

Stimulation of Changes, Collective Commitment and The Patterns of Group Formation in Community Development in South Sulawesi

Syafiuddin Saleh

Faculty of Agriculture University of Muhammadiyah Makassar 90221, Indonesia

Email : syafiuddinsaleh@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aims to examine the pattern of group formation, related to the stimulation of change through the empowerment of farmers and poor fishermen. The pattern of group formation is the basis for sustainable development. The research method used is qualitative descriptive method and relevant research type such as case study and triangulasi. The results of the study showed that (1) stimulation of changes made through development programs or community empowerment in the areas studied both among farm households and poor fishermen households for some programs received positive response from farmers and fishermen. However, the collective commitment to the breeding is relatively weak, since the group formed in each program is not done through good planning and concepts. (2) there are two patterns of group formation that are natural and formed formations initiated by outsiders. Groups that are naturally formed are more institutionalized and have characteristics such as intense and relatively routine interaction, strong mutual trust, and have a common form or mechanism shared for common purposes. The group can form the basis for sustainable development in improving the welfare of the poor.

Keywords: *change, collective commitment, empowerment, society, poor*

1. Introduction

The implementation of modernization as the paradigm of development in all fields, including in Indonesia for 32 years, on the one hand has brought progress. On the other hand, however, it raises various concerns such as creating inter-nations, inter-regions, and inter-communities dependency. Exploitation of natural resources without considering the aspects of continuity and sustainability has caused damage to the environment; economic growth without equal distribution of income causes gaps, in which the rich enjoys a better ratio of development while the poor get poorer and drowned in a sense of helplessness. Nationally, the focus of the development emphasizes on the development of supporting facilities and infrastructure for urban areas, with the expectation to instill the enthusiasm of market players. The implementation of trickle-down effect policy to improve development resources since the 60's causes the activities in the local area not to develop well, and particularly weakens economic activity in the local market. Another drawback lies on the ability of the local administration system to provide services for the community. Both drawbacks continuously weaken the local community, including local poor households [1].

The spirit of regional autonomy in Indonesia is reflected in the Law No. 32 Year 2004, stressing that regions have the authority to organize, manage and develop themselves. According to the Law, parts



of the responsibility of a region are to improve the quality of life of its community, to actualize justice and equity, and to improve basic services. The spirit is embodied in various programs and efforts to address poverty that have been conducted every year. The process of community development or empowerment has been carried out in various ways; however, the efforts made have not fulfilled what is expected.

However, the approach of community empowerment in development should mean that the community is positioned as the actor and not merely as the beneficiary of the development process; the community searches for solutions and achieves better results; the community is thus able to improve the quality of independence in order to overcome the problems encountered. Community empowerment should be able to improve the quality of human resources, especially in shaping and changing people's behavior in order to achieve a higher quality of living standards. The behavioral changes in both sectoral dimension and social dimension should reach all strata of society, the poor in particular [2].

The research conducted by [3] shows that the effort to reduce poverty needs to involve the community itself in a more participatory form in order to enable learning process in the community as well as the process of behavioral change for a more dignified life to occur. The finding [4] describes that in a poor family happiness has a connection with what is thought and felt within the family related to several dimensions such as: education, health, wealth, and others. Therefore, the success of an empowerment program is the result of the interaction between the elements of development and empowerment strategies applied. Empowerment effort and strategy is a pendulum between evolutionary paradigm and revolutionary paradigm that complements each other in a proportion that is in line with the condition and institution of the farmers [5]. If empowerment is a strategic model to eradicate poverty, then it should be a multidimensional and multifaceted process, capable to mobilize various aspects or elements of resources as well as the capacity and potential of the community concerned; it needs mutual cooperation between all existing elements in order to encourage the local micro-economy [6].

The empowerment effort should be able to increase the ability of the community to organize itself, in a sense it is able to organize and manage problems and existing potential in order to adapt and cope with the occurring changes [7]. Lately, there is an indication of the strengthening of problem or the weakening of poverty reduction in Indonesia. According to the World Bank in [8] the indication is shown by the weakening of poverty indicator, not only of income but also on the circumstances such as the level of education, health, infant mortality, etc. and the growing gap in the performance and utilization of development's result. Poor population in rural areas increases from 19.5 percent to 21.29 percent, while poor population in urban areas increases from 11.4 percent to 13.4 percent. The condition is also exacerbated by the state of growth and equity disparities between regions, groups and individuals.

The main problem in this research is the tendency of the development at the local level in rural areas that has not been capable to increase institutional capacity and formation for rural community, especially among the poor or underprivileged households. Various programs have been carried out, yet there are still issues that need to be improved. Furthermore, the weak institutional capacity and formation originates from a sense of powerlessness, achievement orientation, weak collective action, the lack of an alternative vision and low stimulation changes. This study examines specifically how stimulus change and collective commitment can be an important element for strengthening the institutional poor rural household and how the pattern of group formation that can be the basis of institutional strengthening within the framework of sustainable development.

2. Method

This study was conducted in Jenepono Regency as an area with dry-land farming community. In this area, the research location was more specific in rural areas with the highest population (households) concentration, and had been given empowerment programs undertaken by the government as well as by other stakeholders, such as Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and the private sectors. This study used a qualitative descriptive approach by applying case study research combined with triangulation technique. In the pre stage of this study, it enumerated the poor communities who were subjected to this study. The research procedures included: (1) identifying the location of poor households through secondary data, (2) identifying the development or empowerment programs which have been conducted,

(3) collecting baseline data on the conditions and characteristics of poor households, and mapping them based on poverty indicators such as; insufficiency of household elements such as: into insufficient production assets, consumption assets and managerial assets and (4) indepth interviews to get a picture of how stimulus of change and collective commitment can be an important element for strengthening the institutions of rural poor households, what kind of group patterns can be the basis for institutional strengthening within the framework of sustainable development. The main analysis method used was qualitative data analysis.

Qualitative data analysis was defined as an attempt of analysis based on words arranged into an expanded text form.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Overview of Research Sites

This research was conducted in two regions in South Sulawesi namely Jeneponto Regency and PangkajeneKepulauan Regency (Pangkep). Jeneponto Regency is one of the regencies in South Sulawesi Province located in the southern part of Makassar City. This area has an area of 749.79 sq km, and administratively covers 11 districts. The management of this regional government is centered in Bontosunggu City in Binamu Sub-district. Based on the administrative division, the number of villages and sub-districts spread throughout the sub district are 83 villages and 30 urban villages. The data shows the population in this area about 361,000 people, which spread in each district. This area is dominated by dryland farming areas. Of the existing rice paddies manage rice crops and corn. For corn farming, it is generally only harvest twice, whereas rice is harvested only once a year. This situation causes the area to be categorized as dry areas with a large population of poor people. The poor household classification in Jeneponto District is made up of very poor, poor, near poor and vulnerable poor households. The data shows the number of poor households in this area of 54 072 households. [9] (Jeneponto Regency BPS, 2014). Bangkala sub-district includes the largest number of households, following Binamu Sub-district, and Tamalate Sub-district. So the choice of study focus is set in the sub-district of Bangkala, i.e., in Kapita Village.

While *PangkajeneKepulauan* Regency (Pangkep) is a regency in South Sulawesi Province which is located north of Makassar City. This area as its name *sebahagian* consists of small islands located in the sea of Flores and Makassar Strait. Overall the total area of this area 1,112.29 sq km. Among the area is largely marine territory. Pangkep regency has 11 districts. with central government in Pangkajene. Based on data on the number of poor or pre-prosperous homes in this area around 84948 households. Several sub-districts in *Pangkep* District can be divided into two divisions, namely the dominant sub-districts in the Mainland and the dominant subdistricts in the island archipelago. [10] (BPS Pangkep Regency, 2014).

Based on the consideration of the easiness and coverage of the area observed, it was initially chosen or focused on poor fisherman households in Tupabiring sub-district i.e., *MatiroDeceng* i.e., in *Badi* Island and *Pajenekang* Island. This island can be reached by sea using motorized boat with 2 hours travel time from Paotere Port of Makassar City or from *Pangkajene* City. However, *MatiroDeceng Village* is very far from the central government of Pangkep regency, so rarely gets a touch of empowerment program and for the adequacy of data related to local development or empowerment of poor households, the observation area is moved to North *Tupabiring*Subdistrict in *MatiroBombang* Village which consists of *Salemo* Island, *Sabangko* Island, *Sagara* Island and *Sikuala* Island.

3.2 Characteristics of Poor Households

In general it can be described that the condition and characteristics of poor rural households both farmers and fishermen from the point of view of participatory social development, in the two districts of *Jeneponto* and *Pangkep* District are not much different. The only difference is in the use of assets related to the physical production activities used by both groups in the type of livelihood. However, the state of the resource or asset in each condition is limited according to the state of the region and the community. While other resource elements such as human resources, finance for production activities are basically the

same ie the number is limited by productive workers, working capital that most borrowed from other parties or investors whose terms of return positioned poor households in a fairly difficult situation.

Similarly, the assets or resources associated with consumption activities, kedaaanya not different like kitchen equipment (plates, glasses), jirigen water, furniture potluck, walled house and bamboo flooring, electricity from neighbors and other equipment of modest consumption. In terms of human consumption is shown in the number of dependents that many average 3-5 people even up to 7 people and generally less productive. In terms of finansial prominence that is the lack of savings, and the tendency to have debt and unable to send children to a higher level. This situation causes poor households unable to grow and develop. So from the aspect of managerial activities for various purposes, especially those that are economically profitable can not be done.

In this connection, it can be illustrated that the conditions and characteristics of poor farmer households from the perspective of participatory local social development can be illustrated in the following household matrix Table 1:

Table 1. Matrix of Nine Elements of Poor Farmer Households in Jeneponto Regency

Resource Activity	Physical	Human	Financial
Production	Farmer: Land (limited) Crescent, hoe, machete and other tools that are also limited Fisherment: Fishing line, single device wire, fuel, boat (loan), crab fishing trap <200, strap span for seaweed <150	1 productive laborer The rest do not work	Funds, limited capital Most of the capital is in loans form
Consumption	Kitchen equipments (plates, glasses), water jerry cans, makeshift furniture, walled house and bamboo flooring, electricity from neighbors, electric hired from neighbors	3–4 burden people	No savings, Education fund is limited
Managerial	Existing physical assets are not maintained for various purposes	Other laborers are not attempted to assist the household	The investment effort for various purposes is not possible because of limited funding

Further on the institutional side, both on farmers and on fishermen have a similar relationship. Both are only differentiated by the types of commodities that are managed. The form of natural groups like gotongroyong and arisan still exist in each community. Initially this activity is more to strengthen social relations, but along with the development and empowerment, the situation has begun to shift to economic goals as happened in KUBE and other empowerment programs. However, in reality the collective group or formation is largely incapable of continuing due to various causes, and when empowerment and assistance are still dependent on government funding. In a long-term perspective, farmer groups experiencing the process of empowerment (community development) should continue to shift and position themselves close to the market system and establish themselves as autonomous or independent groups [1] and show their performance as a sustainable institutionalized groups [11]. In long-term perspective it is expected to change closer to the market system, and become an independent group or

institution. These positions bring many consequences from an institutional standpoint and then become part of the observations in the next study.

In general it can be argued that (1) poor peasant households in *Jeneponto* generally manage dry land according to the surrounding natural bounty, by cultivating corn and rice. Corn is grown 2 times a year whereas paddy is only one time a year and farmers generally are cultivators and some own a very narrow land. In fishermen community in *Pangkep* most is fishing fisherman, crab and seaweed. The main resources are fishing rods and boats. *Bubu* and rope and span, boats (dugboats) (2) The business capital of each poor household is generally owned by the other party, obtained by borrowing and returning in the form of deposits of production and subsequent profit sharing entirely governed by the owner of capital. Among farmers and fishermen, cultural savings have not existed or have not developed. This is due to limited income, also due to the urgent need for family life. (3) Institutions in poor farming communities and poor fishermen form a natural relationship between patron-client institutional and profit sharing arranged by patrons. Empowerment towards institutional formation that benefits farmers has not been adequately pursued. [4]

3.3 Stimulation of Changes

Every year, the local government through the Local Government Work Unit (i.e., known in Indonesian acronym as SKPD) was tried to empower the rural poor communities. In the area of this study, i.e., Jeneponto Regency area, the planning plot of empowerment program in principle was started by the proposals from the village. These proposals included the number of target groups and the number of members in each group that would be as the implementers of the poverty alleviation program. Those proposals from each village were proposed to the government through the relevant SKPD. In addition, there were programs arising from SKPD initiatives or related ministries through certain SKPD and consulted with the community through the village apparatus.

Among the programs in the village observed was Kapita Village as an agricultural village, in the last 5-7 years, there had been conducted several programs related to the poor communities. These programs included, namely cultivation of food crops, i.e., there was a water pump and tractor assistance program, in the field of livestock, i.e., there was a collective business group (KUBE) coaching program that specializes in goat farming and then in the field of forestry that was in the form of community forestry program through the groups system. Besides, there was also coaching group of joint ventures, such as furniture groups and workshop groups. In the fishermen community in MatiroBombang Village, Pangkep District observed, there are several programs in several groups such as: the program of making fish abon that organize themselves in groups of women or housewives; coaching program of seaweed farming group; a floating net cage program and a crew fishing fisherman group building program.

The empowerment approaches and methods for each program were different based on the implementers of SKPD and the program types being conducted. But, generally each program used a group approach. In that area, several SKPDs involved in empowerment and poverty alleviation programs, namely SKPD from the Department of Social Affairs, the Department of Community Empowerment and Regional Development (i.e., known as Indonesian acronym as BPM-PD), the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Forestry, but in KabupatenPangkep more emphasized on the Department of Fisheries and Marine. and Social Service Department

The total of funds and resources in each activity or in each group, based on interview results with the group leader, each response was different. There were in the form of money and there was also in the form of aid goods, seeds, training and other facilities relevant to the needs of the groups. For example, in coaching of KUBE goat breeding in Kapita Village, each group received IDR 20 million and subsequently each group which was under the supervision of a companion, bought their own goats to be kept together in groups.

The delivery mechanism of development funds that was conducted in each empowerment program can be divided into two, namely (1) the SKPD submits the resources or funds directly to the groups which are guided and forwards to the group membership, and (2) SKPD submits the development fund through Village Head for subsequent resources/coaching funds received by the group to be managed during

program implementation. Both mechanisms systems based on the recognition that group members were not entirely accepted in accordance with the agreements depending on the escort of related SKPD. But, overall the involvement of the Village Head as an administrator representing the government at the village level is a supervisor charged with determining whether the grants and resources in each program are properly used and accepted in accordance with the applicable rules.

The involvement of other parties, such as government, private sector, universities, international agencies and NGOs during the study conducted for some of the mentioned programs did not occur collaboratively because the whole program was implemented only by SKPD, except in some activities where the program beneficiaries were recruited from community leaders and also from NGOs. The funds receiving mechanism in the group was usually accepted by the group leader. If the resources or assistance were in the form of funds or down payment system, the group leader would submit to the group treasurer. But if the aid program was a tool or seeds, then it forwarded to each group member.

In each program, there was always involvement of poor household communities. In each group for each empowerment program, there was a pattern of group membership that showed the proportion of members involved. Although program schemes which were implemented were aimed to alleviate poverty for their target groups, but in groups, they were not entirely composed of poor farmers' households, but it was generally combined with more prosperous households, because poor farmers were generally poorly educated. There were conditions where members' involvement can be shared by 50 percent of poor farmers and 50 percent of the more prosperous members of the community, but there were also some 70 percent of poor households but the rest were either prosperous households or vice versa. In the early stage of program implementation, the groups' condition was always intact with the agreement and the collective rules under the assistance of the officers who were entrusted by SKPD but along with the program progress, the interaction of group members decreased following the interests of the individual entrusted manager.

The poor fishermen households' response to stimulus changes by the government and outsiders is short-term. The efforts of fishermen (cultivators) in managing the assistance provided are not long-term meaning. For example, in a group of seaweed farmers 4 years ago received the help of strap ropes and seedlings. Each member at that time gained 200 stretch. Among the 200 members of the group, only about 10 people or 5% are able to develop themselves well and respond positively to change, by means of each year trying to increase the number of strings that he runs. Among the cultivators who initially received only the same aid of 200 stretches, it has now grown to 800 expanses. One of them is *Asr* (42) by setting aside little by little of his income to increase investment. According to *Asr's* acknowledgment, each stretch can produce 5 kg of dry at a price of Rp 8000 per kg then in 2 months it can generate 32,000,000 rupiah. This amount does not include the acquisition of catching crabs and catching fish. Harvest if the production increases, it tries to set aside its income to increase investment and can finally succeed until now.

Farmers' household responses towards the changes stimulus which was conducted by the government and other parties were in term of short-term or long-term. In some programs, such as water pump assistance, tractor assistance and goat farming, initially they still managed the resources collectively but after the project was ended, the activities were dominated by certain farmers, and returned to individual activities, so that the group's institutions were not sustainable. Generally, the relationship pattern between them was in an imbalanced relationship between patrons and clients, where group leaders oversee several members and place their members in the position of hired labor, not as partners in an activity in order to improve common welfare. However, based on interviews with farmers, there were positive things that can be found in the empowerment as occurred to farmers around the forest area in *Kapita* Village. They considered that the government's efforts to stimulate each empowerment program involving them, is as a long-term opportunity to improve the economic condition of the society. For example, several years ago the government (SKPD) gave the help of *gemelina* tree seedlings to be planted around the field, now it is expanded with other plants, such as mahogany and cashew nuts. The program was successfully developed. There were some farmers who were not as the group members after seeing their neighbors in the field succeeded, now they are consciously trying to plant these plants on their land

by imitating their neighbors' system, although there are still many farmers who are not concerned with the sustainability of the business.

In some poor fishermen's households whose livelihoods were looking for crabs in the past few years there was a help from the iron-braided distribution program, each with 150 vats per iron-made fisherman but the durability of the fishing gear did not last long. For the fishermen the help of the program helps them, especially the poor but can not grow and only lasts 1 year. Only interesting, in making *bubu* develop new innovation which originally *bubu* of iron changed with material from bamboo material. In addition to more durable is also lighter, so the tool is more quickly adopted by fishermen. It's just the cost of making for one *bubu* need cost Rp 25.000 / unit in installed condition. This means that for 200 *bubu* required investment of Rp 50.000.000.

This is felt heavy by poor crab fishermen. Especially when the investment is borrowed at the retainer who will consequently be paid by depositing the production. Return on investment is often difficult to pay in the short term, even the debt can last all time. However, in terms of getting capital both fishermen and poor farmers experienced the same thing. In the village to get capital, the only easy alternative is through the *punggawa* (village financiers). This tendency defeats the option of obtaining capital, for example from the Bank. When farmer or fishermen are asked about the two options they suggest reasons for the reason such as the retainer is close to the residence, easy to do because the courtier persists, the rules are not complicated, payment is not bound by time no need collateral (collateral)

3.4 Collective Commitment

Almost all programs which have been conducted by SKPD used a group approach in distributing support. However, the group's approach to each program in its practice is more varied. The fact that, each program is completed by a group that originally proceeded with the rules agreed with SKPD, and it is not sustainable as expected, except in the group formed on the initiative of the community itself. Based on the observation in that region, the communities' responses, especially the poor household communities for each empowerment program in stimulating change, are relatively not disappointing, especially among the younger people, however the efforts made in collective self-development in fact are still very low. Function of groups as a place where societies gather and as a place to experience-based learning is finally only as a tool to get aid. After the aid is received, each individual is dissolved with his/her activity, while waiting the assistance proposal or appeal for next year. The weakness of collective commitment to any empowerment program can be due to several factors, such as:

- a) Some programs were conducted hastily without further reviewing to the targeted group bases in those programs. Group formation was often carried out where SKPD simply accepted the proposal of society or the district or village. The group that became the direct program implementer was accommodated without considering the proximity of the working area of the farmers or fishermen to be nurtured. There were group formations conducted by recruiting based on residence area, while the working area was still separated apart.
- b) Learning from the experience of more functional guided groups and now they are still sustainable early establishment based on natural mechanisms, such as mutual support or resources pool (i.e., known in Indonesian term as *arisan*) mechanism, for example, in those groups, there are elements of mutual support that formed among them by giving priority to togetherness and trying to avoid the mutual domination that caused conflict between them. Those groups still exist and are developed, but they are only given less opportunities for coaching.
- c) There was a group that initially started at the initiative of richer farmers and subsequently recruited poorer households. Recruitment was not a working partner to jointly achieve common goals but those poorer households were employed. The relationship system between one and another was not equivalent so that the tool aids for example in the program was ultimately dominated by richer individuals. Group conditions were formed like this in each program which tends to be *Toukenism* as termed by [1] where each member is recruited only as wage laborer. Therefore, the degree of member participation of those groups did not improve.

- d) Generally, collective commitment was not well established because in the beginning, the groups were formed without a strong interest and concern among its members to accomplish the goals jointly. Besides, the knowledge of society about how to manage the group was still very poor.

The problem solving jointly and group decision making in the groups were not appeared because the groups which got program assistance were generally no longer shown in the activity after each individual received the first and second year assistance funds. This commitment was not developed, due to the low sensitivity of members to the benefits and usefulness of the groups in the long term and less growing attitudes toward others, the low attitude of sharing and not growing trust to other members. Based on the interview results and all previous descriptions, there were two patterns of group formation occurred at both sites observed which are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. General Characteristics of Sample Groups on Two Patterns of Poor Household Groups, in Both Locations (Jenepono and Pangkep Regency) in 2016

No	Patterns of Group Formation	General Characteristics	Sample Groups
1	Form groups are formed by natural mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Groups are formed because of the urgency of common needs. Managing resources jointly for mutual consciousness. There is a natural mechanism as a group rule. They are managed democratically and participatory. Member interaction is relative routine. There is <i>aroroseng</i> principle. There is a shared desire to progress jointly. Relations with outsider parties are less. The ability to access resources from outside is still poor. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer Group (KUBE) “Jaya Bersama” Tombololoe, Kapita Village The <i>Arisang</i> group of workers around the forestry area.
2	Form groups are based on external parties’ initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It has long been known by external parties (SKPD) or NGOs It is relatively able to get additional resources from external areas. It is managed by applying <i>tokenism</i> (poor households are generally as a complement or labor). It only utilizes groups to get assistance. After getting assistance, the group members tend to leave groups and the resources are managed individually. The results of group effort are not long-term. Generally, the groups disperse after program or project finish. It tends to be dominated by individuals. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Farmer groups who receive tractor aid, Beneficiary group of water pump Group of furniture makers KUBE group of goat breeding

Table 2 describes that initiatives on the initial formation of each group illustrate different characteristics of the group's sustainability and performance in terms of its institutional. The naturally patterned groups have a more solid group performance and practice shared values, share values and members' solidarity based on individual honesty, whereas in the pattern of group formation on external initiatives applies on the contrary.

These characteristics show that the farmer communities still maintain the local wisdom which is as the guides for social life among them. Based on the interview results with some members of farmer group “Jaya Bersama”, they stated that the growing collective awareness among them is influenced by a long-lived principle in society, namely *a bulosibattangacerasitongka-tongka* (working together like a bamboo, and feeling the same fate). In addition, there is also the work principle of mutual support, which is known as *arroseng* (makassar), *Asedisedi* (buginess). This principle is better known as mutual cooperation *orgotongroyong* [12]

In the long run, there should be a development (empowerment) effort that focuses on the dynamics of the community itself. [5] describes that the success of an empowerment program is a resultant interaction of development elements with the empowerment strategy applied. Efforts and empowerment strategies are contingencies between the evolution paradigm and the complementary paradigm of revolution in proportion to the farmers’ conditions and institutions. In addition, the important thing is that in a success program also dominantly determined by the relationship between the funder in this case the government (SKPD) with poor households as the recipient. As [1] [13] points out however, at the project level, the relationship between donor and recipient is fundamental to the success of any intervention.

4. Conclusion

Based on all results descriptions, it can be concluded that:

1. Stimulation of changes made through development programs or community empowerment in the areas studied both among farm households and poor fishermen households for some programs received positive response from farmers and fishermen. However, the collective commitment to the breeding is relatively weak, since the group formed in each program is not done through good planning and concepts.
2. There are two patterns of group formation that are natural and formed formations initiated by outsiders. Groups that are naturally formed are more institutionalized and have characteristics such as intense and relatively routine interaction, strong mutual trust, and have a common form or mechanism shared for common purposes. The group can form the basis for sustainable development in improving the welfare of the poor.

5. References

- [1] Ohama, Y. (2001). The Participatory Local Social Development (PLSD) Concept and Frame Work. Nagoya: Nihon Fukushi University-The Government of Japan.
- [2] Karsidi, R. (2002). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Petani Dan Nelayan Kecil. Research Paper presented at Semiloka Pemberdayaan Masyarakat. Semarang: Badan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Jawa Tengah. (Online) retrieved from: eprints.uns.ac.id.
- [3] Murjanayasa, I.G.W. (2008) Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Berbasis Masyarakat, Jurnal Ekonomid dan Sosial 1(2) :86-91.
- [4] Syafiuddin, &Mahsyar, A. (2016). Condition and Characteristics of Poor Farmer Households in the Perspective of Participatory Local Social Development in Jenepono Regency, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. European Journal of Social Science. 51(1) : 133-140.
- [5] Suradisatra, K. (2016). Strategi Pemberdayaan Kelembagaan Petani. In Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi 26(2) : 82-91.
- [6] Prasetyo, P. E., & Maisaroh, S. (2014). Model Strategi Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Rakyat Sebagai Upaya Pengentasan Kemiskinan. Trikonomika Journal, 8(2) : 103-116.
- [7] Sharma, P.N, & Ohama, Y. (2007). Participatory Local Development, an Emerging Discipline. Delhi: Bharat Book Centre.

- [8] Rusastra, I. W., & Napitupulu, T. A. (2007). *Karakteristik Nelayan dan Keluarga Miskin di Pedesaan*. Bogor: Pusat Analisis Sosial Ekonomi dan Kebijakan.
- [9] Jeneponto regency Statistic. 2015. <https://jenepontokab.bps.go.id/>. Accessed 20th September 2017
- [10] Pangkep Regency Statistic. 2015. <https://pangkep kab.bps.go.id/>. Accessed 20th September 2017
- [11] Uphoff, N. T. (1992). *Local institutions and participation for sustainable development*. London: Sustainable Agriculture Programme of the International Institute for Environment and Development.
- [12] Mubyarto. (1989). *Pengantar Ekonomi Pertanian*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- [13] Jacobs, C. (1998). Institutional Strengthening And Technical Co-Operation: Developing A Best Practice Model. *Journal of International Development*, 10(3), 397-406.