



Fragility and capacity building of social capital of Malaysian fishermen



W.A. Amir Zal

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

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 27 May 2015

Received in revised form

16 October 2015

Accepted 22 October 2015

Available online 4 November 2015

Keywords:

Fishermen

Bonding social capital

Linking social capital

Capacity building

Fragility

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.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. 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 and McKnight, 2005).

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).

2. 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 loose (Ross, 2013).

E-mail address: waamirzal@umt.edu.my.

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. This was recognized by [Nur Hafizah Rahimah Yusoff and Abdul Aziz \(2012\)](#), who studied the involvement of women in Langkawi in Women Economic Group (KEW) and who worked to produce new products based on marine resources.

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. [Sekhar \(2004\)](#) study found a reduction of resources, especially in relation to the activities of fishermen, which may push 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.

3. The 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 researcher 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.

In order to ensure that the respondents had been aware of their participation in this research based on their free will and not forced by any person, the researcher employed two clear stages to invite, as well as to inform the respondents, concerning their participation. In the first stage, with cooperation from the North Kuala Terengganu Fisherman's Association, the research data collection process was informed earlier and they could choose either to get involved in this research as respondents or decline the offer to be part of the research. Moreover, if they had decided to be respondents in this research, they had been requested to go to a specific office of the North Kuala Terengganu Fisherman's Association where the data collection process took place in a room. As for the second stage, if they had truly wanted to be involved in the data collection process and before the researcher distributed questionnaires to them; they had to complete the participant consent form. This form exemplified their awareness on their involvement in this research project, their role, and besides, all their queries were answered to their satisfaction. They were also informed about their right to withdraw from the research at any time, for any reason, and without prejudice. On top of that, the confidentiality of the information that they had provided would be safeguarded and they were free to ask any question at any time before and during the study. They were also requested to sign a form as an agreement of their participation.

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.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. 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–55 years (25%) and aged between 31 years and 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 22–32 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.

4.2. The bonding and linking social capital

Table 2 shows the possession of bonding and linking social capital. The results showed that most respondents had bonding 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 (Coffé and Geys, 2007).

However, the data displayed the manifestation of solidarity and

Table 1
Respondent's demography (N = 100).

Item	%	Item	%
Age		Involvement period	
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	Monthly income	
Marital status		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
Educational status			
Never	8.0		
Primary level	61.0		
Secondary level	28.0		
University	1.0		
Others	2.0		

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

trust amongst the respondents. In fact, according to [Campbell et al. \(2010\)](#), the bonding social capital is a sign for the existence of social trust. The element of trust is very important to the existence of a community because the form of community is not only based on the geographical aspect, but also based on non-physical aspects, such as trust. Other than that, the data were also interpreted based on an argument presented by [Dale and Sparkes \(2008\)](#), which asserted that the existence of bonding social is grounded on the existence of feeling as one's own home, feeling accepted, a sense of belonging to the community, and the perception of the community as reliable and positive social expectations. In this research, those positive elements might have had happened in moderate and high condition. Nevertheless, low percentage with low condition still occurred due to number of factors, and according to [Matarrita-Cascante et al. \(2006\)](#), it is the result of their interaction with other community members.

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 reality of more possession of linking social capital in both moderate and low levels has not given any good sign to both parties, either the respondents or the authority groups. Besides, in previous studies, data that have been manifested with the nature of social capital as a networking ([De Silva et al., 2007](#); [Verhoef, 2008](#); [Phillips and Pittman, 2009](#); [Qingwen et al., 2010](#)), interaction within and between ([George, 2008](#)) mutual networks in which were construed to access any activity or relationship ([Kretzmann and McKnight, 2005](#)), as well as similar values ([Farr, 2004](#)) amongst them, had been found to occur in a weak or moderate situation. Furthermore, those scholars believe that there is a positive potential in the linking social capital to human being activities. Conversely, without those positive elements, there might be a chance for loss to both parties in fulfilling their tasks.

For example, from the fishermen party, according to [Woolcock and Narayan \(2000\)](#), linking social capital has a strong influence on helping individuals to get access to the resources of formal institutions for both social and economic development, including a community to get the power to control the lives of the community members. However, with a weak or moderate situation, the participants would not obtain the opportunity to control their lives even though they might hold a lot of resources based on marine

products. At the same time, they also might lose a chance to improve their lives, especially their economic and social conditions, because they are not linked to the authority group. In fact, this reality was revealed by [Larsen et al. \(2004\)](#) and [Bottrell \(2009\)](#), whereby linking social capital has to be balanced with the 'dark side' of the community as the strong bonding of social capital could limit the communication between community members and external groups.

In addition, this weak or moderate situation also has a direct impact on the authority group. In order to design a good policy or at least to develop a correct intervention strategy to solve a problem or to develop a community, the authority group needs direct information from the community. As discovered by [Chaney \(2002\)](#), information given by other groups could aid the government to provide a good development plan, especially through the partnership approach. This situation clearly presents a disadvantage to the authority group, as they would be short of information provided from the respondents for various purposes; neither for current problem nor for progress. This situation absolutely gives an impact to the authority group to carry out the effort devised, including to solve their problems or to design any policy related to fishermen.

In the case of fragility of social capital, the 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 condition for problems or conflicts with bonding and linking social capital.

Apart from that, the reality of fragility for bonding and linking social capital at low-level could be manifested in the interdependencies between them. Specifically, in order to bond with social capital, low levels of social capital fragility have exhibited cohesion between them that has remained strong until the problem can be interpreted positively. Moreover, fishermen are dependent as they push for fishery activity interdependence; or else, they would not get the economic benefits from the efforts taken by the fisheries. This is consistent with the findings obtained by [Cooke \(2013\)](#), who found that strong support among fishermen was due to the desire for economic benefits. Besides, in the case of linking social capital, even though the fragility level was at a medium level, it cannot be assumed that the relationship between fishermen and authority group is strongly trustworthy. Hence, it merely can be manifested that there is no or less conflict between them.

In the reality of relationships, fishermen depend a lot on the authority groups, especially on the Fishermen Association. Fishermen 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. In situation of relationships between fishermen and middlemen, 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.

Table 2 also shows the result of capacity building of bonding and linking social capital amongst respondents. The level of capacity building 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. On top of that, the capacity for building social capital in this study had been referred as to any effort taken by the respondents to improve their relationship by words or action amongst the community members (bonding social

capital) and also with the authority groups (linking social capital). Nonetheless, this interpretation differs from other definitions provided by various scholars, for example, the definition suggested by Adam and Urquhart (2007) that referred to the effort to increase a certain knowledge or skill.

Moreover, the data also depicted that as a homogenous community, the respondents had been in a progress to ensure that their relationship was going to more devoted. Their tried to improve their relationship, either related to economic or social aspect. This kind of effort, as claimed by Banks and Shenton (2001), would improve their neighbourhood. In fact, this reality is parallel with those findings retrieved by Munford and Walsh-Tapiatas (2006) pertaining to vulnerable communities in Aotearoa, New Zealand, in which strong social bonds within the community supported the community members in coping with their problems. This view is also equivalent with the findings obtained by George (2008), whereby the increasing support among the members of the community showed a significant impact on the recovery of the community on post-disaster. In addition, Emery and Flora (2006) and Boyd et al. (2008) believe that bonding social capital functions as an amalgam in the homogenous community to improve their community.

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%). Furthermore, the results showed that most respondents did not pursue to improve their relationship with the authority groups. Their relationship was merely not more than to accomplish or to protect a specific purpose, objective or interest. Also, the relationships did not expand to more serious relationships, such as to increase trust or to share a community value. This reality is a negative sign to the respondents for their current and future situations, in which based on Middleton et al. (2005) study, the poor groups had more bonding social capital, but almost no linking social capital. Meanwhile, Bottrell (2009) suggested that a community needs to increase its linking social capital to balance the 'dark side' of bonding social capital, which limits the communication with other groups of people. Besides, as stated by Woolcock and Narayan (2000), linking social capital is influential to help people to access other resources for their development.

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 means, building a better relationship with the authority group will give an impact to the fragility of their relationship. If the respondents try to improve their relationship, they would merely have no problem with the authority group. However, if they fail to put any effort to improve their relationship, they might face trouble

as the problem between them will not be solved and issues concerning values or trust might surface. This reality was realized by Sudarmono et al. (2012a), in which the relationship between fishermen and government groups has always been in a suspicious mode, especially amongst fishermen because fishermen hold a negative perception towards the government for the government has been trying to control everything about their lives, including fisheries activities. If the respondents are comfortable with this situation, problems will continue to rise in the fishermen's community.

4.3. Relationship between the 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 (Table 5). The meaning of these findings is that possession of bonding social capital would be threatened if the fragility of social capital is high. If any conflict occurs between the respondents, it will have a direct effect on their relationship including their mutual trust. Also, the strength of bonding social capital depends on the level of fragility of bonding social capital.

Besides, in this study, the fragility of social capital is referred as to any harm or conflict in a relationship amongst community members. This is rather natural as when a community has a conflict, there will be a direct impact to their relationship. Although the respondents live in a homogenous community and they have been assumed to hold similar values, it does not reflect 'collateral glue' to them to have a strong solidarity action, especially when they have a problem or confrontation. This was revealed by Amir Zal et al. (2012) in his study where the relationship amongst aboriginal fishermen community members had been low due to a conflict that had sparked between them. The effect was that their frequency of interaction decreased as the conflict caused a sense of prejudice amongst each other.

Results of the analysis (Table 6) shows that only one predictor variable (capacity building linking social capital) is a factor to 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.

Moreover, this relationship displayed that capacity building is indeed a fatal factor to the existence and the survival of linking social capital compared to the fragility element. Although mere fragility could take place among the respondents, it could be overcome by the effort of capacity building. Thus, capacity building of linking social capital is like a 'patch' in any 'leak' in their relationship. For example, in a study carried out by Mohd Yusof Hussain et al. (2011), they realised that the positive aspect from the

Table 3
Relationship between capacity building and fragility linking social capital.

Correlations		Fragility
Capacity building	Pearson correlation	.289 ^a
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.005
	N	92

^a Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4
Relationship between social capital, fragility of social capital and capacity building.

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	32.260	5.261		6.132	.000
	Capacity building bonding social capital	.670	.092	.610	7.310	.000
2	(Constant)	17.498	7.058		2.479	.015
	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
Predictors for relationship.

Excluded Variables ^a						
Model		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.
1	Regression	1918.737	1	1918.737	40.506	.000 ^b
	Residual	4263.263	90	47.370		
	Total	6182.000	91			

^a Dependent variable: linking social capital.

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

development process by providing an infrastructure gave a good impression by community to the government. This strategy further reduced their feeling of dissatisfaction over other issues in their community.

5. 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 build the 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, in order to have a high possession of bonding social capital, efforts to strengthen bonding social capital should be consistently continued. Or else, fishermen are at risk to confront the fragility of bonding social capital. This reality has been proven as vulnerable to social capital amongst the respondents. This is especially when they confront about a problem or conflict,

their relationship might be jeopardised. Besides, this will not only give an impact upon the community level, but also in micro level, such as family level. This situation will also give a direct impact to the respondents, either to social life or economic activities, because based on [Sultana and Abeyasekera \(2008\)](#) experience, the success of a fishermen's community is rooted in their collective action. That is the reason [Cooke \(2013\)](#) stated that the strength of the fishermen's community is their relationship, although in an economic benefit. Furthermore, this was observed by [Hauzer et al. \(2013\)](#), in which their local relationship is a key for their economic activities, including managing their productivity. In fact, they share certain knowledge and information related to fishers' economic amongst them, including news, new policy or regulation, current price for sea products, and the weather. Therefore, if this issue is not ironed out, it will lead to 'weakness factor' for developing and putting the fishermen's community onto the track of economic transformation.

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.

This situation clearly does not give any advantage to the

respondents, because they would not have enough capacity to improve themselves in many aspects, especially if they are from a traditional fisherman background. They also have limited knowledge about the current issues in the modern world. Moreover, Hayrol Azril et al. (2013) claimed that fishermen failed to adapt to climate change due to lack of knowledge, whereas the authority group is more knowledgeable on such issues. This was also discovered by Akbar Ali Abd Kadir and Nor Diyana Sohor (2009) when they found that fishermen really needed help from the government to solve their problems. In a similar vein, the tendency for the authority group to make a wrong decision is also high due to lack of information given by the fishermen group. This kind of experience was depicted by Sekhar (2004) as the government implemented inaccurate policy or strategy because of wrong information obtained. With that, the fishermen felt threatened and this affected their productivity badly.

Thus, parallel with results obtained from the inferential statistic in which capacity building of linking social capital had an impact on linking social capital; this reality should receive attention towards creating and improving a good relationship between both parties. This is especially when both parties are mutually dependent although they do not share similar values or trust. In addition, as mentioned by Hayrol Azril et al. (2013), the problem faced by both the fishermen and the government should be solved if there is a good networking amongst them. Thus, this element should be given consideration and appropriate attention if an effective solution is sought to solve the problems experienced by fishermen.

References

- Adam, S.M., Urquhart, C., 2007. IT capacity building in developing countries: a model of the Maldivian tourism sector. *Inf. Technol. Dev.* 13 (4), 315–335.
- Agnitsch, K., Flora, J., Ryan, V., 2006. Bonding and bridging social capital: the interactive effects on community action. *J. Community Dev.* 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)*, pp. 286–304.
- Amir Zal, W.A., Redzuan, Ma'Rof, Samah, Asnarukhadi Abu, Hamsan, Hanina H., 2012. Peranan Modal Sosial Rapatan Ke Atas Pendayaupayaan Ekonomi Orang Kuala. *J. Teknol. Soc. Sci.* 5 (8), 63–69.
- Banks, S., Shenton, F., 2001. Regenerating neighbourhoods: a critical look at the role of community capacity building. *Local Econ.* 16 (4), 286–298.
- Bottrell, D., 2009. Dealing with disadvantage resilience and the social capital of Young People's Networks. *Youth Soc.* 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 Dev. J.* 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 Adm.* 17 (4), 20–38.
- Coffé, H., Geys, B., 2007. Toward an empirical characterization of bridging and bonding social capital. *Nonprofit Voluntary Sect. Q.* 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.
- Dale, A., Sparkes, J., 2008. Protecting ecosystems: network structure and social capital mobilization. *Community Dev. J.* 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 Dev. J.* 42 (1), 19–33.
- Emery, M., Flora, C., 2006. Spiraling-up: mapping community transformation with community capitals framework. *J. Community Dev.* 37 (1), 19–35.
- Farr, J., 2004. Social capital: a conceptual history. *Polit. 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 Dev. J.* 43 (4), 444–458.
- Gilchrist, A., 2004. *The Well-connected Community*. The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Hauzer, M., Dearden, P., Murray, G., 2013. The effectiveness of small-scale fisheries, Ngazdja Island, Comoros. *Mar. Policy* 38, 346–354.
- Hayrol Azril, Mohamed Shaffril, Lawrence D'silva, Jeffrey, Abu Samah, Bahaman, 2012. Tahap Adaptasi Sosial Nelayan Pantai Timur Semenanjung Malaysia Terhadap Perubahan Cuaca. *Persidangan Kebangsaan Pembangunan Komuniti Nelayan (PEKON 2012)*. Universiti Malaysia Terengganu, Terengganu, pp. 2–16.
- Hayrol Azril, Mohamed Shaffril, Abu Samah, Bahaman, Lawrence D'Silva, Jeffrey, Md Yassin, Sulaiman, 2013. The process of social adaptation towards climate change among Malaysian fishermen. *Int. J. Clim. Change Strategies Manag.* 5 (1), 38–53.
- Hussain, Mohd Yusof, Manaf, Azima Abdul, Ramli, Zaimah, Saad, Suhana, 2011. Kesejahteraan sosial masyarakat nelayan: Kajian kes di Kampung Sri Bahagia, Mersing, Johor. *GEOGRAFIA – Malays. J. Soc. Space 7 (Special Issue)*, 80–90.
- Jacobsen, R.B., 2013. Small-scale fisheries in Greenlandic planning – the becoming of a governance problem. *Marit. Stud.* 12 (2), 1–19.
- Kay, A., 2006. Social capital, the social economy and community development. *Community Dev. J.* 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*. ABCD Institute, Northwestern University, USA. Retrieved from: www.abcdinstitute.org/docs/skelloggabcd.pdf. on 30th May 2010.
- 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. *J. Plan. Educ. Res.* 24, 64–77.
- Matarasso, F., 2007. Common ground: cultural action as a route to community development. *Community Dev. J.* 42 (4), 449–458.
- Matarrita-Cascante, D., Luloff, A.E., Krannich, R.S., Field, D.R., 2006. Community participation in rapidly growing communities in southern Utah. *J. Community Dev.* 37 (4), 71–87.
- Middleton, A., Murie, A., Groves, R., 2005. Social capital and neighbourhoods that work. *Urban Stud.* 42 (10), 1711–1738.
- Muir, J., 2010. Bridging and linking in a Divided society: a social capital case study from Northern Ireland. *Urban Stud. J. Ltd.* 47 (12), 1–18.
- Munford, R., Walsh-Tapiata, W., 2006. Community development: working in the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand. *Community Dev. J.* 41 (4), 426–442.
- Noor Rahamah, Abu Bakar, 2012. Wanita bekerja dan pengurusan keluarga. *GEOGRAFIA – Malaysia J. Soc. Space* 8 (7), 155–162.
- Noviarti, Jahi, Jamaluddin Md, Nor, Abd Rahim Md, 2011. Kualiti Hidup Nelayan di Sumatera Barat: Kekangan dan Adaptasi. *SARI J. Alam Dan. Tamadun Melayu* 29 (1), 245–257.
- Phillips, R., Pittman, R.H., 2009. *An Introduction to Community Development*. Routledge, USA.
- Putnam, R.D., 2000. *Bowling Alone: the Collapse and Revival of American community*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- 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. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 45 (3–4), 259–271.
- Ross, N., 2013. Exploring concepts of fisheries 'dependency' and 'community' in Scotland. *Mar. 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. *J. Trop. Mar. Ecosyst.* 2, 57–71.
- Sekhar, N.U., 2004. Fisheries in Chilika Lake: how community access and control impacts their management. *J. Environ. Manag.* 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 – Malays. J. Soc. Space* 8 (7), 173–182.
- Sudarmono, Junaenah Sulehan, Bakar, Noor Rahamah Abu, 2012b. Dinamik langganan dalam masyarakat nelayan: Artikulasi ragam pengeluaran perikanan berskala kecil di Kelurahan Cambayya, Kota Makassar, Sulawesi Selatan, Indonesia. *GEOGRAFIA – Malays. J. Soc. Space* 8 (8), 65–75.
- Sultana, P., Abeyasekera, S., 2008. Effectiveness of participatory planning for community management of fisheries in Bangladesh. *J. Environ. Manag.* 86, 201–213.
- Verhoef, G., 2008. Nationalism, social capital and economic empowerment: SAN-LAM and the economic upliftment of the Afrikaner people, 1918–1960. *Bus. Hist.* 50 (6), 695–713.
- Wiber, M., Charles, A., Kearney, J., Berkes, F., 2009. Enhancing community empowerment through participatory fisheries research. *Mar. Policy* 33, 172–179.
- Woolcock, M., Narayan, D., 2000. Social capital: implications for development theory, research, and policy. *World Bank Res. Observer* 15 (2), 225–249.
- Yahya, Ibrahim, 2007. Komuniti Pulau dalam Era Pembangunan: Terpinggir atau Meminggir? *Akademika* 70 (Januari), 57–76.
- Yusoff, Nur Hafizah, Aziz, Rahimah Abdul, 2012. *Pemeriksaan wanita desa: Kajian ke atas Kumpulan Ekonomi Wanita (KEW), Kuala Teriang, langkawi, Kedah*. *GEOGRAFIA – Malays. J. Soc. Space* 8 (6), 15–23.