

**GLOBAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING SCIENCE AND RESEARCHES**  
**THE DYNAMICS OF INSTITUTIONAL PATRON-CLIENT(punggawa-sawi)OF**  
**FISHING COMMUNITY**

**(A Study of Institutional Punggawa-Sawi of Fishermen at Bugis Village, Kendari City)**

**Awaluddin Hamzah<sup>\*1</sup>, Hartina Batoa<sup>2</sup>, Abdul Gafaruddin<sup>3</sup> & Laode Kasno Arif<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>\*1,2&4</sup>Department of Extension, Faculty of Agriculture, Halu Oleo University, Kendari

<sup>3</sup>Department of Agribusiness, Faculty of Agriculture, Halu Oleo University, Kendari

**ABSTRACT**

For this time, fishing community considers themselves as it is and full of simplicity. On the other hand, it causes a special phenomenon for a group of scientists and technocrats that the fishing community is shackled in a cultural value system that tends to be exploited and marginalized. It stimulates an idea about the restructurization program among the fishing community through the development and management or usually known as transformation processes (modernization).

The research finding showed that the development of production organization of fish catching underwent a business transformation from a sole proprietorship to a partnership. The partnership was done during the change in fishing facilities and equipments i.e. sampan/small wooden boat (manual) by adding machine facility (outboard motor) on the boat. The technology development had an implication to the development of complex management of fish catching by forming a punggawa-sawi relationship pattern. The technology development had an impact on the development of a meaning toward the position of both punggawa and sawi. The development of meaning reinforces the domination of punggawa so that the dependence of sawi was very high.

**Keywords:** *Development, Patron-client, Fishermen.*

**I. INTRODUCTION**

The ideology of capitalism and modernism carried by the market and the state development program affect the structural aspect and social relation in the economic institution of the community. In social interaction, furthermore, in the pattern of power distribution in society, the social action that has not been realized yet will result in the persistence of patron-client bonds. The persistence of the relation in the midst of the change of era becomes an important thing to be analyzed deeply. According to Mirajiani et al. (2014) in this era, the era of market economy, the patronage still becomes an alternative of the economic institution that is built for maintaining the sustainability of economic activity and it will be maintained in the situation of crisis, uncertainty, and livelihood that fluctuate. However, patronage institution experiences the change (transformation) along with the socio-economic transformation in the fishing community.

The life of fisherman especially the labor, in production activity (fish catching), mostly depends on a good relationship between them and the employer (the boat owner). It is because of the insufficient or the absence of sufficient financial capital they have. Insufficient capital gradually increases the loads, challenges and a big competition in marine resources utilization. On one side, the fisherman labor with an ability and the skill in catching fish is a potency. However, on the other side, the absence of capital is an obstacle considering that the marine is an outdoor area that can be utilized by everyone who has the capability to manage the available resources.

The community of Bugis Village, Poasia Regency, Kendari City generally has a livelihood in the fisheries sector in wide scale, either as fisherman labor, shipowner, or fishmonger. In addition, the community also has another job that is not directly related to fish catching such as having a grocery store, working as a bike taxi driver, or a state civil servant. They do the job for supporting their household economy. The limitation and the simplicity have formed the characteristic of fishing community for the sake of maintaining their economic stability. One of the forms is the

activity of helping another or doing communal work that is continuously happened and internalized in form of *punggawa-sawi* like what Scott (1982), the person who investigates the life of the farmer and contributes to the development of the fisherman's social system, called as patron-client. The *Punggawa-Sawi* relationship in the research location is an organization in the social system of fisheries in a coastal area that grows and develops organically.

The institutional patron-client (*punggawa-sawi*) of fishermen had been formed a long time ago in Bugis village, as other institutional patronage do, either the farmer, fisherman, or fishermen patronage in other areas. Some residents/fishermen who carry out the catching activity have established cooperation with their affinities, neighbors, and do communal work previously. However, in the community, there is a difference of resources for catching owned by each of them. The institution is strongly related to siri' as a moral philosophy of Bugis ethnic in Makassar. The condition that enables the emergence of the patron-client relationship in the fishing community is economic inequality (capital ownership, production facility, and the provision of employment opportunities). The community group that has a resource in form of capital or other fishing facilities and equipment (*punggawa*) elicits a choice for the community group that has no such resources (*sawi*) to establish a working relationship that is mutually beneficial.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### The Development of Patron-Client Relationship

The main ideas on the social group with "emergent" characteristic such as the groups of fishermen who run the patronage practice as suggested by Blau (Poloma, 2004) that: (a) in an elementary exchange relationship, the person is interested in one another through various needs and reciprocal satisfaction. There is an assumption that the person who gives a reward does such thing as the payment for the value they have accepted, (b) such exchange is easily developed and it becomes the competition relationships where each person should show the reward that has been given for suppressing another people and as an attempt to obtain a better reward, (c) the competition results in the origin of stratification system where the individuals are distinguished based on the scarcity principle of the source they have, and (c) the power is valid (authorization) or compulsory.

In the development, production relationships will experience a dynamic that forms a new pattern of relationship (industrial) or relationship transformation. The assumption according to Ponsioen (Salman, 2006) is when the patron-client shifts, the industrial relationship will appear. For that purpose, it should be analyzed through a concept of compliance by Etzioni. According to Etzioni (Salman, 2006), utilitarian compliance is the characteristic of the employee-employer relationship in an industrial organization that can be seen in two dimensions. First, the dimension of power; it is about what power that will be used by a party in affecting another party to comply with them. Second, the dimension of involvement; it is about the consideration that underlies the involvement of a party to comply with other parties.

By referring to the concept, the sustainability of a patron-client relationship can be affected by the role of those two parties. The principle of client involvement as the employee who has to comply is the calculation in form of profit-loss calculation. If the income is considered proper, according to Salman (2006), they maintain the compliance, but if it is damaged, the compliance will decrease. It means that the basis of employee involvement is a profit-loss calculation. Mirajiani et al. (2014), in their research about patronage transformation, stated that the benefit or profit given by the client to the patron is the profit in form of the material i.e. production yield. The client's loyalty provides the potency and the skill for the patron's interest. In contrast, the owner of *bagan* who does not have an economic potency will have a relationship based on the relationship where the owner of *bagan* employs their subordinates (*anak bagan*) in every fishing activity. The guarantee provided by them is that the client keeps doing the livelihood activities even though they do not have any facility/capital.

The persistence of patron-client relationship is a group as in fishing unit can also be analyzed through the group dynamics. Assessing group dynamics according to Suyatna (1982) means assessing the forces occurred from various sources in the group. The forces are (a) group's goals, (b) group structure, (c) task function, (d) group building and

maintenance, (e) group cohesiveness, (f) group atmosphere, (g) group pressure, and (h) group effectiveness. Meanwhile, the activity of group members that causes job comfort in 1 (one) group according to Hare (Suyatna, 1982) is about the individual interaction in a group that is affected by some factors that become a unit. The factors are individual biological nature, the individual's personality (personality), the individual's role, the small group such as a family or other affinities (small group), a large group (large group), and physical environment (environment).

Additionally, the analysis in form of a framework is to see how strong the patron-client bond is. It can be seen from the idea by Koentjaraningrat (1990) stating that the patron-client relationship is generally a relationship or the bond of emotional friendship and instrumental friendship. Koentjaraningrat (1990) considers that the patron-client pattern is a relationship pattern that is based on the principle of reciprocity. Based on his point of view, there is a term called dyadic contract or a relationship between two units who cooperate with one another. In an exchange theory, Blau (Salim, 2008) states that there are five logical possibilities where the individual can avoid the compliance that can cause the strong or weak condition of the relationship bond. Those possibilities are: (a) they can get similar service so that the relationship with others can be the same reciprocal relationship; (b) they can get similar service so that the relationship with others can still be a reciprocal relationship; (c) they can get similar service wherever they are; (d) they can suppress others to get a service; and (e) they work without expecting such service or they find the substitutes.

A thing that cannot be separated from the social life of Bugis community is the value of *siri'*. In the culture of *siri'*, there is a value of the spirit of solidarity and loyalty to one another. It can be seen clearly from the motto of Bugis people-Makassar saying that *taro ada' taro gau'* (a word means an action). This element can be seen in a *lontara'* expression from Bugis community-Makassar (Pelras (2006), stating that if you lose your self-esteem or self-respect, maintain the humanity you have by upholding the human solidarity and showing your loyalty in yourself (*punna tena nia' siri' nu panaiki paccenu*).

### **The Relationship between Meaning and Action**

A behavior, according to Suparta (2001), is a way to act that shows a person's behavior and it is a combination between the anatomical, physiological, and psychological development and behavior pattern that is used as a behavior of a person in executing their activities. Meanwhile, Sarwono (1992) defines a behavior as a human action both perceptible and imperceptible such as attitude, interest, and emotion. Human behavior varies since each individual has different needs and goals. The action, according to Blumer, contains a different meaning from a mere behavior. G.Herbert Mead (Ritzer, 2004) analyzes the social action by using introspection technique to figure out the thing that stimulates the social action in the actor's point of view.

One of the factors affecting the understanding process and someone's behavior is the status and the role that pertain to them. Linton as cited in Soemardjan and Soemardi (Sunarto, 2000) states that a status is a certain position in a reciprocal relationship (interaction). According to him, a status is related to someone's participation in a certain relationship pattern and it can be a group of positions owned by someone toward a certain pattern. A status can be meant as a group of rights and obligations i.e. a thing that can be accepted and at the same time, the obligations that should be done related to the status they hold.

## **III. RESEARCH METHOD**

### **Time and Location of the Research**

The research was conducted in Bugis Village, Poasia regency, Kendari City, Southeast Sulawesi province. The location of the research was selected purposively based on the consideration that the access to enter the area is quite easy. In Bugis village area, the community's life commonly depends on the fishery sector and their additional jobs. Besides being a fisherman as their main job, providing services became an alternative job for their household economic source when the fishing season ends. An institutional patronage in the research location affected the fish catching activity and other social activities. In each period of the use of production facility, the patron-client relationship in both locations certainly underwent a dynamic of change.

For a qualitative data collection, the determination of informant was based on the initial information about the citizens who were involved in fisherman's activity, either as fisherman labor, traditional fisherman, business owner (boat owner), or fishmonger. The information about this issue was mainly expected to be collected from the instruction of urban village apparatus or head (urban village head). The first informant that had been interviewed was given some questions about the community that could be selected as the next informant. Besides such snowball technique, it was possible for the researcher to determine the informant after having interaction with the community in the research location.

### **Data Analysis Technique**

To answer all the problems stated above, the analysis of qualitative data was done based on the theory suggested by Miles and Huberman (1992). They stated that the activity in the analysis of qualitative data was done interactively and it went continuously until it was completed until the data were saturated by following the principle of a research that used a qualitative approach and an ethnographic method. The data analysis was started from data reduction by summarizing those data that were strongly related to patronage activity of fisherman, and the transformation that had been going on. To obtain the credibility level of the research finding, it could be done by extending the observation period.

The data analysis contained some procedures for analyzing i.e. the way to use the data that had been collected in solving the research problems, the data that had been collected should be separated according to each category, and then it should be interpreted in an attempt to find the answers for the research problems. The activities in the analysis of each purpose in this research can be seen as follows:

1. **Data Reduction**
2. **Data Display.** The display of primary data was done in form of table, graphic, etc. Meanwhile, the display of secondary data could be done in form of narrative text.
3. **Conclusion / Verification**  
 The conclusion in a qualitative research was a new finding that was never existed previously. The finding could be in form of a description or an illustration of an object that was still a phenomenon after it was investigated to be clearer.

## **IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **The Development of Institutional *Punggawa-Sawi***

As has been elaborated before, an institutional patronage in Bugis village developed along with the development of production organization of fish catching that transformed from a sole proprietorship into a partnership. The partnership was done along the change in fishing facilities and equipment i.e. sampan/small wooden boat by adding machine facility (outboard motor) on the boat. The technology development implicated the development of the management of fish catching that became gradually complex by forming the *punggawa-sawi* relationship pattern.

The limited capital source experienced by the fishermen (fisherman labor) forced them to establish a relationship in institutional patron-client (*punggawa-sawi*) with rich people (who own a boat or a ship with large tonnage and wholesalers), both from Bugis village and from outside the village. The difference in wealth would finally form the difference in power and position. Patron (*punggawa*), in institutional patron-client; due to the wealth they have, positioned them at a higher position in hierarchical relationship vertically. Because of the position, the patron had a higher power than the client had.

The social condition that supported the patron-client relationship was the different power for the position, domination, and wealth. To mitigate the problem, they found or started to depend on someone who had more power, was able to protect, and provided the necessities. The imbalance of exchange in the patron-client relationship could be easily found considering the obvious difference between the two of them. Patron (*punggawa*) usually has a house with a different size of the area, the different materials, and furniture than the sawi has. In addition, *punggawa* has private vehicles, both two-wheel vehicle (motorcycle) and four-wheel vehicle (car).

The condition supported the thesis suggested by Blau (Poloma, 2004) who presented two requirements that should be fulfilled for the behavior that led to social exchange. The requirements are:

- a. The behavior should be oriented on the purposes that could be reached only through an interaction with other people,
- b. The behavior should have a purpose to obtain the facility for achieving the purpose.

The development of an institutional patron-client (*punggawa-sawi*) of fishermen in Bugis Village could be differentiated from each implementation of fishing facility and equipment. The *punggawa-sawi* relationship pattern, when the implementation of traditional facilities, was applied in an organization consisting of around 2 to 3 people. Nevertheless, such size of the organization was the characteristic of an institution with the *punggawa-sawi* relationship. The owner of fishing facilities and equipment had a role as *punggawa* and they had a responsibility toward the catching activity. The leadership of *punggawa* was very dominant and they played a role as the production head. Meanwhile, *sawi* played a role as the follower of *punggawa* in which the line of command connected them. When using some technologies for fishing such as hooks, fishing net, or portable traps, there was no tasks distribution. It means that there is no clarity about which person who should do a certain task.

HSb as a informant expressed that:

I remembered the time when we did the fish catching. We leave the parking area for boats to start catching. All of us should be able to do everything because they should take care of the fishing gear and protect the boat not to be flipped.

The distribution of tasks in the fisherman's household that could be seen was fish catching done by male people (husband or sons) and selling activity or processing the catches done by female people (wife or daughters). Basically, the distribution of tasks was applicable to all fishermen's households. According to Kusnadi (2001), fishing activities in the sea such as fish-catching activity became the male's tasks since the characteristic of this task needed more physical competence, rapid action, and had a high risk. With different physical competence, the female people handle the fishing-related tasks on lands such as organizing the domestic responsibilities, and socio-cultural and economic activity. The effect of the system of task distribution was the female people dominated the economic matters in the household and an important decision-making in their household. However, according to Budiman (1995), the task distribution based on gender actually damaged the female people and it did not reflect the justice for female people. Firth (Satria, 2009) and Szanton (Salman, 2006) also found such task distribution for male and female people in the fishing community.

The simple tasks distribution occurred along with the implementation of *bagan* technology (*bagang*). It consisted of *sawi* who kept the boat and handled the kerosene lamp, and *sawi* who took out the fish from the net when it had been lifted from the sea. The hierarchy of *punggawa-sawi* had become clearer than the previous period. Meanwhile, the *sawi* in general and *sawi* with an additional task as explained above would receive a different portion of revenue. At fisherman household level, task distribution was classified based on gender i.e. male people do the fish catching task and female people do the selling activity or processing the catches as their tasks.

Aras aPunggawastated that:

When we use*bagang*, there should be people to be involved.It cannot be done if the number of people is few since there are many things to do. The people who do more tasks will get more *bage*(share/portion).

The result of the interview illustrated that each change in fishing technology would affect the job diversification, and it resulted in social differentiation. The social differentiation would implicate the different portion of revenue (revenue sharing). The difference in revenue sharing positions the fisherman in various social position was because of the wealth they had.

The result of interview to HSb as *apunggawais* as follows:

There are many*sawi* if we use*bagang* because we have to do this and that. We will be in trouble if there is no person. So, the revenue will be sharedwith many people.

The institutional*punggawa-sawi* experienced the culmination of developmentwhengae was started to be operated aroundthe beginning 1980s. In the use of *gae* facility, fishing business in Bugis village was dominated by a



partnership and it was organized. During the period, there was an increase in the capacity and the organization became more complex. The higher capacity of ship machine (gross ton) was, the more *sawi* involved in the organization of fish catching.

In the beginning of *gae* development (around the beginning 1980s), the owner who played a role as *punggawa* took a responsibility as the head of fish catching while the fisherman had a role as *sawi*. At the time, the capacity of purse seiners here was around 6-10 GT, with 5-7 people as the size of an organization. The fishing ground was not as far as the current condition. The type of fishing done was using one-day fishing. With the type of fishing time, the fishing unit did not need operating costs in form of food provision, ice cube, and more fuel. However, the *punggawa-sawi* relationship pattern was developed and it became the strong bond in organizing *sawi*. For purse seiners with a capacity of 30-54 GT used by the fisherman in these days, they needed food provisions (figure 2) and fisheries organization consisting around 20-25 people of *sawi*.

Along with the development of fishing technology, the volume of catches increased. The condition caused the production organization to be wider with the existence of the marketing part. This marketing part was mostly handled by the boat owner or other assigned people. The activity of fish catching was assigned to an able seaman (*punggawa laut*/catching manager). Meanwhile, the boat owner had a status as *punggawa darat*/boat owner.

In recruiting *sawi*, *apunggawa* did not limit only from acquaintance, family, relatives, and neighbors as the candidates. It was also applicable to the age of *sawi*. In these days, the requirement for recruiting *sawi* is more based on their competence. The requirements for recruitment likely consider the competence, capability, experience, and honesty. The effect of fishing skill and leadership that previously became the benchmark for *punggawa* was replaced by the capital ownership in the implementation of *gae*. Among the community in Bugis village, there was a fisheries capture organization where the owner only invested in the shareholding of *gae* without skipping the “process” of the previous shift in fishing facilities and equipment. It means that the measurement for the leadership of *punggawa* was bigger due to the effect of shares in the production facility.

From the elaboration above, it can be concluded that the development in patron-client (*punggawa-sawi*) relationship pattern happened along with the implementation of fishing facilities and equipments. The modern one needed bigger vessel crew than the previous facility. The development occurred in form of the number of *sawi* in the fisheries capture organization, tasks distribution, and revenue sharing system.

### The Connotation of Patron-Client

The *punggawa-sawi* relationship could be analyzed through understanding the position of each of them and the understanding toward other positions. For the purpose, some *punggawa* considered themselves in the position as a capital owner. It was based on the consideration of the amount of capital that should be invested in fishing facilities and equipment. As a capital owner, *punggawa* was the company's director. The *punggawa* has the right for determining the number of fishing trips are done in a month, hiring and firing *sawi* based on their performance, and even, they have the right for determining the amount of revenue sharing, other bonuses, and operating costs. Even though *sawi* had seen the purchase invoices, they had never paid attention to it carefully and they never expressed any protest/complaint. It reinforced the belief by Scott (1992) stating that poor community prioritized their safety and avoided the risk of sanction that could make the rich people retract the consumption facilities they had been obtained.

The meaning reinforced the domination of *punggawa* so that the dependence of *sawi* became very high. According to *punggawa* i.e. Al, HSb, and Ar, the investment that they had spent was very high so that they dominated both in decision-making and obtain a larger share than the *sawi* did. The fluctuated catches and the threatened risk factor, the *punggawa* implemented a strict management in financial matters. However, there was no harmoniousness among all fishermen. It is in line with the research finding by Siswanto (2008) in fishermen in Prigi, or by Satria (2001) about the revenue sharing system in fishermen in an employer coming from *Bagan Siapi-api*.

Another meaning was that the *punggawa* considered themselves as ordinary people who needed other people/other parties to run their activities. However, with their dominant position, *sawi* was considered as a business partner. The

understanding became the *punggawa*'s reason to implement a fair revenue sharing, bonus award, and give a freedom in fishing and becomes the *sawi*'s property fully in the middle of a fishing activity. This type of meaning was relevant to a thesis done by Weber (2006). It was stated that the work system based on dynasty with patrimonial characteristic where the state servant's compliance was not based on the job but based on the personality of political figures (patron). The Weber's idea was that the procedures should be substituted in more rational way where the compliance to the personal substituted with the compliance toward the impersonal rules. The organization proposed by Weber was a legal-rationale organization.

From both meanings, it can be concluded that the trend of *punggawa* is to maintain the relationship pattern. It was caused by the role that dominated the fish catching activity and significant profit from the investment they had invested. For them, the position of *punggawa* played a business role and helped the economic condition of the people who needed a job. Both parties carried out the system of a relationship between the employee and the employer. Additionally, they maintained the values of humanity.

Meanwhile, for *sawi*, the meaning included their position as the workforce who worked in a business led by the *punggawa*. The conclusion from the result of the interview to *sawi* i.e. Md, Ed, and Li showed that they were very glad for being recruited to work at the fishing fleet of *gae* currently. The significant income they obtained became one of the reasons for them to feel comfortable in working as *pagae*. The opinion reinforced the idea of Scott (1992), stating that the client is the property of the patron who serves the employee and the skills for the patron's interest in any form.

With the significant income due to the availability of the job and the opportunity for *sawi* to change their status (social mobilization), *sawi* wanted to maintain the relationship. The opportunity to stimulate the social mobilization was strongly related to a way new for production. As has been explained, the existence of purse seine ship (*gae*) created the job position that needed a special skill such as ship's captain, *bricklayer*, *palampu*, *pakurung*, and *pakacca*. Those positions had a stronger impact on the increase of reward/revenue sharing directly than those who played a role as *sawi* in general. Even though, some analyses concluded that there was an exploitation of client by a patron in fish catching. Those analyses were conducted by Mappawata (Hamzah, 2008), and Mochtaria (Satria, 2001). Basically, both *punggawa* and *sawi* realized that they depended to one another and they were interdependent and they needed each other for their economic activity. Generally, *sawi* did not feel that the relationship was exploitative for them.

## V. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### Conclusion

1. The patron-client relationship pattern formed in the fishermen at Bugis village is the relationship pattern in form of a *punggawa-sawi* bond. This relationship pattern is the alliance of two groups of community or individual with different level, both from the status, power, and revenue. Thereby, it can position *sawi* in a lower position (inferior), and it positions *punggawa* in a higher position (superior).
2. The *punggawa* with their ability and the ownership of sufficient fishing facilities and equipment use the services by *sawi* who relies on their physical resources. The relationship pattern has occurred and it becomes the economic support for the fishermen. Therefore, both *punggawa* and *sawi* always try to maintain the relationship by using a strategy related to their status and role. The strategy done by *punggawa* is giving the remuneration and normative manipulation. Remuneration is given in form of revenue sharing, a bonus award, and an opportunity for *sawi* to reach social mobilization, boat maintenance, and fish gears they have used. The normative manipulation is done by giving some helps that tied in the norm of reciprocity. Meanwhile, for *sawi*, the thing they should do is the consideration in a calculation and moral. The calculation covers the significant revenue sharing and comfortable work atmosphere. Besides that, the moral consideration for the aids given by *punggawa* is considered as a debt of kindness for the *sawi*.

### Suggestion

One of the aspects that should be a consideration for the government is finding out how far the meaning of fishermentoward each position they have both as a patron and as a client. The program related to a fisherman is the synergy between the economic aspect and the cultural aspect. It happens since the trend of the meaning shiftsto a commercial thing (economic) in fisherman group. However, they do not leave the cultural meaning. Therefore, the intensive interaction should be carried out by the government informally through following the traditions among the local residents and minimizing the “space” between the government and the fishermen

### REFERENCES

1. Abernethy, C.L. 2002. *Water Institution to Enhance Economic Development. Majalah Agricultural + Rural Developmet, No. 2 Tahun 2002.*
2. Alimuddin, M.R. 2005. *Orang Mandar Orang Laut. Jakarta: KPG.*
3. Anggraini, E. 2002. *Analisa Model Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Laut. Skripsi FPIK IPB.*
4. Arief, A. 2015. *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Nelayan Melalui Pendekatan Kelembagaan Lokal (Studi Kasus Desa Pajukukang Kecamatan Maros Utara, Kabupaten Maros).* <https://www.scribd.com/doc/13134563>.
5. Arifin, A. 2014. *The Patron-Client Relation In Fishermen Community. International Journal of Academic Research . May 2014, Vol. 6 Issue 3*
6. Babbie, E. 2004. *The Practice of Social Research. 10 th Edition. WP Company.*
7. Damsar. 2011. *Sosiologi Ekonomi. Jakarta: Kencana*
8. Danim, S. 2002. *Menjadi Peneliti Kualitatif. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.*
9. Dahuri, R. 2015. *Menuju Indonesia Sebagai Poros Maritim Dunia. Bogor: Roda Bahari*
10. Daris, L. Kartika, E. Amanuddin. S. 2012. *Dinamika Konflik Dan Peran Kelembagaan Lokal Dalam Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Perikanan Tangkap Di Kabupaten Maros Provinsi Sulawesi Selatan (Jurnal Agrisistem vol 8 no 1, ISSN 2089-0036.*
11. Etzioni, A. 1985. *Organisasi-Organisasi Modern: Foundations of Modern Sociology Series. UI-Press dan Pustaka Bradjaguna, Jakarta.*
12. Fadjar, U, M.T. Sitorus. AH Dharmawan. S.M.P. Tjondronegoro, 2008. *Transformasi Sistem Produksi iPertaniandan Struktur Agraria Serta Implikasinya Terhadap Diferensiasi Sosial dalam Komunitas Petani (Studi Kasus pada Empat Komunitas Petani Kakao di Provinsi Sulawesi Tengah dan Nangroe Aceh Darussalam), Jurnal Agro Ekonomi. Volume 26 No. 2 Oktober 2008.*
13. Gassing, A, Qadir. 1991 “Rengge: Studi Tentang Teknologi dan Dampak Sosialnya dalam Kehidupan Nelayan”. Dalam Mukhlis (Ed.). *Teknologi dan Perubahan Sosial di Kawasan Pantai. P3PM - UNHAS. Ujung Pandang.*
14. Gunawan, I. 2013. *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif, Teori dan Praktik. Jakarta Bumi Aksara.*
15. Hakim, M. 2016. *Social Structure and Poverty in the Fishing Community at Pandang-Pandang, Jeneponto in South Sulawesi Province. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences MCSER Publishing, Rome-Italy. Vol 7 No 1 S1 January 2016*
16. Hamid, 2014. *Siri: Filosofi suku Bugis, Makassar, Toraja, Mandar. Makassar: Arus Timur.*
17. Hamzah, A. 2008. *Respons Komunitas Nelayan Terhadap Modernisasi Perikanan. Tesis IPB. Bogor*
18. Hamzah, A. 2009. *Perubahan Struktur Sosial Nelayan Akibat Modernisasi Perikanan. Jurnal Agrisep. Vol 19/3/2009*
19. Hamzah, A. 2013. *Transformasi Moda Produksi (Mode Of Production) Masyarakat Pesisir (Studi Kasus Nelayan Bajo di Desa Latawe Kabupaten Muna Provinsi Sulawesi Tenggara). Jurnal Agriplus Vol. 23 No.3.*
20. Hamzah, A. 2017. *Institutional Patron - Client Fisherman's in Kampung Bugis District of Poasia Kendari. IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS) Volume 22, Issue 11, Ver. 7 (November. 2017) PP 32-41 e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845. www.iosrjournals.org*
21. Hamzah, A. N.K. Panjaitan., N.W. Prasodjo. 2008. *Respon Komunitas Nelayan terhadap Modernisasi Perikanan (Studi Kasus Nelayan Suku Bajo di Desa Lagasa, Kabupaten Muna, Propinsi Sulawesi Tenggara), Jurnal Transdisiplin Sosiologi, Komunikasi dan Ekologi Manusia, Volume 2.*
22. Hamzah, A, M. Aswar., La Nalefo, A. Gafaruddin. 2015. *Fishing Technology Conversion, Differentiation, And Social Mobility Of Fisherman In Lagasa Village Of Muna Regency. IJSTAS Vol: 2 No. 1*
23. Hamzah, A, W. Widayati, Bahtiar., A. Bafadal. 2016. *Dynamics of Institutional Patron - Client in Kampung Bugis District of Poasia Kendari. Journal WWJMRD 2015; 2(8).*



24. Harini, 2012. *DariMiyangKeLonglenan: Pengaruh JaringanSosialPada*
25. *Transformasi Masyarakat Nelayan. Jurnal Komunitas, 4 (2) (2012)*
26. Haryanto, 2012. *Spektrum TeoriSosial. Dari Klasik Hingga Postmodern. Jakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.*
27. Hasani, Q. 2012. *Konservasi Sumber Daya Peikanan Berbasis Masyarakat, Implementasi NilaiLuhur Budaya Indonesia dalam PengelolaanS Sumber Daya Alam. <http://jurnal.fp.unila.ac.id/index.php/JPBP/article/view/18>*
28. Hurmain, Puriana. 2013. *TransformasiNelayan di Pesisir Kepulauan Bengkalis (StuditentangPergeseran PolaInteraksi Sosial, Agama, Alatpenangkapandan Perubahan Ekosistem. JurnalToleransi, Vol. 5 No. 1*
29. Istiana, T, I Kurniawan. 2014. *Entanglement fishermen with middle Man (Case study on Fishermen of gerbangMekar village, cirebon district, West java) International Researcher Volume No.3 Issue No. 1 March*
30. Kusrandi, 2009. *Keberdayaan Nelayan dan Dinamika Ekonomi Pesisir. Yogyakarta: Arruz Media*
31. Maulana, A. 2014. *Hubungan Patron Klienpada MasyarakatNelayan Desa Kuala Karang Kecamatan Teluk Pakedai Kabupaten Kubu Raya. Jurnal S-1 Sosiologi Volume 3.Nomor 2.*
32. Mead D dan M.Y Lee. 2007. *Mapping Indonesian Bajau Communities in Sulawesi. www. SIL-International.com (19 juli 2007)*
33. Minaro, S, GN. Ferero, H. Reuter, I. Puten.2016. *The role of patron-client relations on the fishing behaviour of artisanal fishermen in the Spermonde Archipelago (Indonesia). Marine Policy vol 69 July 2016.*
34. MintaroemdanFarisi, 2010. *AspekSosial-BudayapadaKehidupanEkonomiMasyarakatNelayantradisional (studipadamasyarakatnelayantradisional di desabandaran, pamekasan).www. kebudayaan/aspeksosial-budayapadaekonomimasyarakatnelayantradisional xml. [25 Desember, 2011].*
35. Mirajiani, E.SWahyuni, A Satria, Saharuddin, T.Kusumastanto. 2014. *TransformasiPranataPatronase Masyarakat Nelayan: Dari Ekonomi Moralitas Menuju Ekonomi Pasar.JurnalKomunitas 6 (1) (2014)*
36. Nuryadin, L.T. 2010. *Kapital Sosial Komunitas Suku Bajo. Studi Kasus Komunitas Suku Bajo di Pulau Baliara Provinsi Sulawesi Tenggara. Disertasi UI.*
37. Paongan, Y. Zulkipli, K.Agustina. 2012. *Perspektif Menuju Masa Depan Maritim Indonesia. Kepustakaan Nasional Indonesia: Jakarta.*
38. Poloma, M. 2004. *Sosiologi Kontemporer. Jakarta: PT.RajaGrafindo*
39. PSKPL-IPB. 2002. *Evaluasi Sistem Pengupahandan BagiHasil Usaha Penangkapan di Pantai Utara (Pantura). Bogor: Laporan Penelitian.*
40. Putra, A. 1991. *Minawang: Ikatan Patron-Khen di Sulawesi Selatan. Yogyakarta: UGM Press*
41. Salman, D. 2006. *Jagad Maritim. Dialektika Modernitas dan Artikulasi Kapitalisme pada Komunitas Konjo Pesisir di Sulawesi Selatan. Makassar: Innawa.*
42. Satria, A. 2002. *Pengantar Sosiologi Masyarakat Pesisir. Jakarta: Cidesindo.*
43. Scott, J.C. 1972. *The Erosion of Patron-Client Bonds and Social Change in Rural Southeast Asia. Journal of Asian Studies.*
44. Siswanto, B. 2008. *Kemiskinan dan Perlawanan Kaum Nelayan. Malang: Laksbang Mediatama.*
45. Sugiarto, G, Suryanto. 2014. *Peran Kearifan Lokal Sebagai Modal Sosialdalam PenyelesaianKonflikNelayandi Daerah Kabupaten Situbondo.Jurnal Psikologi Kepribadiandan SosialVol. 3 No. 2*
46. Suriadi, A. 2006. *Transformasi Industrial PadaKomunitasNelayan :StudiKasus di DesaSeiApung Jaya. Medan: USU Repository.*
47. Susilo, E. 2010. *Dinamika Struktur Sosial dalam Ekosistem Pesisir. Malang: UB Press.*
48. Suwarsono., A.Y. So 2000. *Perubahan Sosialdan Pembangunan di Indonesia. Jakarta: Penerbit LP3ES.*
49. Suyuti, N.2011. *Orang Bajo di Tengah Perubahan. Jakarta: Penerbit Ombak.*
50. Syahyuti, 2003. *Alternatif Konsep Kelembagaan untuk Penajaman Operasionalisasi dalam Penelitian Sosiologi. Forum Penelitian Agroekonomi. Vol 21. / 2.*
51. Tiryakiyan, E.A. 1992. *Dialectics of Modernity: Reenchanment and Diferentiation as Counterprocess. Dalam: H. Haferkamp and N.J. Smelser (Eds.) Social Change and Modernity. California: University of California Press*
52. Weber, M. 2006. *Etika Protestan dan Spirit Kapitalisme ( cet. 1); Yogyakarta: Pustaka pelajar.*