

Fragility and Capacity Building of Social Capital of Malaysian Fishermen

W. A. Amir Zal*

*School of Social and Economic Development,
Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Malaysia*

*Corresponding author; email: waamirzal@umt.edu.my

ABSTRACT

Fisher communities are a homogenous community with close relationships. These close relationships are recognised as bonding social capital. At the same time, they have relationships with other groups of people identified as linking social capital, in which an authority group has direct influence on fishermen. Two types of social capital influence the lives of fishermen but they always confront issues of fragility and the effort to expand those relationships. To investigate the issues, this article focuses on possession, fragility and capacity building of bonding and linking social capital amongst fishermen. The research involved 100 fishermen residing in Kuala Terengganu. The data were analysed based on descriptive, multiple regression and Pearson Correlation statistical procedures. The findings confirm a significant relationship among possession, fragility and capacity building of bonding social capital. However the fragility of bonding social capital is more influential on bonding social capital possession. Therefore bonding social capital will likely be vulnerable if fragility of social capital remains at a specific level. Thus, effort to strengthen bonding social capital must be made consistently. For linking social capital, the level and capacity building of relationships between fishermen and authority groups are at a low level. Efforts to increase this type of social capital must be given attention by fishermen.

Keywords: *fishermen, bonding social capital, linking social capital, capacity building, fragility*

INTRODUCTION

The term social capital is increasingly influential as the dominant actor on measuring progress and social development of the communities. This is essentially due to human nature which requires interaction and manifestations of interdependence. Scholars like Agnitsch et al. (2006) and Matarasso (2007) have been aware of this reality and insist that social capital is the source of human involvement. Human involvement will continue in its existing networks as well as create new networks. Involvement in manifest relationships is created in the community through a network of relationships between people. But the network contains reciprocity between them (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993).

Mutual reciprocity would not exist except for the element of 'trust' between interacting individuals (Qingwen et al., 2010). Trust as a growing element depends on interaction. This is because, according to Kay (2006), Dale and Sparkes (2008), and George (2008), human interaction will begin by sharing, including developing specific values to form collective action. If this continues, it creates an intimate relationship which is described as 'glue' by Emery and Flora (2006) and Boyd et al. (2008). This means, an interaction and trust a character of connectivity. However, this interaction in turn helps amplify existing feelings. Through it, individuals or communities can work better, because interaction serves as a 'lubricant' to action within the community (Kay, 2006).

THE ISSUE OF FISHERMEN'S SOCIAL CAPITAL

On the question of fishermen's social capital, no such survey specifically in Malaysia has comprised a deepening of it. Social capital refers to the social relationships of individuals or groups (Agnitsch et al., 2006; Matarasso, 2007). Other scholars have discussed this only in a general way, as relationships between family members and relationships with individuals who have authority as a middleman and government agencies.

The other researchers did not emphasize the meaning of social capital per se. Meanwhile, elements of social capital exists and has a large

and direct impact on fishermen. For example, a study conducted by Ross (2013) in Scotland found a dependence among fishermen communities despite the complex nature of that dependence. While a growing number of fishermen are involved in the industry, intimate relationships, shared values, and business networking still occurs. In other communities, participation in certain industry sectors causes relationships of mutual dependence between members to become more loose (Ross, 2013).

An explanation of interdependence between fishermen by Ross (2013) indicates the strength of fishermen's social capital. Social capital in the context of relations between fishermen refers to bonding social capital. According to Putnam (2000), bonding social capital means homogeneous social relations within a group, with a relationship which strengthens their identity. A study conducted by Ross (2013) is closest to the meaning of the results of surveys conducted by Akbar Ali Abd Kadir and Nor Diyana Sohor (2009) on fishermen in Sabak Bernam. The study showed factors influencing fishermen to participate in activities which were precisely due to the influence of the family. Most fishermen were accompanied by their family members who serve as employees. This is because they believe more in their own family members than others.

In an economic context, bonding social capital also plays a significant role on the fishermen. The Cooke (2013) found support in the fishermen's community as a catalyst to the acquisition of the economic benefits to the fishermen, including getting paid better and economically supporting one another through the principle partner. In fact, according to Sultanaa and Abeyasekera (2008), support in the fishermen community is more effective because of elements of collective action. Similarly, the results of the study Hauzer et al. (2013) were almost the same as a study by Cooke (2013), namely that the village of fishermen organizations play an active role in the management activities of fishermen. The role is to establish, monitor and enforce existing regulations. Compliance with existing regulations provides an overview of the strength of solidarity among fishermen (Hauzer et al., 2013). Therefore, the efforts made by the government can succeed if leveraging the strengths of a community, but also can achieve effective management (Hauzer et al., 2013). But Hauzer et al. (2013) made statements more referring to the purpose of linking social capital.

According to Gilchrist (2004), linking social capital means that people cross the border between the partners, and common status, allowing people to use the influence and reach outside of their community resources. But the meaning given by Aldridge et al. (2002) in Muir (2010) more clearly refers to the network that connects powerful groups. That is, linking social capital refers to human relationships with individuals or groups who have the power or authority, including government agencies.

There's no denying linking social capital has a significant impact on the lives of fishermen. This is because, according to Sultanaa and Abeyasekera (2008), fishermen often encounter conflict in order implementing collective action as a constraint to the parties who have the power or authority. This is similar to the studies made by Hayrol Azril et al. (2013), who found that fishermen fail to adapt to climate change because of limited networks with authority groups. On the other hand, many problems can be resolved if this problem can be solved. Similarly, according to Akbar Ali Abd Kadir and Nor Diyana Sohor (2009), to ensure the success of fishermen, they need more help as provided by the government. Whether the dimensions of relationships amongst fishermen (bonding social capital) or by authority groups (linking social capital), the two dimensions have not been studied in depth by other scholars. This has led to some questions about the level of bonding and linking social capital actually possessed by fishermen.

But it is not fair to simply examine only the possession of bonding and linking social capital, the study by Amir Zal et al. (2012) found that the element of conflict in the social capital that threatens Orang Kuala who originally worked as fishermen. The conflict occurs when a negative element happens in social capital. The conflicts in social capital were identified as the fragility of social capital. The fragility of social capital may occur in the fishermen community, especially in transition of fishermen change. This was recognized by Yahya Ibrahim (2007) and Salleh et al. (2012), who found that many changes have occurred over the fishermen community, including in the context of fishermen employment in other jobs. For example, studies conducted by Noviarti et al. (2011) on the quality of life of West Sumatra Fishermen found the fishermen have changed their lifestyle to improve the quality of life. But they had to work to get increased economic side of the family.

It is undeniable a role of household in economic can increase the family income, but the addition of such a role may increase a conflict in a family. A study of working women undertaken by Noor Rahamah (2012) showed that a working woman encounters problems at home and at work because they have to bear the burden at home and in the workplace. This can pose a direct conflict to the fragility of existence of social capital, particularly on bonding social capital.

In the context of linking social capital, the fragility of social capital can also occur. The Sekhar (2004) study found a reduction of resources, especially in relation to the activities of fishermen, which may cause fishermen feel threatened, especially when fishermen are trying to maintain their existing lives. They want to always reach of their rights to access and continue traditional management strategies. The conflict occurs when there is government intervention through specific mechanisms and regulations that attempt to interfere with the efforts made by fishermen (Sekhar, 2004). This happens when the government maintains that the fishermen's problem can be overcome by introducing a policy or regulation. Instead, fishermen do not think like that, but consider more government action as harassing them.

For Sudarmono et al. (2012a), fishermen feel uncomfortable due to outside interference when they aware of the implications. Among the implications confronted by fishermen is their lower social status than outsiders, who are viewed as high status, whereas they are entitled to that status because they work more to get marine resources. For Jacobsen (2013), who investigated the style of fishing in coastal Greenland, efforts to change the situation of fishermen through specific policy can be successful if taking into account the views of fishermen. Otherwise, conflicts will often occur and create fragility linking to social capital.

Despite the fragility of social capital among fishermen, many efforts have been made to improve the relationship, including enhance their relationship. For example, in a survey conducted by Mohd Yusof Hussain et al. (2011), the well-being of fishermen in Mersing achieved a good level due to the addition of infrastructure. Typically, the addition of a comprehensive structure was provided by the government. This manifests in the occurrence of social capital capacity building efforts by the government.

These efforts may be done on the consideration that the fishermen could not afford on their own to improve their lives. Moreover, Hayrol Azril et al. (2012) found that the mean scores of fishermen income is RM669.62, which does not exceed the poverty line set by the Economic Planning Unit of Malaysia at RM720.00. Thus, collective action based on social capital became a significant approach. This fits with the findings of Wiber et al. (2009) in exploring community empowerment directly affecting aspects of social transformation. He said that a collective process is needed to effect positive change. Collective process would not happen if social capital is in a negative mode. For example, a survey conducted by Sudarmono et al. (2012b) showed that the relationship between fishermen and authority group has a mutual conflict and is often overwrought because their bonds are debt based. But in order to achieve common interests, the relationship can grow and create more positive relationships and no longer be relationship-strata based. The result of the study indicates the need for capacity building of social capital. However, a detailed discussion has not been done well before.

These discussions raise many questions about the reality of social capital (bonding and linking) among fishermen, and also raise questions about the fragility and capacity building of social capital by fishermen. To answer these questions, this article lists three objectives, which are to explore possession of bonding and linking social capital, to explain a fragility of bonding and linking social capital and describing capacity building to bonding and linking social capital of fishermen.

SOCIAL CAPITAL INTERPRETATION

According to Agnitsch et al. (2006) and Matarasso (2007), social capital refers to the social relationships as the source for individuals or groups to be or not be active in the community. Social capital refers to networks possess by the community (Kretzmann & McKnight, 2005; Farr, 2004; De Silva et al., 2007; Verhoef, 2008; Phillips & Pittman, 2009, Qingwen et al., 2010) which are formed through interactions within and between communities (George, 2008). The networks are mutual (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). The term network is construed as access to activities or relationships that

bind people together as a community. This contains norms, beliefs and psychological capabilities fundamental to the production of collective action or product (Farr, 2004). Meanwhile, Qingwen et al. (2010) detailed social capital as a combination of interdependent relationships, trust and participation in neighbourhood (Qingwen et al., 2010).

In operationalization, Cuthill and Fien (2005), Boyd et al. (2008) and Qingwen et al. (2010) divided social capital in a specific domain, namely interdependence, trust, social cohesion, sense of community and participation. This was also agreed to by Kay (2006), Dale and Sparkes (2008), and George (2008), who found that social capital in the relationship motivated people to share, trust, have shared values and common norms and form collective action. For these features, Emery and Flora (2006) and Boyd et al. (2008) emphasized the social capital will produce 'glue' which makes people want to act collectively.

Typology of Social Capital

Scholars divide social capital into several types, such as Woolcock (2001), who categorized three types of social capital as bonding social capital, bridging social capital and linking social capital. Based on the views of Larsen et al. (2004), Leonard (2004), Kay (2006) and Bottrell (2009), bonding social capital refers to a strong relationship in a homogeneous group. A homogeneous group refers to groups that have similarities in socio-economic characteristics, including age, gender, social class (Coffe & Geys, 2007) and refers to individuals who are well-known (Dale & Sparkes, 2008; Phillips and Pittman, 2009) among family and close friends (Dale & Newman, 2010).

Bonding social capital is not only applied to the type of individual or groups, but includes the recognition of an individual or group having value, character, interests and goals which are similar based on the prevailing norms and culture. This recognition is a person or group as having the same value or a homogeneous nature. Therefore, the concept of bonding social capital can be changed depending on the recognition of individual or community.

To measure the possession of bonding social capital, scholars have certain parameters. For example, as suggested by Campbell et al.

(2010), there are three clues to possession of bonding social capital or the relationship with the individual or organization, which is based on the closeness of the relationship and the existence of social trust. For Dale and Sparkes (2008), familiarity can be seen through the existence of a certain feeling like the community feeling as one's own home, feel accepted in the community, a sense of belonging to the community and the community's perception as a reliable and positive social expectations, such that people should help each other .

In contrast, for linking social capital, Gilchrist (2004) defined it as a link between the human and organizational network across borders of contacts, the status and equality that allows people to use the influence and reach outside of their community resources. Middleton et al. (2005) defined social capital as linking a clearer, vertical nature of the bond between the communities and groups that have power. Vertical can refer to the recognition of 'social strata' existing unnoticed. For example, the relationship between low level economic groups with high-level groups (Pieterse, 2003). This also has the meaning that the in-class jobs are 'lower', and that 'higher' have the power to make decisions.

While linking social capital involves relationships with individuals or groups outside of their community, it is a little different with bridging social capital (Evans & Syrett, 2007). Bridging social capital refers more to individuals or groups outside of the same values or norms. They are connected to the community just to acquire certain interests; however, the issues are often associated with bridging social capital in exploitation and manipulation. Linking social capital refers to relationships with more individuals or groups outside of the community (whether community of place or community of interest) who has the authority or power directly over the community. Common issues associated with linking social capital are the imposition or execution of a top-down nature (top-down) on the community and a lack of space for the community to get involved in any activity directly related to the community.

While linking social capital has biases in determining the power of a community, according to Middleton et al. (2005) linking social capital is needed by the community, especially a community which

is often exploited or oppressed by another group. For example, an interventions performed by the government in the case of immigrants by introducing a specific policy on the nationality of the new immigrant and ultimately helping them to access to formal sources (Woolcock, 2003 in Cheong et al., 2007). According to Woolcock and Narayan (2000), linking social capital has a strong influence on helping individuals get access to the resources of formal institutions for social and economic development. Even linking social capital can be offset some of the earlier control or exploit communities through the power. This has been confirmed by Chaney (2002), as a partnership between government and the third sector in the promotion of equal opportunities and top-down approach as a means of intervention can reinvigorate and expand participation.

Moreover, linking social capital can also balance the 'dark side' by the community due to the strong bonding social capital that limit communication between community members and external groups (Larsen et al., 2004; Bottrell, 2009). Similarly, according to the views of Middleton et al. (2005), the results of his study revealed that the poor groups have more bonding social capital, but almost no linking social capital. Through linking social capital, welfare can be improved.

METHODOLOGY

This study uses a quantitative approach based on deductive strategy because researchers wanted to test the concepts in the existing approaches in the community development discipline, namely Asset Based Community Development (ABCD). This approach holds that the exploration of potential in the community is essential to achieve a more sustainable development. Thus, assets or capitals chosen in this study (social capital) were operationalized to enable them to be measured in reality, especially for the fishermen community. Due to limited funds, the researchers had to limit the size of the sample, which only involved one hundred fishermen in the North Kuala Terengganu area of Malaysia. They were selected using convenience sampling; the respondents were selected among the fishermen who receive subsidized petrol at the North Kuala Terengganu Fisherman's Association office.

Data was collected using a questionnaire; the questionnaire consisted of three elements specifically to measure social capital, the possession, capacity building and fragility of bonding and linking social capital. Bonding social capital as measured in the frequency domain trust and interacts to achieve common interests with individuals who were assumed to have the same values and interests such as family members, relatives and neighbours. Linking social capital was measured by the possession, frequency and trust in the network with the authority groups, including the headman, the warden, government officials either directly or indirectly related to the fisheries.

In addition, the questionnaire also measured the element of bonding and linking social capital capacity building. The measure was an effort made by the respondents to build and strengthen social capital, including measures to increase the frequency of interaction and build better relationships by increasing trust. The element of fragility of social capital was measured by observing the frequency of the problem or conflict between respondents with social capital, in which it was assumed that conflict would threaten the existing social capital.

Data were analysed using SPSS that involves two kinds of statistics, namely the descriptive and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics were used to present the results in terms of percentages. The inferential statistics used the multiple regression and Pearson Correlation statistical procedures.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Respondent's Demography

Table 1 shows the background of one hundred respondents who were involved with the study. By age, the largest number of respondents who participated in this study were aged 56 and over (54 %), followed by the age of 41 years to 55 years (25 %) and aged between 31 years to 15 years. The majority (83 %) of the respondents were married and 13 percent were single. A total of 61 percent of the respondents had only primary level education, followed by secondary level by 28 percent and 8 percent that had never attended school. 47 percent had been involved in fisheries for over 33 years, followed by 30 percent

between 6 and 21 years and 14 percent for involvement of 22 to 32 years. For monthly income, 38 percent had an income of between RM441 to RM750, closely followed by income between RM751 to RM2000, which was 35 percent. Another 14 percent of respondents had an income below RM440 and only 13 percent had incomes above RM2001.

Table 1:

Respondent's Demography (N=100)

Item	%	Item	%
<i>Age</i>		<i>Involvement period</i>	
Under 25	3.0	Under 5 years	9.0
26 until 30	3.0	6 until 21 years	30.0
31 until 40	15.0	22 until 32 years	14.0
41 until 55	25.0	33 years and above	47.0
56 and above	54.0		
		<i>Monthly income</i>	
<i>Marital status</i>		Under RM440	14.0
Single	13.0	RM441-RM750	38.0
Married	83.0	RM751-RM2000	35.0
Widower	4.0	RM2001 and above	13.0
<i>Educational status</i>			
Never	8.0		
Primary level	61.0		
Secondary level	28.0		
University	1.0		
Others	2.0		

The Bonding and Linking Social Capital

Table 2 shows the possession of bonding and linking social capital. The results showed that most respondents had linking social capital at a moderate level (47.5 %), followed by high level (37.4 %). This means that more respondents had bonding social capital only at a moderate level. The possession of bonding social capital at moderate level higher than high level shows the dependence between them was not too strong, but also not too weak. Nevertheless, the interaction will happen as often simply to mutually satisfy their needs within the scope of the norm that acknowledge by others. Interdependence is still going on in the community that has similar environments and forms a homogeneous characteristic (Coffe & Geys, 2007).

Similarly, the linking social capital, more than half (56.7 %) of respondents possessed linking social capital at a moderate level. In contrast to the bonding social capital, 33 percent of respondents possessed linking social capital at low levels. Low levels of possession of linking social capital shows less intimate relationships between the respondents and the individuals who have the power or authority in managing fishermen community. The results show a clear situation in which there is a no strong relationship between the fishermen and authority groups, and fishermen may be tackled by a problem with the authority groups in certain contexts. For example, the study by Sudarmono et al. (2012a) highlighted that the fishermen feel uncomfortable in the presence of the authority groups due to fear of the authorities intervening in their fishing business. According to Jacobsen (2013), the intervention of the authorities through specific policies affected the fishermen.

The fragility of social capital result showed that the fragility bonding social capital majority (94.6 %) was at a low level, while only slightly (5.4 %) of the respondents had a medium level of fragility of bonding social capital. Similarly, the level of fragility of linking social capital, the majority (97.8 %) had low levels of fragility of linking social capital. This means that the majority of respondents had a very low encounter rate for problems or conflicts with bonding and linking social capital.

But the difference was in the context fragility of linking social capital, even though fragility level was at medium level, as it cannot be

assumed that a relationship between fishermen and authority group is strongly trustworthy. It was manifested that there was no conflict between them. In the reality of relationships, fishermen depend a lot on the authority groups, especially on the Fishermen Association. The Fishermen Association is not under fishermen control, but is controlled by the government. Fishermen also obtained much profit from the Fishermen Association such as petrol subsidies and monthly allowance for registered fishermen. That was why they avoided any conflict with the authority group.

But there are some different situation relationships between fishermen and middlemen. The low level fragility of linking social capital in the context of middlemen was because fishermen have to avoid a confrontation to ensure they can sell their product easily through middlemen. The findings contrast with Sudarmono et al. (2012b) opinion that the relationships between fishermen and middlemen are always in conflict because their relation bonds are debt based.

The reality of fragility of bonding and linking social capital at low-level were manifest in interdependencies between them. Specifically to bonding social capital, low levels of social capital fragility shows cohesion between them remains strong until the problem can be interpreted positively. Fishermen are dependent as they push for fishery activity interdependence, if not they will not get economic benefits from fisheries effort. This is consistent with the findings by Cooke (2013), who found that strong support among fishermen was due to the desire for economic benefits.

Table 2 also shows the result of capacity building of bonding and linking social capital amongst respondents. The level of bonding social capital building was mostly at a high level (41.8 %), followed by moderate (35.7 %). This study shows an effort to increase ties with bonding social capital available is mostly high, followed at a moderate level. As a homogenous community, fishermen always try to ensure their community value and relationship expanded to more tightness. That is why bonding social capital is recognised as glue in the homogenous community (Emery & Flora, 2006; Boyd et al., 2008).

In contrast, capacity building of linking social capital, more than half (52.5 %) respondents with low levels of capacity building and followed

a moderate level (31.3 %). The results show that most respondents do not pursue to improve their relationship with the authority groups. The finding shows the reality of the purpose of relationship amongst fishermen and the authority group. Their relationship is not more than to accomplish a specific purpose. Also, the relationships do not to expand to more serious relationships, such as to increase trust or to share a community value. Their relation is only to protect their interest. As stated by Woolcock and Narayan (2000), linking social capital is influential to help people to access other resources for their development.

Table 2:

Bonding and Linking Social Capital

Social capital type	Low	Medium	High
Bonding social capital (N= 99)	15.2	47.5	37.4
Linking social capital (N= 97)	33.0	56.7	10.3
Fragility bonding social capital (N= 92)	94.6	5.4	-
Fragility linking social capital (N= 92)	97.8	2.2	-
Capacity building bonding social capital (N= 98)	22.4	35.7	41.8
Capacity building linking social capital (N= 99)	52.5	31.3	16.2

Specifically in terms of the relationship between capacity building of linking social capital at low level and fragility of linking social capital at high level, Table 3 shows the correlation results using the Pearson Correlation test. The results of Pearson Correlation analysis showed that the relationship between capacity building linking social capital and fragility of linking social capital was significant ($r = .289, p < .05$). This means that there is a relationship between capacity building and linking social capital fragility with a weak relationship $r = .289^{**}$. This also means that building a better relationship with the authority individual or organization is at low level because there is no problem that exists between them.

Table 3:

Relationship between Capacity Building and Fragility Linking Social Capital

		Fragility
	Pearson Correlation	-.289**
Capacity building	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005
	N	92

**Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Relationship between Social Capital, Fragility of Social Capital and Capacity Building

The results (Table 4) shows two predictor variables, namely capacity building and fragility bonding social capital, as factors in development of bonding social capital ($p < .05$) = .00. By using the Stepwise method, this study suggests fragility bonding social capital is the factor of possession of bonding social capital. The meaning of these findings is that possession of bonding social capital would be threatened if the fragility of social capital is high. If a conflict occurs between fishermen and bonding social capital, it will have a direct effect on the relationship with individuals close to the fishermen. The strength of bonding social capital depends on the level of fragility of bonding social capital.

Results of the analysis (Table 6) shows that only one predictor variable, namely capacity building in linking social capital, is a factor in linking social capital ($p < .05$) = .00. The results show that efforts to strengthen the existing relationship have a positive impact on relationships with individuals or organizations that have control over fishermen. If the respondent fails to emphasize building better relations with linking social capital, this will have a direct effect on the existing relationship.

Table 4:

Relationship between Social Capital, Fragility of Social Capital and Capacity Building

Model	Coefficients ^a				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	32.260	5.261		6.132	.000
1 Capacity building bonding social capital	.670	.092	.610	7.310	.000
(Constant)	17.498	7.058		2.479	.015
2 Capacity building bonding social capital	.668	.088	.609	7.609	.000
Fragility bonding social capital	.643	.215	.239	2.989	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Bonding social capital

Table 5:

Model	Excluded Variables ^a					
	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics	
						Tolerance
1 Fragility bonding social capital	.239 ^b	2.989	.004	.302	1.000	

a. Dependent Variable: Bonding social capital

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Fragility bonding social capital

Table 6:*Relationship between Possession, Capacity Building and Fragility Linking Social Capital*

ANOVA ^a					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1918.737	1	1918.737	40.506	.000 ^b
1 Residual	4263.263	90	47.370		
Total	6182.000	91			

a. Dependent Variable: Linking social capital

b. Predictors: (Constant), Capacity building linking social capital

SUMMARY, IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTION

That the possession of bonding social capital is at the medium level is an indicator that the relationship between fishermen and other people was not really warm. As implied, the relationship is no guarantee to encourage fishermen to continue their survival. This is because the relationship at a moderate level will be not the ultimate determining the dependencies between them. However, the fishermen indicated that they have been able to improve the bonding social capital. The study also showed a significant relationship between possession, capacity building and fragility of bonding social capital; however, the fragility of bonding social capital was more influential to development of bonding social capital. This means that bonding social capital would be threatened if the fragility of social capital reached a certain level. Any conflict between fishermen and bonding social capital will have a direct effect on the relationship between them. In other words, bonding social capital depends on the level of fragility of bonding social capital. Concerning this fact, to have a high possession of bonding social capital, efforts to strengthen bonding social capital should be consistently continued. If not, fishermen are at risk of confronting the fragility of bonding social capital.

In the context of linking social capital, the relationship amongst fishermen and authority groups was at a low level. Thus, the

relationship between them cannot be expected to secure continuity in fishery activities, including facilities and financial assistance. Further, efforts by fishermen to strengthen their relationship with linking social capital were at a low level. Among the factors was that the fishermen thought that they did not have a problem with linking social capital. However, the inferential statistical show the opposite result, any action imposed on capacity building will have a direct impact on linking social capital. If fishermen do not pursue raising their network, the relationship between them will become more distant in the future. On the other hand, any effort to strengthen relationship with linking social capital will have a positive impact for them. Therefore, efforts to improve the linking social capital must be increased. Even just a small effort by fishermen will have a direct effect on increasing linking social capital.

REFERENCE

- Agnitsch, K., Flora, J. & Ryan, V. (2006). Bonding and bridging social capital: The interactive effects on community action. *Journal of the Community Development*, 37(1), 36-51.
- Akbar Ali Abd Kadir & Nor Diyana Sohor (2009). Analisis faktor yang mempengaruhi hasil tangkapan ikan: Kajian kes di Perairan Sabak Bernam, Selangor. Prosiding PERKEM IV (Jilid 1), hlm. 286-304.
- Amir Zal, W. A., Ma'rof Redzuan, Asnarukhadi Abu Samah & Hanina H. Hamsan (2012). Peranan modal sosial rapatan ke atas pendayaupayaan ekonomi Orang Kuala. *Jurnal Teknologi (Social Sciences)*, 5(8), 63-69.
- Bottrell, D. (2009). Dealing with disadvantage resilience and the social capital of young people's networks. *Youth and Society*, 40(4), 476-501.
- Boyd, C. P., Hayes, L., Wilson, R. L. & Bearsley-Smith, C. (2008). Harnessing the social capital of rural communities for youth mental health: An asset-based community development framework. *Aust. J. Rural Health*, 16, 189-193.
- Campbell, A., Hughes, J., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2010). Social capital as a mechanism for building a sustainable society in Northern Ireland. *Community Development Journal*, 45 (1), 22-38.

- Chaney, P. (2002). Social capital and the participation of marginalized groups in government: A study of the statutory partnership between the third sector and devolved government in Wales. *Public Policy and Administration*, 17(4), 20-38.
- Cheong, P. H., Edwards, R., Goulbourne, H. & Solomos, J. (2007). Immigration, social cohesion and social capital: A critical review. *Critical Social Policy*, 27(1), 24-49.
- Coffé, H. & Geys, B. (2007). Toward an empirical characterization of bridging and bonding social capital. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 36(1), 121-139.
- Cooke, B. (2013). Community supported fisheries: Establishing new markets in a limited resource industry. Master of Arts Thesis. UMI Dissertation Publishing.
- Cuthill, M. & Fien, J. (2005). Capacity building: Facilitating citizen participation in local governance. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 64(4), 63-80.
- Dale, A. & Sparkes, J. (2008). Protecting ecosystems: Network structure and social capital mobilization. *Community Development Journal*, 43(2), 143-156.
- De Silva, M. J., Harpham, T., Huttly, S. R., Bartolini, S. & Penny, M. E. (2007). Understanding sources and types of social capital in Peru. *Community Development Journal*, 42(1), 19-33.
- Diacon, D. & Guimarães, S. (2003). Agents rather than patients - Realising the potential for asset-based community development. Retrieved 12/2/2009, from <http://www.bshf.org/scripting/getpublication.cfm?thePubID=1>.
- Emery, M. & Flora, C. (2006). Spiraling-up: Mapping community transformation with community capitals framework. *Journal of the Community Development*, 37(1), 19-35.
- Evans, M. & Syrett, S. (2007). Generating social capital?: The social economy and local economic development. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(1), 55-74.
- Farr, J. (2004). Social capital: A conceptual history. *Political Theory*, 32(1), 6-33.
- George, B. P. (2008). Local community's support for post-tsunami recovery efforts in an agrarian village and a tourist destination: A comparative analysis. *Community Development Journal*, 43(4), 444-458.
- Gilchrist, A. (2004) *The well-connected community*. Bristol: The Policy Press.

- Hayrol Azril Mohamed Shaffril, Bahaman Abu Samah, Jeffrey Lawrence D'Silva & Sulaiman Md. Yassin (2013). The process of social adaptation towards climate change among Malaysian fishermen. *International Journal of Climate Change Strategies and Management*, 5(1), 38-53.
- Hayrol Azril Mohamed Shaffril, Jeffrey Lawrence D'silva & Bahaman Abu Samah (2012). Tahap adaptasi sosial nelayan pantai timur Semenanjung Malaysia terhadap perubahan cuaca. *Persidangan Kebangsaan Pembangunan Komuniti Nelayan (PEKON 2012)* (pp. 2-16). Terengganu: Universiti Malaysia Terengganu.
- Jacobsen, R. B. (2013). Small-scale fisheries in Greenlandic planning – The becoming of a governance problem. *Maritime Studies*, 12(2), 1-19.
- Kay, A. (2006). Social capital, the social economy and community development. *Community Development Journal*, 41(2), 160-173.
- Kretzmann, J. P. & McKnight, J. L. (2005). A community-Building workbook discovering community power: A guide to mobilizing local assets and your organization's capacity. USA: ABCD Institute, Northwestern University. Retrieved 30/5/2010, from www.abcdinstitute.orgdocskelloggabcd.pdf.
- Larsen, L., Harlan, S. L., Bolin, B., Hackett, E. J., Hope, D., Kirby, D., Nelson, A., Rex, T. R. & Wolf, S. (2004). Bonding and bridging: Understanding the relationship between social capital and civic action. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24, 64-77.
- Leonard, M. (2004). Bonding and bridging social capital: Reflections from Belfast. *Sociology*, 38(5), 927-944.
- Matarasso, F. (2007). Common ground: Cultural action as a route to community development. *Community Development Journal*, 42(4), 449-458.
- Middleton, A., Murie, A. & Groves, R. (2005). Social capital and neighbourhoods that work. *Urban Studies*, 42(10), 1711-1738.
- Mohd Yusof Hussain, Azima Abdul Manaf, Zaimah Ramli & Suhana Saad (2011). Kesejahteraan sosial masyarakat nelayan: Kajian kes di Kampung Sri Bahagia, Mersing, Johor. *GEOGRAFIA - Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 7(Special Issue), 80-90.
- Noor Rahamah Abu Bakar (2012). Wanita bekerja dan pengurusan keluarga. *GEOGRAFIA - Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 8(7), 155-162.

- Noviarti, Jamaluddin Md. Jahi & Abd. Rahim Md. Nor (2011). Kualiti hidup nelayan di Sumatera Barat: Kekangan dan adaptasi. *SARI: Jurnal Alam dan Tamadun Melayu*, 29(1), 245-257.
- Patel, K. (2004). Capacity building or control? ISTR Sixth International Conference, "Contesting Citizenship and Civil Society in a Divided World". Ryerson University and York University, Toronto, Canada July 11-14, 2004. Retrieved 24/6/2010, from www.istr.org/conferences/toronto/workingpapers/patel.kirit.pdf.
- Phillips, R. & Pittman, R. H. (2009). *An introduction to community development*. USA: Routledge.
- Pieterse, J. N. (2003). Social capital and migration beyond ethnic economies. *Ethnicities*, 3(1), 29-58.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: *The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Qingwen, X., Perkins, D. D. & Chun, J. C. C. (2010). Sense of community, neighboring and social capital as predictors of local political participation in China. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 45(3-4), 259-271.
- Ross, N. (2013). Exploring concepts of fisheries 'dependency' and 'community' in Scotland. *Marine Policy*, 37, 55-61.
- Salleh N. H. M., Othman R. & Idris S. H. M. (2012). Penglibatan komuniti Pulau Tioman dalam bidang keusahawanan pelancong dan peranan insentif pelancongan. *Journal of Tropical Marine Ecosystem*, 2, 57-71.
- Sekhar, N. U. (2004). Fisheries in Chilika Lake: How community access and control impacts their management. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 73, 257-266.
- Sudarmono, Junaenah Sulehan & Noor Rahamah Abu Bakar (2012a). Globalisasi industri perikanan: Dampak terhadap komuniti nelayan lokal di pesisiran pantai Kota Makassar, Indonesia. *GEOGRAFIA - Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 8(7), 173-182.
- Sudarmono, Junaenah Sulehan & Noor Rahamah Abu Bakar (2012b). Dinamik langganan dalam masyarakat nelayan: Artikulasi ragam pengeluaran perikanan berskala kecil di Kelurahan Cambayya, Kota Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia. *GEOGRAFIA - Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 8(8), 65-75.

- Sultanaa, P. & Abeyasekera, S. (2008). Effectiveness of participatory planning for community management of fisheries in Bangladesh. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 86, 201-213.
- Verhoef, G. (2008). Nationalism, social capital and economic empowerment: SANLAM and the economic upliftment of the Afrikaner people, 1918–1960. *Business History*, 50(6), 695-713.
- Wiber, M., Charles, A, Kearney, J. & Berkes, F. (2009). Enhancing community empowerment through participatory fisheries research. *Marine Policy*, 33, 172–179.
- Woolcock, M. & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research and policy. *World Bank Research Observer*, 15(2), 225-249.
- Woolcock, M. (2001). The place of social capital in understanding social and economic outcomes. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2(1), 11-17.
- Yahya Ibrahim (2007). Komuniti Pulau dalam era pembangunan: Terpinggir atau meminggir? *Akademika*, 70(Januari), 57-76.