlet was in the range of 350-400 thousands rupiah. It was based on the fulfillment of the needs while at sea. Requirement for one fishing period if the fishermen stayed and sailed to the island consisted of 30 liter of diesel fuel more or less, which was Rp. 8,000 per liter in retailer and they also bought 3 kg gas for Rp. 18,000 and rice of 5 liter, water for cooking of 1-2 gallon, one tray egg and spices. Fishermen went fishing at certain time. They usually set a net in the morning and pull it in the afternoon. For large catch, they usually went fishing to the island for 3 days 2 nights. For fishermen who went fishing with a partner, they would divide the yield evenly; however, the boat owner usually received more than the partner. As stated by informant (H) on trust in catch distribution:

 *“Usually I invite my friends who do not have boat and sometimes my relatives so they could help me. I share my catch with them. We help each other because we are not always have more income. Normally, I will divide the result evenly but I receive more. I am the one who divide the result because they trust me. I will never divide the result differently so they trust me” (Interview, May 29, 2016)*

In addition, informant (S) also stated about another type of trust that existed between the communities, as follows.

 *“In this area, no one locks their door. They believe everyone is good. Many people in and out other people’s houses but they believe they will not do any harm. If someone leaves for several days, we will guard their home” (Interview, May 29, 2016)*

Moreover, informant (S) who worked as a worker woman also provided information that fisherman in Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet always helped her by giving parts of the catch as stated in the following statement.

 *“I always receive assistance from the fishermen here. When they comeback from fishing, they will give me a small amount of their catch. It is because I am a widow and my mother just passed away. Sometimes they give me their seaweeds and I will dry it and sell it to the fisherman again) (Interview, May 29, 2016)*

The lending and borrowing money had become a mutually beneficial relationship between one community and the other. Most of them borrowed money to their relatives; thus they didn’t feel burdened since they assumed that tolerance to pay the debt among the family was better than those to other person that usually would be more stringent. Any dispute occurred related to the lending and borrowing to be settled amicably. Capital owners were also a source to borrow money that included people with more income. In addition, there were also people who borrowed money in a village cooperative through installment payment system. The debt payment was conducted directly or through installment.

The high brotherhood feeling between one another had become a base and a facilitator regarding lending and borrowing money in the community. Their closeness acted as collateral. Borrowing money was conducted directly; however, there were several systems to pay the debt. The debt could be paid as a whole or gradually for once a week or once a month based on the agreed amount. Due to a strong kinship between the communities, there was no sanction imposed for late payment, either to the family or other people who lent the money. All disputes occurred were better to be maintained and resolved amicably.

The fishermen or communities at Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet who needed money or capital would borrow to their family or directly to the collectors. The collectors here were similar to retainers. As stated by Informant (M) on borrowing money:

*“In this area, if fishermen need money, they would ask directly to the collector as well as if they need capital. Fisherman should have the capital because if they don’t have it they would try hard to sell their catch from one collector to another. If the fishermen receive capital and loan for fishing they don’t have to try hard to sell their catch. It means, if they use the capital they don’t have to do that no matter the price in other collectors. Fishermen who receive capital would go to me. The capital is used to buy boat, net or to fulfill their needs. I usually give them a loan. They would sell their catch to me to pay the debt. They would feel bad if they sell it to other collector” (Wawancara 29 Mei 2016).*

 Different statement was stated by informant (T) on borrowing money by the fishermen to the collectors (M):

 “*Currently, if fishermen wanted to borrow money to Mr. M, they have to sign in Mr. M’s debt notebook. It did not happen years ago. It just happened, if you want to borrow money they would require your sign. He said it is an order from his boss in the area” (Interview, May 29, 2016).*

The statement proved that most communities held mutual trust when it came to borrowing money. Along with the development of relationship between the communities and the collector, however, a change occurred in the borrowing system, which was the use of sign proof as collateral for the collectors in lending and borrowing. The fact indicated that there was a strong trust bond between the communities in terms of borrowing money, which was different when the community borrowed money to the collectors.

The trust that grew between the communities was supported by their honest attitude. High honesty could lead to high trust.

**The Trust of the Communities to People outside the Community (External)**

According to the interview with informant (M), it was revealed that trust had been interwoven outside the fisherman community of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet. Collector (M) had a trust relationship with collectors in Balang Island Pangkep Regency, he stated that:

 “*I go to Balang Island every day to pick up some items in the collectors. There are two collectors in the island where I take the items from. They usually call me if I don’t come or if I am late to pick the items because they never sold their items to collectors other than me)*

The above statement suggested that trust occurred between collectors outside the communities was strong. They trusted each other so that it would impossible for them to shift to other collectors. The trust was evident since they did not sell their goods to others but to sell them to the collectors they had trusted since the beginning.

 The trust also intertwined between collector (M) and a collector from Mambue, which was Mr (R). It was Mr. (R) who brought catch from fishermen of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet that he bought from collector (M). Following is information obtained from informant (M).

 *“Mr. R’s price could vary; however, I believe if the price is the real price. If there is an increase or decrease in price from Kima area, he would contact me in advance. Thus, no one feel loss. I believe Mr. (R) since I also check the area. I just believe the price he gave me) (Wawancara 29 Mei 2016)*

The presence of work relationship between the collectors and the communities became a mutually beneficial relationship in the community. Marx has discussed work relationship discourse by stating that human is an “ensemble of social relations” and that human nature is basically intertwined with social relations.

Marx also explains about work that work is not only changed the nature but also us, including our needs, awareness, and nature. Marx does not limit work in merely economic activities but it also includes all productive activities where we change and process material nature for our own purposes. For Marx, work is the development of powers and our real potentials by transforming material reality to be suitable to our goals. Works involve other people, directly in the production or indirectly due to other people provide the tools or raw materials required for our works or since it is them who will enjoy the work products. (Ritzer, 2010: 53-54).

The above community condition, theoretically, explained the work relationship took place between the collectors and fisherman community. Fishermen provided the catch and collectors acted as a buyer for the fishermen’s catch. Therefore, a work relationship or in this case, a social relation between collectors and fishermen occurred. On the other side, however, there was a work relationship between the collectors inside the community and those outside the community. Further, the work condition reflected class grouping as explained by Marx, which were proletariat and bourgeoisie classes. Marx described proletariat as workers who sell their work and do not have the means to work, whereas the bourgeoisie is people who pay the work (Ritzer, 2010: 62).

Referring to the condition of the fisherman community of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet, the class division, however, was not as strict as those in Marx’s. The fisherman community was in the condition where all the fishermen had achieved an independent stage. They had their own fishing gears. Hence, according to the Marx’s class concept, the fishermen (proletariat class) collected sea products and sold them to the collector who, in this case, acted as a capital owner (bourgeoisie) who bought the products from the fishermen.

Marx believed that human has productive nature. Productivity is a natural way to express basic creativity impetus of human being. In addition, the basic impetus is expressed along with others’. That is to say, it implies that human basic nature is in production field and social life. They need to cooperate to survive and fulfill their needs and desires. (Arisandi, 2015: 45-46).

The research result indicated that the fisherman community condition had experienced what Fukuyama stated as a high-trust community. Trust is a hope emerges in a community that behaves normally, honest and cooperative based on a common norm for the sake of other community members (Fukuyama, 2002 :36). The trust was not only inside the community but also outside the community. It was depicted in the research where trust outside the community intertwined due to the clear working relationship based on high trust and honesty.

**CONCLUSION**

The research pointed out that the community of Kuri’ Ca’di Hamlet showed high trust where the trust between the community members was firm. Environmental security felt by the community members indicated that they had no fear of losing if they left their home unlocked since they had high trust to their neighbors. The high trust was also indicated in the borrowing money activity. The trust was the basic in the borrowing money system that occurred between the community members. The trust led the birth of high solidarity among the community members. The high solidarity helped to foster collective consciousness between them that can be seen from giving assistance. The collective consciousness was based on understanding, norms, and trust. The mutual assistance relationship (reciprocity) was built upon trust and it was illustrated in the activity called “*mappasibantu*”. The high trust had created better relationship between the community members and the high solidarity established an unconditional relationship and an environment with thick kinship. A good environment and relationship created an environment with less conflict and dispute between the community members.
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