Maritime Ecolexicon in Bajo Community of Kolaka Regency Coast and its Implications for Ecology
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Abstract. This study described deeply about the survival of Bajo language on the coast of Kolaka Regency and its implications for maritime ecology. Data collection was done through: (a) lexicon competency test, (b) observation, (c) interview, and (d) documentation. The results showed that 53.75% of the maritime ecolexicon was no longer survived. It means that the maritime ecolexicon of Bajo language was on the verge of the most extinct loss of maritime flora and fauna. The causes of this inadequacy were: ecological changes, lack use of Bajo language, low environmental awareness of the community, loss of several marine traditions, and transfer of community work from fishermen to other jobs. The recommendation of this study is: Bajo language should be one of the local content materials in schools, government and the community need to run a maritime environment that has an impact on the survival of Bajo language and environmental sustainability.

1. Introduction

One of the factors that cause a reduction in language use is the changing of the environment, including vocabulary reduction in the maritime environment. When the environment changes, it is possible for the extinction of vocabulary in the environment. For example, it can be found from an area that was previously an agricultural area into an industrial area, or an environment that was once thick with marine life, but because of changing times, the activity was left to wrestle with other activities on land. So, when this happens, it will also influence the vocabulary mastery in that environment.

The above conditions can lead to vocabulary poverty. It even leads to the extinction of vocabulary. So, it was time for the regional languages, including the language of Bajo region in the coastal district of Kolaka, to be preserved. This is important because language is a valuable part of human assets. This shows that the loss of a language is a description of people's knowledge of poverty [1].

In an ecologic perspective, language and its speaking community are seen as organisms that live systematically in life with other organisms [2]. Thus it can be stated that human time and effort determine the preservation of regional languages [3].

As an interrelation study between language and environment [4], this study will provide valuable and new information on the ecolexicon of maritime language on the coast of Kolaka. In addition, this research can be one of the references in strengthening strategies in providing support...
for linguistic, environmental preservation that will have an impact on maritime environmental sustainability.

Based on the above, this research reveals the survival of Bajo Language on the coast of Kolaka Regency and its implications for ecology.

2. Methodology

This research is qualitative research that produces descriptive data in the form of written or oral data in the language community [5]. This research is also supported by quantitative data to see the acculturation quantity of Bajo lexicon by the age of adolescents in the coastal area of Kolaka Regency. These data are collected from January to June 2017. Both qualitative and quantitative data in the study were collected through techniques (a) lexicon competency tests, (b) observations, (c) dept interviews, and (d) documentation

The subjects in this study focused on the age of teenagers in Bajo community who inhabited the coast of Kolaka Regency. As respondents, there were 50 people who were asked to fill out questionnaires containing several 100 maritime vocabulary lists.

One hundred vocabularies are the ecolexicon related with:

- marine namely: lao, tingga Lao, patindeng, Gusoh, bare’, lao lalang, rumangi, goya, duta
  boe, ngirri’.
- equipment and fishing gear namely: Bile’, tasi, pissi, um pang, palulong tasi, balango, ringgi,
  binnah, palampung, laam
- marine vehicles / parts and equipment, namely: Bodi, lepeh, body kayu, lama’, ningkolo
  di a leng bodi, raki’ bolo, soa lepe’, timbe lepeh, buse, kemudi kappang
- fish name, namely: Dayah uto, dayah bulawwes, dayah layaran, dayah rambo, dayah kareo,
  dayah bello, dayah pai, dayah lumeah, dayah batu, dayah
- names of shells namely: garas gusoh pote, garas bangko, garas laha, garas ginseng, garas
  batu, duritayong, sipu’ batu, tireng.

3. Research Result

3.1. Bajo community in the Kolaka Coastal

Bajo is one of the tribes that depend on the sea and are spread throughout the Indonesian coast, events in Southeast Asia. The spread of Bajo people on the Indonesian coast can be found around the East coast of Sumatra Island and one coast and another [6]. They are also called Bajo, Luwaqan, Turujene, Sama, Palaquan, Pala’u.

In addition to Indonesia, Bajo community can also be found on the northern coast of Australia, Johor, Malaysia, Zamboanga, the Zulu archipelago, and the West Philippines Stangkai [6]. Their residence is in their boat, which is a boat or bido. It was on the boat that they gave birth, built family life. In this case, their carrying capacity bido seems to be controlling the demographic growth of the family unit in Bajo community. The sea for them is an area that is open to anyone. Therefore their sense of belonging or "sense of territoriality" does not look as strong as those who live on land. For them, the places where they dock and meet fellow Bajo people are more important than the region. This can explain various points, villages or places in various islands in Indonesia with the same name: Labuan Bajo, which more or less means the birth of Bajo people.

Bajo community can also be found in the coastal estuary and offshore regions of North and East Kalimantan, Maluku islands, along with the North coast of Sumbawa, along the West and north coast of Flores, Babi island and Alor islands. On the island of Sulawesi, islands can be found in several districts in South, Central, North and Southeast Sulawesi [7], [8].

In Southeast Sulawesi, Bajo people use Bajo which has been integrated with Bugis language. In fact, Bajo Language is indicated as a regional language that is quite several speakers in Southeast Sulawesi, which is more than 71,573 people. The settlement area covers the entire ocean which is on the coastline of several sub-districts and districts in Southeast Sulawesi such as Kolaka Regency
(Latambaga District, Pomalaa District, Tanggetada District, and Watubangga District); North Kolaka Regency (Wolo District, Lasusua District). That population is the object of this study.

3.2. The survival of maritime ecolexicon the Bajo Community

An interesting phenomenon in this study is the amount of vocabulary that is no longer recognized by Bajo people. There are 43 (53.75%) maritime vocabularies which are unknown by Bajo community, namely: vocabulary: tingga lao, palantoh, ngirri, palulong tasi, mate pissi, panaguan ningkolo dialan lepeh, lama’, dayah dibilleh, jampa, kuku’re, batah poong mapakkang, didiki, tikolo dayah, lobang ringgi, timbe lepeh, dayah tape, bubuloh, dayah lumeah, dayah utto, dayah bello, dayah layaran, dayah sanggar, katoah, kutta, kende, hubu, tubbo dayah, kalangkah, doah, kite lao, garas sinseng, garas laha, durita yong. This is because the referrals no longer exist.

If the maritime ecolexicon is ranked in Bajo community, six gradations will be found, as follows.

Table 1. Level of knowledge of bajo people towards maritime ecolexicons which is at 86.66% -100%

| No | Maritime Ekolexikon | Total Respondent | Percentage (86.66 % - 100 %) |
|----|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1  | Lao                 | 30               | 100 %                        |
| 2  | Rumangi             | 27               | 90 %                         |
| 3  | Tasi                | 26               | 86,66 %                      |
| 4  | Umpang              | 27               | 90 %                         |
| 5  | Bodi kayu           | 27               | 90 %                         |
| 6  | Lepeh               | 29               | 96,66 %                      |
| 7  | manggar besi       | 26               | 86,66 %                      |
| 8  | Dayah               | 30               | 100 %                        |
| 9  | Dayah pai           | 26               | 86,66 %                      |
| 10 | Laampu              | 27               | 90 %                         |
| 11 | Bodi                | 28               | 93,33 %                      |

Table 2. Level of knowledge of bajo people towards maritime ecolexicons which is at 70% -83,33%

| No | Maritime Ekolexikon | Total Respondent | Percentage (70 % - 83,33 %) |
|----|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1  | Patindeng           | 25               | 83,33 %                      |
| 2  | Pissi               | 25               | 83,33 %                      |
| 3  | Palampung           | 25               | 83,33 %                      |
| 4  | Dayah turingan      | 23               | 76,66 %                      |
| 5  | Ringgi              | 23               | 76,66 %                      |
| 6  | Dayah aseng         | 25               | 83,33 %                      |
| 7  | Akar bangko         | 25               | 83,33 %                      |
| 8  | Lumu’               | 21               | 70 %                         |
| 9  | Karama’             | 23               | 76,66 %                      |
| 10 | Goyah               | 22               | 73,33 %                      |
| 11 | Gusoh               | 24               | 80 %                         |
Table 3. Level of knowledge of bajo people towards maritime ecolexicons which is at 53,33%-66,66%

| No | Maritime Ekolexikon | Total Respondent | Percentage (53, 33 % - 66,66 %) |
|----|---------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1  | Sipu batu           | 17               | 56,66 %                          |
| 2  | Mamano ciu          | 20               | 66,66 %                          |
| 3  | Dayah kapi          | 20               | 66,66 %                          |
| 4  | Mamano gereja       | 18               | 60 %                             |
| 5  | Mamano bango        | 16               | 53,33 %                          |
| 6  | Bille’              | 20               | 66,66 %                          |
| 7  | Dayah batu          | 19               | 63,33 %                          |
| 8  | Dayah buwalles      | 18               | 60 %                             |
| 9  | Dayah Rambo         | 16               | 53,33 %                          |
| 10 | Panah               | 17               | 56,66 %                          |
| 11 | Badi                | 15               | 50 %                             |
| 12 | Pissi               | 18               | 60 %                             |
| 13 | Bangko              | 19               | 63,33 %                          |
| 14 | Daong               | 18               | 60 %                             |
| 15 | Agar                | 15               | 50 %                             |
| 16 | Kende’              | 16               | 53,33 %                          |
| 17 | Kuali               | 15               | 50 %                             |
| 18 | Embere              | 17               | 56,66 %                          |
| 19 | Dayah tunu          | 16               | 53,33 %                          |
| 20 | Kemudi kappang      | 19               | 63,33 %                          |
| 21 | Buse’               | 16               | 53,33 %                          |

Table 4. Level of knowledge of bajo people towards maritime ecolexicons which is at 36,66%-50%

| No | Maritime Ekolexikon | Total Respondent | Percentage (36,66 % - 50 %) |
|----|---------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1  | Dayah toho          | 14               | 46,66 %                       |
| 2  | Dayah dipanasi      | 13               | 43,33 %                       |
| 3  | Kambote             | 11               | 36,66 %                       |
| 4  | Tayong              | 14               | 46,66 %                       |
| 5  | Daong rumbia        | 14               | 46,66 %                       |
| 6  | Garas bangko        | 15               | 50 %                          |
| 7  | Palantoh            | 11               | 36,66 %                       |
| 8  | Palulong tasi       | 13               | 43,33 %                       |
| 9  | Ringgi              | 12               | 40 %                          |
| 10 | Katoah              | 11               | 36,66 %                       |
| 11 | Kukure              | 12               | 40 %                          |
| 12 | Kutta               | 11               | 36,66 %                       |
| 13 | Bubu                | 12               | 40 %                          |
| 14 | Garas gusoh         | 12               | 36,66 %                       |
| 15 | Mata pissi          | 15               | 50 %                          |
| 16 | Mamano camar        | 15               | 50 %                          |
Table 5. Level of knowledge of bajo people towards maritime ecolexicons which is at 20%-33.33%

| No | Maritime Ekolexikon       | Total Respondent | Percentage (20 % - 33.33 %) |
|----|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 1  | Tingga lao                | 10               | 33.33 %                      |
| 2  | Garas laha                | 10               | 33.33 %                      |
| 3  | Ngirri                    | 9                | 30 %                         |
| 4  | Lama’                     | 8                | 26.66 %                      |
| 5  | Ningkolo dialeng lepe     | 6                | 20 %                         |
| 6  | Dayah tape                | 7                | 23.33 %                      |
| 7  | Jampa’                    | 9                | 30 %                         |
| 8  | Bubuloh kalangkah         | 8                | 26.66 %                      |
| 9  | Doah                      | 9                | 30 %                         |
| 10 | Didikki                   | 6                | 20 %                         |
| 11 | Sereh dayah               | 8                | 26.66 %                      |
| 12 | Durita yong               | 7                | 23.33 %                      |

Table 6. Level of knowledge of bajo people towards maritime ecolexicons which is at 10%

| No | Maritime Ekolexikon       | Total Respondent | Persentase    |
|----|---------------------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1  | Batah poong mapakkang     | 3                | 10 %          |
| 2  | Akar bangko               | 4                | 13.33 %       |
| 3  | Kitte lao                 | 5                | 16.66 %       |
| 4  | Timbe lepeh               | 5                | 16.66 %       |

Overall, it was found that the ecolexicon's survival rate in Bajo language reached 46.25%. There is a 53.75% maritime ecolexicon that is lost or extinct along with the loss of its ecological reference. The ecolexicon that is not recognized by Bajo community is a vocabulary related to the marine.

Overall the percentage of the ecolexicons that still survive and those that do not survive are illustrated in the following histogram.
3.3. Factors affecting the survival of maritime ecolexicon in bajo community

Language is an identity, recording local wisdom, collective concepts, historical values, religious, philosophical, socio-cultural, and ecological aspects of society. In connection with that, what is needed by a language-speaking community is not only a cognition or knowledge, but also a competence and communicative, productive, and creative performance, both oral and written with a richness of the use of ethnic nuances (Halliday, 1997: 10)

Language can live or die, depending on the use and development of a language. Developing and shrinking a language is certainly influenced by various factors. This is caused by the language of life in the social environment of a speaking community to interact, interdependence, and interrelate with the environment. A language survives and lives if the speaker always uses that language. Thus, the language will be maintained and remain in mind or cognition of the speaker. Conversely, if the speaker rarely or never uses the language, then one day the language will shift, shrink, and eventually die or become extinct from the supporting community.

Based on the conditions above, then actually a lexicon can survive and shrink, shift, even lost or extinct can be influenced by various factors that occur in society. The results showed that the factors that influence maritime ecolexicon resistance in Bajo communities are as follows.

- Marine Ecological Change; the non-survival of the maritime ecolexicon of Bajo language on the coast of Kolaka Regency is caused by ecological changes.
- The low use of Bajo language for Bajo people. This is due to the lack of parental participation in teaching Bajo languages to children.
- Dominant Use of Indonesian Language; at present, Bajo community is eroded by the use of Indonesian. The use of Indonesian in the Bajo community is a prestige.
- The loss of some cultural activities; who usually still use Bajo.
- Many Bajo people switch jobs, from fishermen to farmers or traders.

4. Conclusion
The percentage of survival in Bajo is only 46.25% and 53.75% which is no longer survive. The data indicates the maritime ecolexicon of Bajo language is already on the verge of extinction and the loss of several floras and fauna that exist in the maritime environment of Bajo community. The ecolexicon's insecurity is caused by ecological changes, low environmental awareness, lack of support for the language and ecological environment, loss of some marine traditions, transfer of work from fishermen to other occupations. The recommendations of this study are: Bajo language should be one of the local content materials in schools, the need for government and stakeholders to carry out maritime environmental safeguards that will have a positive impact on the survival of Bajo language and environmental sustainability.
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