Our panel invites papers that explore questions and concerns above. We also welcome papers presenting results of studies utilizing conceptual, theoretical, and/or methodological innovations borrowed from both Political Science and Anthropology.

**PATRON-CLIENT RELATIONSHIP: BETWEEN ANTHROPOLOGY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE**

Heddy Shri Ahimsa-Putra  
Department of Anthropology, Universitas Gadjah Mada

Since the publication of Foster’s ethnography on patron-client relationships among the Tzintzuntzan in Mexico (1963), many anthropologists had followed his step to study, describe and analyze patron-client relationships within the societies they studied. Various terms have been used for those relationships, such as: clientship, clientelism, clientage and patronage. Studies of this phenomenon flourished further as some political scientists used patron-client model to explain political dynamics in non-western countries, as they found that the model they have used in studying political phenomena in western countries could not cope with the socio-political realities and problems in many non-western settings (Scott, 1972).

Fourteen years after Foster’s patronage ethnography, *Friends, Followers and Factions: A Reader in Political Clientelism* was published. A collection of articles on patron-client relationships in anthropology, sociology and political science -mostly from 1960-1970s-, the book is a landmark in patron-client studies. A lot has happened in patron-client studies since then, as anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists continue their research on that topic. The question then is: What perspectives (paradigms) have been used by social scientists in studying patron-client relationships? What kinds of insights have been gained? What kinds of problems have been solved? What kinds of theories have been produced?

In this paper the author attempts to answer those questions. The paper will elucidate further how ideas, views, theories on patron-client relations were developed further by anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists in their studies.

**STRADDLING BETWEEN DIFFERENT WORLDS: NAVIGATING DIVERSE FIELDWORK MODES**

Iqra Anugrah  
New Mandala

Social science fieldwork is often seen as a challenging and often-misunderstood intellectual enterprise. Long seen as the domain of the few, fieldwork – more specifically, its major component, immersion – has made a comeback in social science despite the enduring drive toward quantification in the discipline (Morgenbesser and Weiss, 2018; Schatz, 2009). But misperceptions regarding fieldwork, such as its perceived machismo and inability to offer generalizations, still persist among social science researchers and readers while in reality fieldwork entails different types of work and modes of engagement with local interlocutors and social realities.

This paper therefore aims to debunks the myths surrounding fieldwork and contextualizes it. Focusing on my own fieldwork experience in Indonesia since 2015 as an early-career, anthropologically-inclined political scientist, I will discuss my experience conducting fieldwork for three different types of research: policy, dissertation, and advocacy research. In particular, I will