

**Social Capital, Does It Matter? Case Studies in Three Kenyan Villages**

A senior thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Arts at Pomona College

Program in International Relations

Professor Pierre Englebert, Department of Politics

Professor Richard Worthington, Department of Politics

Chloe Schaefer

April 27, 2010

## CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Research Proposal, Literature Review, and Theory and Methodology	
I. Research Proposal.....	1
II. Literature Review.....	8
III. Theory and Methodology.....	19
IV. Chapter Outlines .....	23
Chapter 2: Village Overviews and Primary Phase Reports	
I. Villages Overviews: Mulunguni.....	25
Mdomo.....	27
Chanzou.....	27
II. Phases Overview.....	28
III. Primary Phase Report: Mulunguni.....	35
IV. Primary Phase Report: Mdomo.....	39
V. Primary Phase Report: Chanzou.....	41
Chapter 3: Later Phase Reports	
I. Later Phase Report: Mulunguni.....	45
II. Later Phase Report: Mdomo.....	49
III. Later Phase Report: Chanzou.....	53
Chapter 4: Phase Analysis and Conclusion	
I. Analysis.....	56
II. Explaining the Improvement.....	61
III. Explaining Factors.....	70
IV. Conclusion.....	78
References.....	85

## TABLES

Table 2.1 Overview of the phases.....30

Table 4.1 Improvement experienced by Mulunguni.....59

Table 4.2 Improvement experienced by Mdomo.....60

Table 4.3 Improvement experienced by Chanzou.....60

## **CHAPTER 1: Research Proposal, Literature Review, and Theory and Methodology**

### **I. Research Proposal**

From 1950 to 2005, over \$100 billion has been spent on foreign aid to help countries develop (Easterly, 2008, 3). The amount of progress made, however, seems negligible given the fact that today “over three billion people live on less than \$2.50 a day” (Shah, 2009, fig. 1). “Despite the steady flow of development aid to poor countries in the last 50 years, the results have been somewhat disappointing...many of the poorest countries have actually seen their real per capita incomes decline since the 1970s” (Ovaska, 2003, 175). This does not mean that foreign aid is useless and in fact there are existing organizations making a difference, but rather it begs the question, what can be done differently to enhance foreign aid effectiveness? There are several variables which might explain foreign aid effectiveness. Deborah Brautigam and Stephen Knack argue that good governance and political systems makes aid more effective (2004). Paul Mosley shows that aid effectiveness may be dependent on the conditionality of the aid (1996). Another idea is that social capital enhances foreign aid effectiveness. One small, non-governmental organization based out of Salt Lake City, Utah named CHOICE Humanitarian works towards third world development with this idea in mind. CHOICE deems social capital vital for economic development and assisting people in their efforts to escape poverty. This is not a new concept, but is one which could be very important in helping make aid more efficient and deserves further study. This thesis aims to examine key components and the impact of social capital using villages CHOICE works in as case studies. Thus my question is how does the presence of social capital affect foreign aid? Literature says that certain social capital helps economic development, and thus it should enhance the effects of CHOICE’s foreign aid as well. This is what I shall investigate through case studies of three villages in Kenya where CHOICE

## 2 Does Social Capital Matter?

works.

CHOICE Humanitarian was founded in 1982 by Dr. Tim Evans (a dentist) and Dr. James Mayfield (a professor). It started out as the Andean Children's Foundation working in the Altiplano in Peru where Dr. Evans was a missionary, and was inspired to do humanitarian work, but quickly evolved into an international organization which aims to "connect motivated villagers to resources and tools to change their lives" and does so "by building skills, capacities, and leadership of the villagers" (CHOICE Humanitarian. 2005). Despite its religious founders, CHOICE Humanitarian is not a religious organization and does not work to further any church or religion. The goal of CHOICE in helping a village is to enable the village to get the resources it needs to elevate its quality of life and bring greater development to their village. As stated before, it believes that the key to getting more resources for development is creating greater leadership, which will prove to be important throughout this study. It came to this realization not through research, however, but through its own work in the field. The organization works simply under the motivation of individuals feeling responsible for making a difference and helping others in need, not for any larger organization or government.

While CHOICE works in five countries throughout the world (Nepal, Guatemala, Bolivia, Mexico, and Kenya) I will focus on 3 specific villages in Kenya because I can examine villages here that are within close proximity to one another, with similar physical resources, yet with varying rates of success in development. They are Mulunguni, Mdomo, and Chanzou with Mulunguni experiencing rapid success in development, Mdomo experiencing slower results, and Chanzou showing the least improvement of the three. All three have made progress in development while working with CHOICE however, the rates of improvement vary significantly. These villages will be examined to see the changes made over the time CHOICE works with

them and the social capital present in them. By examining the social capital in each village and cross-referencing it with the improvement made over time, I should see whether social capital actually has a positive effect on foreign aid or not. This is important because it may prove whether or not social capital is valuable for economic development and enhances the physical or human capital invested, as Putnam believes, so those working to end poverty can better understand if focusing on building social capital is important (1993, 36). The focus of this study is whether the presence of social capital speeds up development, and in order to do this it is important to look at the smaller components and manifestations of social capital within a community.

By integrating literature on the subject of social capital and how its presence can impact village development and growth, an empirical theory will be developed. This will rely on both quantitative and qualitative data of the work CHOICE does and has done. Numbers cataloging progress in the villages will be analyzed along with qualitative data consisting of observations and stories from the field.

CHOICE does not simply hand out money or assistance to any village in need. Instead, the villages must show commitment toward improving their standard of living and economic situation and must be self-motivated and approach CHOICE for help in achieving their goals for specific projects and overall capacity building. Thus the village is seeking the help of CHOICE rather than CHOICE imposing its assistance and ideas upon a village. This theoretically creates a rather horizontal relationship as the village works to get CHOICE's help while CHOICE works to help the village. These are the main donor characteristics of CHOICE.

The donors, however, represent only one side of the foreign aid development topic. On the other side, equally important – if not more so – are the characteristics of the recipients. This

#### 4 Does Social Capital Matter?

is where the examination of the social capital in the villages plays its role. The three villages will be looked at to determine how differences in their social capital levels correlate with differences in their success rates and why. Factors that show why social capital exists will include interaction with CHOICE and other NGOs (either previously or currently), ethnic makeup and family. The display and presence of social capital will be seen in public goods provisions within each village and the interactions which take place within the community. The weight these factors have on the strength of social capital and its subsequent effect on aid will be explored and determined by seeing how differences in these factors effect development. In the end, I will seek to demonstrate what the role of social capital is in the development process and its value in enhancing – or diminishing – the effects of foreign aid.

First I will see what other interactions the village has had with aid, reflecting the donor and recipient sides. This may prove to be important because it may influence how the village responds to aid from CHOICE. Of special interest is the manner in which the other aid has been given. For example, “AID and other donors have encouraged Third World governments to rely on handouts instead of on themselves,” but CHOICE tries to get the villagers to rely on themselves, not handouts (Bovard, 1986). If the village has received a fair amount of “handout” aid, in which case a village receives supplies or other capital from an NGO without actually working for it or contributing to it themselves, I believe it will be less successful in working with CHOICE’s partnership methods. This is because CHOICE requires that the villagers do a lot of the work themselves. CHOICE provides oversight, management and some financing, but the villagers must do most of the work to get what they want on their own. If the village has not experienced this as much or has had help from other NGOs but in a manner more similar to that of CHOICE, then I believe it will likely be more successful and the changes more sustainable.

Another aspect of this is whether the village has reached out on its own to other NGOs or the government. While they may still be in need of help, it shows they are able to mobilize their community and work together to get what they need from various sources. The main goal of CHOICE is to get the village to be independent of CHOICE. Thus if the village is able to get funding on its own now, for certain projects from other sources, this will be of importance in demonstrating the existing level of beneficial social capital. Without networks and associations – social capital, in essence – to come together and organize to ask agencies such as the government for what they need it would be difficult to get necessary resources. This is just one aspect of the village, however.

The majority of the paper will look at the recipient side in terms of social capital and elements which influence it as well as those which are manifestations of it. First will be to consider how social capital in general is important in harnessing aid and producing growth and helping a village to work itself out of poverty. As will be seen in the literature review, the belief is that more social capital should enhance the investment of aid. Thus, examining how much social capital there was to begin with in each village, and cross-referencing it with a village's rate of improvement, will be vital in showing the significance of social capital in the realm of development. CHOICE believes that economic development tends to follow social capital development (akin to the ideas of Robert Putnam). Putnam defines social capital as “features of social organization, such as trust, norms, and networks, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions” (1993, 167). This study should show whether there is an apparent correlation between social capital and economic development in each village. I plan to measure social capital through the amount of coalitions and organizations present in the village as well as how much they invest in their community, through public goods provisions, and the

## 6 Does Social Capital Matter?

existence of social structures within the community. These parameters will be used to gauge the degree to which social capital is present within a village. First, however, I will look for factors which affect social capital and may explain the strength of its presence.

The first factor will be the demographic makeup of the village. This includes the size of the village but the intensive focus will be on the ethnic groups within the village. In other words, whether or not the village is very homogeneous or composed of many different ethnic groups. If there are many different ethnic groups it will be important to look to see whether or not they get along. The idea of how much ethnic composition affects the social capital and hence development will be further addressed in the literature review.

The second factor is the idea of family structure. If it is very hierarchical or vertical, it will most likely not be as conducive to enhancing aid as it will not create bridging capital and will not foster as much cooperation as a horizontal social structure (Flora et al, 2004). Also, if families are larger and spend more time together, they will likely generate more social capital within the family unit, as well as creating external social capital in the community (Portes, 1998). Next I will look at the articulation of social capital within a village as measured by public goods provision in the community, notably education. Public goods are shared assets such as schools and tend to represent the strength of the community-oriented values of a village, town, or city. For the purposes of this study I will look at how many public goods the village began with and how that correlates with their success rate now. Typically public goods represent a greater willingness to work together and hence should also represent a greater amount of social capital in a village. Most likely, those villages with greater public goods, or even the simple desire for more public goods, will respond more effectively to CHOICE's aid as they will already be more community-oriented identifying with the welfare of the entire village, not just themselves. This

will lead to greater teamwork which should speed up the growth and development process. A second important representation of social capital is the community structure and how many inter-familial links there are within the community. Thus the community organizations and interactions which take place within the community for each village will be examined.

While CHOICE measures its own personal success in terms of improvement in leadership capacity, this study will take a broader approach, to discover how social capital affects improvement in other realms of development and the correlation between successful development and social capital levels. The projects CHOICE helps villages complete are primarily catalysts to get the villagers out of the cycle of poverty and to build leadership so they may develop independently and sustainably. While providing some monetary assistance for basic needs CHOICE is more importantly building capacity for the people to help themselves. Thus, a graduated village in CHOICE's eyes may actually still be in Phase I or II (underdeveloped) in many material areas, but is considered to be in Phase III or even IV (developed) in leadership and human capacity. I will look at how much social capital there is and how quickly it improves and how this relates to the other indicators – education, healthcare, living environment, and access to market. Key to this will be to look at how strong the improvement and correlation is between the social capacity aspect and the other, more tangible factors. I will not be as concerned with absolute values for each village in each indicator but rather their rate of improvement. This will then be compared to the presence and strength of social capital in each village.

As these key data are observed and evaluated, along with interviews, comparisons will be made across the villages. Quantitative numbers as well as qualitative data will be examined side by side to see if social capital influences the effectiveness of CHOICE's aid in one village

## 8 Does Social Capital Matter?

compared to the others. This information should inform other NGOs when they may face more difficult situations so they may be more prepared, as well as being able to recognize a village which with a small amount of help may be catapulted out of the poverty cycle faster, stretching the NGO's dollar further due to the presence of social capital.

In conclusion the determination of the effect of social capital on CHOICE's aid and why it varies across villages can be useful not just for CHOICE but for other organizations, not to mention the villages themselves. It will establish whether social capital is in fact a large player in foreign aid effectiveness. This may then be applied to NGOs across the globe, while honoring the diverse forms that social capital may take with respect to different cultures. The differences among villages will also allow CHOICE to address very specific issues as well as bring these to the attention of other NGOs which may be working in similar villages, regions, or situations. NGOs globally, as well as CHOICE, should be able to learn the value of social capital in the creation of sustainable third-world development and what fosters greater social capital and hence development. It is now important to look at what theories are already established regarding social capital and foreign aid effectiveness to see what should be expected of these villages given their levels of social capital.

## **II. Literature Review**

While there are many contributing factors to foreign aid effectiveness depending both on those giving the aid as well as those receiving it, as stated before, I will examine one factor which plays an important role, that of social capital. Robert Putnam describes social capital as 'features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. Social capital enhances the benefits of investment in physical and human capital'" (Flora et al, 2004, 52). Foreign aid often comes in the form of

physical and human capital – supplies for building schools or labor to build infrastructure, for example – but based on the latter sentence of Putnam’s definition, social capital should thus be able to “enhance” the investment made through foreign aid to help with development. I will examine here how it is argued that social capital accomplishes this as well as two factors that affect social capital, ethnicity and family, and two factors that constitute and represent the level of social capital in a village: public goods and community participation or interaction.

Robert Putnam conducted a study in which he found that differences in economic development between Northern and Southern Italy may be due to their varying levels and types of social capital – in this case meaning social networks and the development of trust among communities which is not implemented nor enforced by law, but is self-perpetuating. Those communities in the North have long-standing self-created social networks that breed trust and have thus flourished much more than those in the South. What Putnam draws from this is that economic development can be a function of social capital. The more social capital that exists in a community, the more robust their economic development should be.

According to Putnam, there are two types of social capital: bonding and bridging. “*Bonding social capital* consists of connections among individuals and groups with similar backgrounds. They may be based principally on class, ethnicity, kinship, gender, or similar social characteristics. Members of a group with high bonding capital know one another in multiple settings or roles. *Bridging social capital* connects diverse groups within the community to each other and to groups outside the community. The ties that make up bridging social capital are usually single purpose or instrumental, whereas bonding ties are affective or emotionally charged. Bridging social capital fosters diversity of ideas and brings together diverse people” (Flora et al, 2004, 61-62).

## 10 Does Social Capital Matter?

Both types of social capital are important however because bridging social capital brings together diverse people or those normally not associating with each other, thus it may reflect greater levels of cooperation among different communities or the organizations within them. Together, though, these two types of social capital may significantly reinforce one another and augment the effects of a simple injection of physical or human capital within a village. The ideal situation is to have a high presence of both types of social capital while a low amount of both types will typically produce a society in which the individual is the dominant figure and there is no real social organization (Flora et al, 2004, 62). Vertical structures emerge where bridging capital is high but bonding social capital is low due to the fact that people will be seeking power, but will be dealing with groups they are not familiar with or people they are not normally associated with. On the contrary, when bonding capital is high but bridging capital is low, there is often fighting or conflict (Flora et al, 2004, 62). This is because there will be groups with strong loyalty, but those groups will not connect with each other and may in fact be adversarial.

From this we can gather that a community which engages in high levels of both bridging and bonding social capital will be more likely to use human and physical capital more effectively and should thus also show increased levels of development when given foreign aid. What is critical here is that there are very strong horizontal networks that are able to operate within a broader realm of networks which may be organized vertically such as town, county, state, and national governments. This applies as well to small developing villages throughout the world. Within the village, economic performance will be aided by strong horizontal networks but it must also be able to function vertically within the local, state, and/or federal government, especially if the government may be able to help them even further. They thus must have high levels of both bridging and bonding social capital.

Steven Knack and Philip Keefer also agree that “trust and civic cooperation [social capital] are associated with stronger economic performance” (1997, 1252). However, on the exact definition of what social capital is, they differ slightly from the ideas of Putnam stating that it is not just “associational activities;” trust and civic cooperation are vital elements as well (Knack and Keefer, 1997, 1252). While they treat this as a very different form of social capital, I see it as merely an elaboration of Putnam’s definition of social capital, or perhaps a more specific definition of what may be called beneficial social capital. While Putnam may define it more simply as “associational activities,” the idea is that these associations and networks, when coupled with trust and cooperation, can enhance economic performance. Daniel Posner also acknowledges the necessity of “trust and norms of reciprocity” as base characteristics of social capital (2004, 242). These traits are very important if social capital is to have a positive affect on economic development because without them, even if social organizations exist, they will not be beneficial. Without trust and the belief that a person’s actions will be reciprocated, an individual has little incentive to do anything for the good of the community. It is “the presence of reciprocal trust [that] allows the community to achieve a beneficial outcome” (Posner, 2004, 242).

Understanding how greater social capital may help economic development is a relatively straight-forward concept. What is difficult in dealing with social capital is the conceptual framework of where it comes from and how it was developed. Once social capital is present, it often becomes cyclical – the more social capital there is, the more cooperation among the community, and more cooperation fosters the creation of more social capital – but how it first becomes present is more difficult to identify (Boix and Posner, 1998, 687). Boix and Posner identify two hypotheses for how social capital develops. The first is that if a community (or

## 12 Does Social Capital Matter?

individual) recognizes that interactions with other individuals or communities will be frequent and will continue forever with no signs of stopping, they are likely to develop a method of cooperation to deal with such constant interactions. The second hypothesis is that it develops out of common interests, not due to forced or imminent interaction (Boix and Posner, 1998, 687). While neither of these hypotheses can explain entirely why there is more social capital in one place than another, they are important factors to consider and may overlap or build upon one another.

There are also several ways to think about social capital. In treating social capital as an aspect of economic development, Woolcock and Narayan identify four different schools of thought: communitarian, networks, institutional, and synergy (2000). Communitarians believe that social capital “is inherently good, that more is better” and fail to recognize that while often times social capital does provide benefits, it can work negatively to exclude some people from receiving certain benefits (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000, 229). The networks view is predicated on the idea that there must be both horizontal and vertical associations and networks in order for social capital to be a positive factor in economic development. This explains both how social capital can be positive and negative. Strong ties may be beneficial or those ties may prove exclusive and cause harm to others (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000).

Next is the institutional view which states that social capital and its “vitality of community networks and civil society is largely the product of the political, legal, and institutional environment” (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000, 234). This view thus shows social capital as something which is created by institutions in contrast to the communitarian and networks view which see social capital as something which affects institutions.

Lastly is the synergy view which combines the views of the institutional and networks views. Thus the government and its citizens have relationships which are reciprocal or “mutually supportive” as well as “embeddedness [which] refers to the nature and extent of the ties connecting citizens and public officials” in which case more is better (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000, 236). The citizens and politicians should be closely working together and not segregated. For the purpose of this thesis, the most relevant viewpoint is the networks because the structure of organizations will be examined to determine whether they are horizontal or vertical, as well as the fact that social capital will be seen as an independent variable in relation to economic development.

This idea of social capital correlating with economic development is seen in Knack and Keefer’s studies where they have found that social capital is stronger in wealthier nations, thus correlating with economic development. These nations which have stronger social capital, also tend to be more ethnically homogeneous and better-educated. This introduces the first aspect of a village which may greatly influence its social capital: ethnicity. The World Bank goes on to identify several sources of social capital including families, communities, firms, civil society, public sector, ethnicity and gender (World Bank, 2009d). For the purpose of this study however, the focus will be on ethnicity, family, public goods and community.

In terms of ethnicity, the more ethnically diverse a region is, the weaker its bridging social capital will tend to be because it will be less likely to cooperate as ethnicity will be an individual’s primary identity and loyalty, resulting in strong bonding capital (Geertz, 1973). In Africa there are so many different ethnic groups it is very likely that two people are not from the same one. Ethnicity is a vital part of many African’s identity. It is seen as the ultimate defining trait, more so than what nation or city a person may be from. Within a village, people may bow

## 14 Does Social Capital Matter?

first to their ethnicity and then to the identity of their village as a whole. This is represented by Peter Ekeh's idea of two publics – the primordial and the civil – and it is the primordial which really matters in people's lives. It takes precedence over the civil public which tends to be amoral. If ethnicity defines identity in a village, it is less likely that they will want to work together to improve the situation of their village if there are multiple ethnic groups – especially if it means making small sacrifices for people of other ethnicities. By having ethnicity as their primary identity, their living community may not be seen as important. Conflict between ethnic groups may thus hinder the building of bridging social capital and hence foreign aid effectiveness, whereas an ethnically homogeneous village will likely be much more successful in developing. With ethnicity as such a strong force, it “can mobilize human and physical resources towards some common goal” and thus can prove to help create social capital and enhance foreign aid (World Bank, 2009a).

The second factor which influences social capital creation is family. Family is important because it can foster the psychologically necessary trust which is vital to the creation and development of social capital as seen by the fact that trust is a key tenet of Putnam's definition (World Bank, 2009c). The way in which the family interacts with outside forces will also influence how the individual connects with others and so is the building block for interactions within a community – having an effect on whether it is inclusive or exclusive (World Bank, 2009c).

Families are important in determining social capital within a community because it facilitates and models the links and relations they will develop with other individuals, which then become a display of social capital. Thus we can surmise that the predisposition of a family to be outwardly reaching and connected to the community affects the level of social capital in a

community. Portes also explores this idea of links between parents and children as being essentially social capital, along with the fact that the structure of the family is important in the development of a child's social capital (1998). The less a parent interacts with the community the less the amount of social capital there is in a community, and hence the smaller the amount of social capital a child is exposed to.

“Social capital tends to be lower for children in single-parent families because they lack the benefit of a second at-home parent and because they tend to change residences more often, leading to fewer ties to other adults” (Portes, 1998, 11). The model for links and relationships in social capital can come from the relationships within the family, which creates social capital for each person, especially children, and the more time the parents are home, the more siblings one has, the stronger their social capital (Adler and Kwon, 2002). Hence the structure of a family greatly influences the presence and strength of social capital in a village. Based on this idea, what the overwhelming family structure is like in each village and how they interact with others correlates with the existence and potency of social capital in their village. I have identified what makes social capital, so I now turn to factors which indicate levels of social capital in a community that will be considered in this study.

In examining the first of two factors which may indicate the amount of social capital in a village, public goods, there is a distinct link between the measure of social capital (in this case by the presence of public goods) and ethnicity which greatly affects the strength and existence of such social capital (here represented as the presence and strength of education). William Easterly and Ross Levine find that ethnic heterogeneity may explain “low schooling, underdeveloped financial systems, distorted foreign exchange markets, and insufficient infrastructure” (1997, 1241). Supporting the idea of ethnic heterogeneity negatively affecting

## 16 Does Social Capital Matter?

education is James Habyarimana and his colleagues' view which examines the connection between ethnicity the idea of public goods in general. They state that "ethnic diversity can sometimes impede the provision of public goods by communities" (Habyarimana et al, 2009, 16). Technically speaking, a public good is non-excludable and non-rival. This means that no one may be prevented from enjoying or reaping the benefits of this good, even if only one person pays for it, and also that the availability of consumption is not limited. Thus, the consumption or use of the good by one person does not prohibit it from being used by another. Public goods often create the problem of "free-riding" in which one person who has not contributed to the creation of the good gains from it. This makes it less appealing for some people to make sacrifices which everyone gains from. "Public goods provision depends...on the ability of a community to work collectively to solve its problems" (Habyarimana et al, 2009, 16).

The ability of the community to work collectively is often a display of its social capital. Social capital levels may be revealed in how much or how well public goods are provided within a community. I will now refer back to the idea of public education as a symbol of a public good and hence of social capital in a village. While education may be privatized, more often it is a public good. By creating a chain through which ethnicity and family affect the strength of social capital, which is shown through public goods provision a facet of which is education, we can see how Easterly and Levine found that ethnic heterogeneity may explain low schooling and how this is related to the social capital within a village. For the purposes of this study, the levels of public goods (notably education) in a village will be seen as a measure of social capital. Public goods are the product of collective action of the community, which brings about the second, more general, factor which measures social capital: community.

The interaction of people within the community represents their level of social capital. The amount of interaction stems from the family, but while the family is a source of social capital, the community is a gauge of the social capital in a given region. The community is really where the level of social capital is on display and is an indicator of how strong it is, as it is here where involvement of different individuals in various organizations and associations can be seen. The more involved a community is, the more social capital it will likely have (hopefully beneficial social capital which bridges various groups) (World Bank, 2009b). Thus looking at how the village interacts as a community, in other words how much they work together and take collective action, will be an indicator of their level of social capital and its subsequent strength. This will in turn affect the economic development a community is trying to achieve because as stated earlier, greater social capital tends to breed greater economic development (Knack and Keefer, 1997).

As stated before, the community is not so much something which affects social capital, but rather it is a weathervane for the amount of social capital present in a village or town. The interactions of the community are part of the community's social capital and hence a measure of it. James S. Coleman speaks about the importance of cross interactions within a community as part of building trust in a community, which according to him is in and of itself an expression of social capital (1988). He gives the example of parents of children in school. If the parents do not connect and interact with one another, it is an open structure in which there are no norms, trustworthiness, or collective action which may be taken. If however, the parents interact with each other, there is a closed system in which the children are interacting with one another and with their parents, and the parents are interacting with each other as well, closing the circle. "Closure creates trustworthiness in a social structure" (Coleman, 1988, S100). And

trustworthiness is a vital tenet of social capital, as defined by Robert Putnam. This is also important to the idea of norms in Putnam's definition of social capital. As stated by Portes, "closure means the existence of sufficient ties between a certain number of people to guarantee the observance of norms" (1998, 6). He also says that social capital is not in someone's bank account (economic capital) or within the skills or knowledge possessed by someone (human capital) but in the relationships one has with others and their structures (Portes, 1998, 7). This supports the idea of a closed community having more links and relationships between people. Subsequently, the more links and connections there are within a community, the more social capital will exist. How a community interacts is hence an indicator or measure of social capital as "social capital in its first form [is] community social bonds" (Portes, 1998, 12).

Thus two characteristics of villages or towns which indicate the level of social capital in a given locale are defined and will be looked at: public goods and the community. Two main factors which influence the proliferation of social capital in a village will also be examined: ethnicity and the family. While all four of these aspects of social capital are interconnected, I draw stronger connections between ethnicity and public goods, and the family and the community. The literature suggests that ethnicity strongly influences the display of social capital in the form of public goods and their provision, while family is the building block for the show of social capital at the community level. These factors of social capital and the broader concept of social capital itself will be thoroughly examined in each village to see the effects they have on economic development, if there are stronger ties between ethnicity and public goods and the family and community, and if indeed social capital enhances development, as seen in the literature.

### **III. Theory and Methodology**

In order to see whether or not social capital has an impact on aid and development in a village, I will take these ideas presented by the literature and apply each of these to the three selected villages. For example, I will look at the demographic makeup of the village. Does it have several ethnic groups living together or is it rather homogeneous? Based on this and the readings, which state that more ethnically homogeneous groups will develop faster (due to less conflict and more willingness to share), I can assess from that point of view why social capital may have a strong presence or not. This will then be done with the various factors affecting and indicative of social capital identified in the literature review. I will essentially take inventory of what the village was like at an early date in terms of working with CHOICE and compare that with how it has changed over a given period of time, then explore how this change relates to a village's social capital.

In order to understand what is happening in these villages while CHOICE is there, it is important to know the CHOICE method, which consists of five-steps. The first step includes the identification of leadership and a commitment to change in a village, but this is not a requirement of the village before involvement. During this phase, the assets of the village are also reviewed. Next is the team-building phase. Participatory rural appraisals (PRAs) are completed to get an idea of what needs to be done in the village and get the community mobilized. At this point the roles and responsibilities of both CHOICE and the village are clearly delineated. This teamwork approach helps build sustainability and independence. The village then organizes and a long-term strategy is developed. Following this an action plan is created – the third step. This action plan is where the villagers determine the project they want to work on with CHOICE's assistance. They must reach consensus on what the project will be in order to continue on to the

## 20 Does Social Capital Matter?

next step. Note it is the villagers that come up with project, not CHOICE. The fact that the villagers will have to plan the project and figure out how to build it and what supplies are needed will hone skills that will assure a greater chance of sustainability. This methodology avoids the trap of a complex water system that might meet Western needs, but which the villagers cannot fix or maintain and thus becomes useless in a short period of time and irrelevant to their development. By having the villagers plan the project, they will more likely be able to maintain it, providing long-term improvement. This also forces them to network outside of CHOICE to obtain some of the resources as well as assigning responsibilities throughout the village, demanding participation. These steps and the speed with which they are executed will likely reflect the level of social capital in the village since they require significant organization and cooperation on behalf of the village.

The next step is the actual execution of the planned project. The leaders launch the project and, as previously agreed upon, CHOICE mentors the project management process and provides oversight. They help the villagers learn to manage work teams, coordinate the acquisition of resources, and continue to work on the sustainability of the project. This includes teaching the villagers how to maintain their project, fix it, or other technical information they may need to know over time. The last step in the CHOICE cycle is called the learning phase. Once the project is completed the outcomes are evaluated, as is the overall increase in standard of living and human capacity of the village. Sustainability is assessed and preparation for the village's next priority or project begins.

The CHOICE model is cyclical. Once a village completes a project, it is expected that it will take on another, becoming more independent and self-sustaining with each project. CHOICE considers a village a success when CHOICE's assistance is no longer needed and the

village can develop and fund projects on their own. Funding may come from the newly acquired ability of the village to reach out to other organizations or from money made due to the projects CHOICE implemented, for example from a micro-credit program which enabled the capitalization of a small village business. They call this a graduated village. In the case of these villages, none are graduated. What will be most important is to examine the improvement each village has experienced and in what time frame, how these correlate to their varying levels of social capital, and furthermore explaining why these differences exist.

Working with the CHOICE employees in the United States as well as the In-Country-Director, I will be able to obtain first hand accounts of progress as well as difficulties in the field along with descriptions of what the village is like in terms of community organizations and associations, family structure, and public goods provisions, all of which are vital to the assessment of social capital. There will be anecdotal information in the form of stories and interviews from staff members in the field in addition to real quantifiable data collected on the villages and the projects attempted. I will see what their rate of improvement has been and what it has looked like (where the village has improved). This will be vital in determining how important social capital is in aid effectiveness as well as what really affects social capital. CHOICE also implements their own measurement system of phases to evaluate and depict the situation of a certain village which will be the basis for the data for this study. As CHOICE works with a village, they expect it to climb up this phase ladder.

The phases pertain to five different dimensions of the village. These include human capacity and leadership, access to education, access to healthcare, living environment and the ecosystem, and lastly access to market. A Phase I in any of these areas is low and undeveloped. For example, health care is over two hours away and education may be virtually non-existent.

## 22 Does Social Capital Matter?

The highest phase is Phase V. Once a village has attained Phase V status in these areas it is no longer a village in need but a town where the inhabitants are bettering their own lives independently. There is a modern hospital close by and secondary schooling is standard, with many children going on to college. The majority of CHOICE villages lie within the Phase I-II range in all aspects at the beginning of their contact with CHOICE and progress and improve as they work with them. Thus, I will be able to observe the difference in phase changes in many different areas such as enterprise or farming or literacy for the villages throughout the time of the phase reports. This will expose development trends in the villages.

The phases are measured by the CHOICE field team in conjunction with the villagers and the village leaders. To be in a certain phase there are quantitative as well as qualitative benchmarks. For example, in education, to be in a phase II, 80% of children in the village must complete primary education. The qualifications for each phase will be further discussed in Chapter 2 with the actual phase reports.

I will have data on the phases of each village over various time intervals. The time intervals vary simply due to the resources available and thus when the CHOICE staff was able to make phase reports for each village. The initial phase report for each village is relatively early in the village's relationship with CHOICE. The later phase report varies however from five months later in Mulunguni to fourteen months later in Chanzou. These reports will be valuable information which will quantitatively show their progress as well as making it easy to see what areas were the least developed to begin with and what were the most, and this will facilitate tracking improvement. This will be cross-referenced with the level of social capital and enable conclusions to be drawn on affected rates of improvement.

By choosing three villages in Kenya, I will be controlling for factors such as colonial

history, national government, and possible language barriers. Additionally, they will all be under the same CHOICE team so the ICD will not be different and hence doing things very differently with each village, although their tasks do vary depending upon what each village needs most. I will investigate whether Mulunguni's relatively rapid improvement correlates with a higher level of social capital present in the village as compared with the other two villages, especially Chanzou (the slowest to improve). The value and importance of social capital will be seen in real life development situations in these villages and will test the theories laid out in the literature review, and perhaps form the basis for introducing other factors which may need to be examined.

#### **IV. Chapter Outlines**

The following chapters will provide in-depth looks and evaluations of each of the three villages. A quantitative and qualitative summary of the changes which took place will be made using the phases as outlined by CHOICE and will then be viewed in respect to the factors outlined in the research proposal and literature review. Then their successes will be cross-referenced and compared to their levels of social capital which may explain the disparity in their rates of success. In conclusion, I will compare the findings within these three villages to what is being said in current literature – in other words whether or not the villages acted as expected based on their social capital. This will either reinforce or question the theory that greater social capital will enhance aid effectiveness. I expect to find that these villages support the theory of greater social capital and expect to find greater ties between ethnicity and public goods, and family and community. It is notable that what also becomes apparently important is the value of leadership in development, something which I did not foresee happening, but which I discovered throughout the study.

## Chapter 2: Villages Overview and Primary Phase Reports

- I. Villages Overview
  - a. Basic description of Mulunguni, Mdomo, and Chanzou
- II. Phases Overview
- III. Primary Phase Report for Mulunguni
- IV. Primary Phase Report for Mdomo
- V. Primary Phase Report for Chanzou

## Chapter 3: Later Phase Reports

- I. Later Phase Report for Mulunguni
- II. Later Phase Report for Mdomo
- III. Later Phase Report for Chanzou

## Chapter 4: Analysis and Conclusion

- I. Analysis of phase reports
- II. Explaining the improvement in the villages
- III. Examining factors which may explain variation
- IV. Conclusion
  - a. Does social capital impact foreign aid effectiveness?
  - b. What constitutes a hospitable environment with good social capital?

## **CHAPTER 2: Village Overviews and Primary Phase Reports**

### **I. Village Overviews**

#### **Mulunguni**

Mulunguni is a village of approximately 4,500 people, located in the Southeastern part of Kenya in Kinango Province, divided into eight smaller sub-villages. It first came into contact with CHOICE on February 13, 2008 and a little over a month later, began actually working with CHOICE. In terms of ethnicity, almost all of the village is of the Duruma tribe. There are a few intermarriages and influences from other tribes in the area, but overall it is a very homogeneous village ethnically speaking. Due to this, everyone within the village speaks Kiduruma and so can communicate with one another. In order to communicate with the world outside of the village, however, Swahili is necessary and this is only learned in school. This creates a great divide between men and women as men tend to receive much more education than women, and yet it is the women raising the children, and they are not as educated, so children must rely on school to further their education (E. Franson, personal communication, January 15, 2010).

Religion is not as homogeneous. The village is split with about thirty percent of the population being Muslim and the other seventy percent being Christian. This does not tend to create much tension, but rather they peacefully coexist with one another and will come together to work on projects to help develop the village. However, this does make working on a project a little difficult as it is harder to determine whether or not to work on Sunday and/or Saturday and around various holy holidays. Also, while they will work on the same project together, there is definitely some division within the working groups between Christian and Muslim women. Not in a malicious way, but due to the fact that their friends and the people they know will tend to be of their same religion, as is typical of bonding social capital.

The family structure in the village depends on the religion of the family. Christian families will tend to be comprised of one husband, one wife, and several kids. Families live in family compounds in which the grandparents, aunts, and uncles also live thus there is a very large extended family living together. If the family is Muslim, there will be one husband and up to four wives and several children with each wife. If the first wife picks the other wives, as is traditional, they will typically live near each other, however if the husband picks them they may be spread out in various villages. The wives thus live with extended family while the husband moves between wives. This does not differ much from the Christian families, however, in the fact that there is extended family living all together.

In these families, however, it is common for the father to be absent frequently either because he is visiting other families and wives (if he is Muslim) or simply because men often go to work in cities leaving families in the villages for extended periods of time. This means that “mothers are the constant in the home” and so primarily raise the children although extended family helps out at times too (E. Franson, personal communication, January 15, 2010). It is important to note however, that infidelity is widespread among both men and women, but especially for men as it is seen as their “god-given right” to father as many children as they want with multiple women. This also contributes the fact that many families may have more absentee fathers although with the support of the extended family it is not seen so much as problem in the culture, but rather a norm.

Because extended families live together there is a wide social network within families. Families also readily help out and frequently interact with one another. They form a very tight community and any one person’s problem is the community’s problem. Everyone knows each

other and so knows everyone's problems as well and is generally willing to help out when necessary. There is a much stronger sense of community than is typically seen in America.

### **Mdomo**

Mdomo is located in the Samburu municipality in Southeastern Kenya. It has approximately 3,800 people in it, split into six sub-villages, and first started working with CHOICE in January of 2006. Mdomo is a relatively new village which developed around a primary school and very small scale shopping center that were built as a road linking Samburu to Kinango was being constructed. It thus lies close to a main thoroughfare with access to two of the larger cities or towns of the area. This village is also of the Duruma tribe which settled in the area, primarily as small-scale farmers. Due to this, everyone speaks Kiduruma and ethnically it is a homogeneous village. It is also similar to Mulunguni in its religious make up of seventy percent Christians and thirty percent Muslims coexisting side by side.

Because of the two predominant religions in the area, the family structure is similar to that of Mulunguni in which there are large families with several children, living in family compounds. Husbands have either one wife if they are Christian or several if they are Muslim. Extended family, as stated before, lives close by and helps in raising children as well as in other tasks around the family compound. As in the other villages, fathers may be absent either off visiting other families or working in cities for extended periods of time frequently, leaving mostly mothers to raise the children along with some help from aunts, uncles, and grandparents.

### **Chanzou**

The village of Chanzou is located in Samburu province, 14 kilometers from the town of Samburu which lies between Mombasa and Nairobi. It is actually split into two villages, Chanzou 1 and Chanzou 2, consisting of approximately 4,200 people total. There are two

dominant tribes in Chanzou: the Duruma and the Giriama. The Duruma comprise about 75% of the village and the Giriama the other 25%. The two villages each have a village elder. The people mostly speak Kiduruma with many men (and a few women) speaking Swahili as well. In terms of religion and family structure, Chanzou is like Mulunguni and Mdomo – 30% Muslim, 70% Christian with similar family structures in which extended families live together and support each other.

## **II. Phases Overview**

Now that the basic makeup of the villages is understood, the phases, which are a quantitative measurement system developed by CHOICE, will be used to give an idea of what conditions are like in the village. There is an initial phase report and over time the villages are reevaluated with the phases system to show what improvement they have made and in what areas. The broad categories for the phase reports are leadership, access to education, access to healthcare, living environment, and access to market. Within each of these categories are several more specific subcategories. For example, within leadership there is family participation and village organization; under access to education there is primary school and attitude about education; under living conditions there is kitchen sanitation and agricultural practices. These are just a couple examples from each category.

Within each category, the village receives a score or number. The numbers range from 0 to 5, signifying 5 phases of development with development meaning an increase in “GDP per capita or average material wellbeing of a country’s [or village’s] population” until it reaches levels similar to those of industrialized countries (World Bank Group, 2004). It is important to note that while CHOICE is concerned with a village’s material and economic development in a somewhat traditional sense in the end, what it focuses many of its efforts on is developing social

and human capital because they believe that this is the key to economic development. This is not an idea unique to CHOICE, but something which they developed from their interaction with the villages. Development in the realm of leadership and human capacity is thus most important to the organization in order to improve the other material aspects of the village and the villagers' standard of living and will be seen to be valuable as this study progresses. Phase I, shown as scores of 0 – 1.9 is very primitive. There are very little, if any, services in the village and the villagers are living basically, really just trying to survive. Phase II (scores of 2.0 – 2.9) is an advancement in development, showing the village has made some improvements in various areas, but that they are still far from being a modern, economically developed village or town. Phase III (scores of 3.0-3.9) signifies yet another step up or improvement in the villages development and quality of life. Phases IV and V (scores of 4.0 – 5.0) represent a state where the village has reached self development. Categories which have achieved a score of 4.0 or higher are no longer seen as in need of help from outside sources, but rather that the villagers can handle their issues themselves and are quite developed. A phase V score represents a modern lifestyle or quality of a certain aspect in which there is little more development needed (or possible). After phase III, CHOICE's help is no longer seen as necessary for the villages (but this is of course, once the village has entered phase IV in almost all categories). In order to cross from one phase into another there are usually certain quantitative thresholds which must be reached. For example, to go from a phase I to a phase II in terms of girls' attendance in school, the village must go from having less than or around 20% of girls attending school to at least 50% of girls attending school. I will now speak more specifically of what the phases represent for each indicator (which is also outlined in Table 2.1).

Indicator	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Phase V
Leadership	Families isolated, don't work together; no real leadership	Beginning to cooperate but not regularly; leadership emerging	Village development committee; only a little oversight from CHOICE needed	Village is independent; development committee working with other villages' committees to get outside help	Strong, respected elected officials; leaders strong, control large projects
Education	Inadequate primary school; high levels of illiteracy	Primary school through at least third grade; basic literacy	Primary school through at least sixth grade; secondary school within two hours; high literacy rates	Primary and secondary school in the village; teachers are progressive; education highly valued	All kids attend secondary school; many attend university
Healthcare	No health post or trained village health worker; contaminated water supply; malnutrition and disease common	Health post within two hours; occasional doctor and nurse visits; water somewhat clean but dependent on seasons	Health post in the village; educated village health worker; clean, year-round supply of water	Health post, village health worker, full time nurse in village; hospital within thirty minutes by car; clean and constant water supply	Health clinic in the village (fully equipped and staffed), modern hospital close by; villagers are healthy and well fed
Living Environment	Cooking and living areas open to animals and insects; poor ventilation	Animals kept out of cooking areas; trash is collected and burned; food somewhat is protected from contamination	Better ventilation; community-wide trash program; food stored safely	Clean cooking and living areas; sense of hygiene among individuals and household; food is safe from contamination	Equivalent of living in modern homes with gas, electricity, and indoor plumbing
Access to Market	No real businesses in village; rely on subsistence farming	Farming is still key to survival, but some businesses starting up; some savings programs starting; may be one phone in the village	Farming is no longer just subsistence; micro-credit program in place; savings program in place; communication is easier	Farming becomes specialized and mechanized; other businesses are established; fair access to credit; communication accessible to all	All business and work is specialized; good roads; village is operating within larger economic system; phones in every household; internet in the village

Table 2.1: Basic overview of the five indicators in each phase

As far as leadership goes, a village in phase I does not have a very unified community. Families are rather isolated and not very willing to work toward a common goal. What officials there are in the village have little, if any, power and respect. There is no real strongly developed leadership. At phase II, families are beginning to cooperate, but not regularly, only for special projects and/or occasions. There is leadership emerging but it is still in the process of being developed. In phase III, there is a village development committee in place with effective leaders. There is effective communication among villagers and a good sense of working within a larger economy. The villagers are very independent and very little oversight is needed from CHOICE. In phases IV and V, as stated before, CHOICE's help is no longer seen as necessary. In phase IV, the village's development committee is working in coordination with other villages' development committees to advance their needs and gain support from the government, private businesses, and other NGOs. In phase V, there are elected officials in the village who are strong, solid leaders with a voice in the political realm. These leaders are able to deal with large-scale projects with big organizations such as the World Bank and USAID.

In regard to education, a phase I represents that there may be a primary school in the village but it is inadequate and teachers show up irregularly. Education is not highly valued by the villagers and illiteracy is common. In phase II, there may be primary school up to the third grade available. There is basic literacy in the village and education is slightly more valued. If a village is in phase III, there is primary education through sixth grade in the village with reliable teachers. Within two hours is a secondary education institution. The majority of villagers are literate. In phase IV, there is secondary schooling in the village through tenth grade. Teachers are progressive and there is training in various trades to better the economic situation. Education

## 32 Does Social Capital Matter?

is very highly valued and seen as the key to a better life. Everyone is literate at a relatively high level. In phase V, all kids attend secondary school and several attend college.

Next is the area of access to healthcare. In phase I, there is no health post in the village, with the closest one being over two hours away by walking. There is no trained village health worker and hence no one to treat basic emergencies. The water supply is contaminated and limited, there is malnutrition, and disease is common. If the village is in phase II, it means that there is a health post within two hours by foot. There is someone who has basic knowledge of how to handle emergencies and occasionally there are doctor and nurse visits. The water supply is somewhat clean and not as limited throughout the year by the seasons. There is some knowledge about basic nutritional needs and common diseases are known and understood and there may be some preventative measures taken. In phase III, there is a health post in the village and a village health worker who is working to educate the villagers about nutrition, first aid, and hygiene and is capable of dealing with many emergencies which arise. There is a hospital within two hours of the village by car or foot. The drinking water is clean and the supply is constant year-round. There is good nutrition and most common diseases are dealt with and do not affect most villagers. In phase IV, there is a village health worker, working at the health post in the village which is very organized and clean. There is a full time nurse, adequately equipped with medicine and other supplies. All of the villagers know about basic nutrition and hygiene. There is a hospital within thirty minutes (via car). There is also clean water in constant supply. Diseases are not very prevalent in the village. In phase V, there is a health clinic in the village which is fully equipped and well staffed. There is a modern hospital very close and all of the standard, modern health amenities are available and villagers are healthy and have balanced and varied diets.

In the area of living environment indicators, a phase I once again is very basic and primitive. The animals have access to the cooking and living areas of the house, cooking takes place in poorly ventilated areas on open fire, there is no trash management, food is not safely stored and can be easily contaminated. As a village moves into phase II, animals are kept out of the living and cooking areas, the trash is no longer thrown out at random, but is collected and burned by each family (not on a community level), and food is more protected from contaminants (although not fully). From this, the village ideally moves to phase III. In phase III, the villagers are using gas or equivalent stoves to cook. The area where the food is prepared is clean. There is a community-wide program for dealing with trash and waste and food is stored and protected from contaminants. Once a village enters phase IV and is seen as relatively developed, the living environment consists of a clean cooking and living area and the villagers are using gas stoves. There is a sense of hygiene both for the individuals and the household, there is a trash disposal program established in the community and food does not get contaminated. In phase V, the villagers have reached the equivalent of living in modern homes with amenities such as gas, electricity, and running water.

Lastly is the category of access to market indicators. At phase I in this area, the village has no real businesses, savings programs, or modes of communication with the world outside. The families are relying on subsistence farming. As the villages enter phase II, farming remains a key aspect of the villagers' way of life and survival but there is some budding micro-enterprise. Some savings programs may be getting started and there may be limited access via roads to the village and hence to the world around them. There may be one phone for the entire village. In phase III, farming is no longer simply for subsistence but may start to generate a small profit or allow for trading or bartering with excess yields. They are starting to have business dealings

with surrounding villages, there is a micro-credit program in place which allows for some entrepreneurial activities. There is also a savings program in place and communication is easier with a public telephone. The village may have electricity. In phase IV, the village's farming starts to become mechanized and specialized and workers are hired to tend to the growing agriculture business. Other family businesses have been established and are strong. There is easy and fair access to credit and commerce occurs between the village and those surrounding it as well as with some nearby areas. There are good roads and communication is very accessible and ready to be used. In phase V, all work is specialized (including farming). Villagers either have jobs or own businesses and the village is operating within a larger economic system. The government maintains the roads in and around the village and there are phones in almost every household and internet in the village.

This is a broad overview of what the five phases represent. As the villages are analyzed individually, the more specific details of the scores and subcategories in the phases and what they mean are exposed. It is important to note that in these cases there tends to be a positive progression. Whether or not this is strictly linear is difficult to capture without more phase reports and more field work. Also, whether or not the progression is strictly positive is true at this point for these villages, but may not be (and probably will not be) for all villages, especially in the long run. It is more likely that over a longer period of time backward trends will be revealed once the initial aid and its subsequent enthusiasm has been exhausted, or as various crises emerge. These phase reports, however, are spaced in relatively short time periods. While the linearity of these phase reports may seem unrealistic, it remains a very good way to track the overall changes and development in the villages. With more numerous reports a trend could be seen which may show that development is not linear but that it plateaus or jumps and dives over

the long run. At this point, we cannot tell definitively but the reports remain very helpful in showing general development and because they allow us to see that some areas will progress more than others and if there is an overriding pattern. Overall it is difficult, nearly impossible, to perfectly quantify qualitative data such as quality of life, but I think that these phase reports, at least for the purposes of this study, do a sufficient job. Now with an understanding of the phases, they will be applied to the villages to greater depict the situations in each village.

### **III. Primary Phase Report: Mulunguni**

A primary evaluation of Mulunguni gave it an overall phase score of 1.29 signifying that most aspects of the village were in phase I, the least developed. In all categories of the phase report (leadership, health, living environment, access to market, and access to education) Mulunguni's overall scores resided in phase I and II.

In leadership, they were in phase II of village organization and leadership skills as well as their level of self-development. This signifies that there was already established in the village some form of leadership working toward developing the village and which could be used to harness the cooperative power of the village to work toward their development goals and at the very least greater potential, for social capital working toward amplifying aid effects. More specifically, a 2 in leadership skills represents that leaders are working toward uniting the villagers in a common goal and vision for their village although as seen in family participation, this is not yet fully rooted in the village. The leaders in Mulunguni share the leadership role at this stage with CHOICE in terms of projects and mobilizing the community, in other words the leadership of the village is good but not enough on its own to get projects done. Mulunguni is unique because it is the only of the three villages in which there was an organized group which contacted CHOICE and asked for assistance, in fact it was a women's group which had been

formed to choose projects to help better the lives of the villagers. They would identify key problems in their village and take action, going to the district chairman and bringing him to the village to help them work out their problem and help them develop their village. It was these women who made the first step towards a partnership with CHOICE (E. Franson, personal communication, January 15, 2010). They would help immensely as they were an established group which was already organizing meetings and lunches to bring attention to those issues in the village which were most important. This group of women consisted of three or four key women who were able to rally other members of the village around their cause.

Interestingly, through Mulunguni's initial phase report for family participation project management and women leaders were rated 1. This means that the focus for development in the village is on the individual families rather than on the village as a whole because the good of the community is not yet recognized as vital and good for the individual. In project management it means that village leaders are managing less than 20% of the project hence CHOICE's presence is strongly required. As far as women leaders, this means that there are no openly accepted women leaders in the village in public political positions. Note, however, that this is different from having a women's group in the village, which Mulunguni does have and did have at the beginning of involvement with CHOICE.

In education, Mulunguni was in phase II in primary education as well as attitude about education in the primary phase report. There is a primary school consisting of eight classrooms which was built a couple of decades ago and serves over six-hundred hundred students. The teachers are local villagers who have graduated from high school and have obtained their teaching certificates. The government promises "free" primary education. This means they will provide a certain number of teachers as well as some materials and food for the students. The

number of teachers and materials provided by the government tend to be very limited and minimal, for example having one teacher for fifty or sixty children, or two or three textbooks for thirty kids (E. Franson, personal communication, January 15, 2010). Parents must pay for uniforms for their children to go to school.

A score of 2 indicates that there is primary school education and hence teachers are available up to a third grade level (at minimum) and that most villagers have basic literacy skills. Less than 50% of children though, complete primary school. In Mulunguni, the parents seemed to be rather involved in students' education but it still rated at 2 initially, as did their PTA organization. This means that limited value is placed upon education and the parents are connected with the teachers, but mostly for special projects and occasions, not regularly. The parents recognize the importance of education, but it is not the main priority for their children. Most students do not go on to secondary schooling and the education rate for girls was given an initial rating of 1.5, which is quite low. This signifies that around or less than 20% of girls attend primary school. Despite the relatively low rankings in education, they do recognize it as important and interestingly, the first project they did with CHOICE was to build additional classrooms which would hopefully create a better environment for learning as there would be fewer kids in each classroom.

Mulunguni has a spigot for water on the main road on which Mulunguni lies. This makes it about a ten minute walk for most families to go and get water for their daily needs. If they cannot get water there, they can walk twenty minutes to a reservoir, however the reservoir is quickly drying up. In March of 2008, water supply for Mulunguni was rated as 0.50. This means that it is in a phase I and very poor. The water is likely contaminated and during the dry season becomes very scarce and hard to come by. In other factors regarding health, Mulunguni

fell within phase I. This means that a health post is more than two hours away and doctors and nurses visit the village very infrequently. There is no trained village health worker and less than 20% of the village has built latrines and uses them. Men have priority for food over women and less than 20% of the village has a firm grasp of what proper nutrition and hygiene are and what to do to achieve that. What stands out is that Mulunguni rated as a 3 in vaccinations for common diseases meaning that over half of the village is taking preventative measures in fighting common diseases. This, however, is due to widespread government inoculation programs.

In terms of living environment, Mulunguni fell in phase I in all categories. This shows that there is a lot of indoor air pollution due to poor ventilation in the house and the use of fires or cooking stoves. Houses consist of dirt floors and natural roofs and insects and livestock can easily enter the house, bringing dirt and germs with them. Food is not stored in a clean environment, and there is no knowledge of how to treat the environment sustainably. There is no organized waste management, trash is thrown out wherever, whenever. There is no electricity in the village and the watershed area is not protected. Overall, basic needs are barely met and sanitation is poor.

Lastly, in terms of access to markets and hence opportunities for business Mulunguni ranks in phase I with the exception of food supply which is rated as a 2. This demonstrates that over 50% of the villagers practice subsistence farming or else work for other land owners and earn a fair labor wage. Access to income sources outside of the village is very limited. It is difficult to access the village by road, there is no telephone or radio available to communicate outside of the village. Men seek out credit for business ventures but can only obtain it from loan sharks who charge extremely high interest rates. No savings program is in place and so money is used immediately (for needs though, not excesses).

#### **IV. Primary Phase Report: Mdomo**

The next village is Mdomo, which actually rated higher initially than Mulunguni. The first phase report on Mdomo was conducted on August 8, 2008. It received an overall average of 2.17. This shows that many aspects of the village were in phase II which is still quite primitive, but more developed than phase I. This score is much higher than Mulunguni, because initial evaluation of leadership came in as much stronger, at an average of 2.46 but all other categories were in phase I with an average of 1.88. Mdomo received a 2 to 2.9 in most aspects of leadership and self-development indicators. This means that families were cooperating on “isolated village-level projects to raise the standard of living for all” and there is some leadership present in the village, although it may not be extremely strong (CHOICE Humanitarian, 2009a). Hence the focus is no longer on the individual families but on improving the village’s living standard as a whole.

At this stage, village leaders share power and the role with CHOICE leaders. Regarding elected officials, there may be some respect, but not total trust of them and so they may wield some power but not a great deal. There are, however, no openly recognized women leaders and women are discriminated against both in politics and life in general. Mdomo started with a relatively high mark in vision – essentially what they envision is possible for their village and whether they realize they can work together and achieve betterment for the entire village – which was a 3 (or in phase III). For special projects and initiatives they may be trying to organize committees to deal with them, but there is no overarching development committee. In project management, villagers are managing more than 50% of a given project.

In the area of education, Mdomo initially ranked very highly – in the three range – for many aspects including primary education, teachers, attitude about education, and PTA

organization. This is not surprising since the village was literally built around a primary school. The school, however, is similar to the one in Mulunguni, consisting of ten classrooms with more than six-hundred students. Teachers are reliable and education is seen as important, and almost all children complete primary school, once enrolled. The teachers are paid by the government and show up every day to school and value the quality of the education they give to the children. Attitude about education scored a 3.2 showing that parents are willing to sacrifice to send their children to school as they see it as a top priority. The PTA organization brings parents and teachers together regularly, not just for special projects or occasions and both parties express a concern for the education of the children and want to better it. As is typical of the region, fewer girls than boys attend school, but Mdomo was rated as a 2 indicating that 50% or more of girls attend school. In the realm of adult literacy, however, Mdomo was still in phase I signifying that less than 20% of adults are literate. Due to schooling, however, the rate for children is likely higher.

In health, the village was primarily in a phase I for most indicators showing that there is no health post within two hours (by foot) from the village, water supply is inadequate, contaminated, and limited by the seasons. Doctors and nurse visits are extremely rare and malnutrition is common. They did score relatively well in vaccines for common diseases in the area, with a mark of 3, showing that over 50% of villagers are vaccinating against diseases common in the area. This is a common trend among all of these villages, however, due to widespread government inoculation in these regions. Also in Mdomo, there is a village health worker who has basic training in first aid. The health worker is connected to the local health post (although this is over two hours away) and has some supplies and training to deal with emergencies, although it is limited.

In terms of economic opportunities, Mdomo rated quite poorly with an average of 1.6 in their first assessment. Most families are practicing only subsistence farming, there is no savings program in place and there is no real link to larger economies where they can sell goods they produced or conduct other business. As far as food supply, communication, and access to credit, however, they were in phase II. This means that only just over 50% of people, not all, are depending on subsistence farming or else working on someone else's land to make a living. Also the wages are more fair, they are not working as indentured servants. There is a public telephone which villagers may use limitedly enabling greater contact outside of the village. And these villagers also have a little access to credit which they can more reasonably pay back in a few months. Hence overall they have more opportunities for entrepreneurial endeavors.

It is interesting because initially, Mdomo may rank much higher than the other two villages, yet we will see that their rate of success is lower. In dealing with Mdomo, they have the vision and desire to improve their lives, but often fail to actually take any action to do so. For example, women have ideas of raising chicken or cattle and selling them but they do not do it “that is the difference between Mdomo and Mulunguni,” where they take action (E. Franson, personal communication, January 15, 2010).

#### **V. Primary Phase Report: Chanzou**

Lastly is the village of Chanzou. In Chanzou's primary phase evaluation, in April of 2008, they had an overall average of 1.31 which shows that the village resided primarily in phase I – very basic – in all aspects of living and development, similar to Mulunguni. In terms of leadership and self development indicators, however, Chanzou was split between phase I and phase II scores. In family participation, village organization, networking and vision they received scores of 2. This means that families cooperate with one another on a village level and

## 42 Does Social Capital Matter?

work together to improve the living standard not just for one family but for the village in general. As far as village organization, it also shows that the elected officials in the village are at least somewhat respected and along with their leadership, natural leadership among villagers is emerging. The village also is forming committees to further special projects. They also are developing a community-wide vision but not in great depth.

However, in other leadership indicators, Chanzou was in a phase I. Thus in terms of actual leadership skills, women leaders, and project management Chanzou is not as developed and strong. More explicitly, there is no clear leadership in the village (although it may be slowly emerging, it is not already present). There are elected officials, but no real development leaders. There are also no women leaders in the village. There is very clear discrimination between men and women. Village leaders manage 20% or less of projects, once again showing great reliance on outside leaders like those of CHOICE.

As far as education, they received a 2 for primary education, but fell in the phase I category for all other education indicators. Hence at least 80% of children (mostly boys) complete primary school. This is much greater than Mulunguni's initial primary school rating. Despite the high amount of school enrollment and completion, they still are low in the other indicators and are similar to Mulunguni in that sense. Less than 20% of girls attend school, the nearest secondary education school is more than two hours away and hence secondary education is received by less than 20% of villagers. Also, adult literacy is less than 20%, teachers are unreliable and do not show a strong commitment or enthusiasm for teaching and providing children with a decent education. The attitude about education scored a 1.5 showing that education is not extremely valued and when forced to choose between having the children work

for the parents or family and school, children often end up working. This may provide short term economic stability for the family, but hinders their long-term development.

In terms of health indicators, Chanzou also falls primarily into phase I rankings. It takes more than two hours to get to the nearest health post. Doctors and nurses virtually never visit the village. The water supply is limited, contaminated, and depends greatly on the season and whether it is wet or dry. Less than 20% of the villagers have and use latrines and knowledge of hygiene and nutrition is very poor. Childhood mortality is higher than the national average for children aged 5 years old and younger. Chanzou, however, also falls into phase III in terms of vaccinations for common diseases which means that over 50% of the village is vaccinating against common diseases in the area, once again due to widespread government vaccination programs. Also, Chanzou scores a 2 for most common health problems which shows that at least 50% of villagers are taking preventive measures to guard against the most common health problems for villages. Women are not given as much priority in determining food provisions as in other villages.

Living conditions in Chanzou received an average score of 0.78. This is very low and demonstrates a very basic standard of living. There is bad ventilation in the house which is problematic because of the use of open fire and cooking stoves inside. Bio-gas, natural gas, electrical stoves or ventilated cooking stoves are used by less than 20% of villagers. Kitchen sanitation is very poor. Surfaces cannot be cleaned and livestock and insects can easily enter the kitchen, as well as sleeping areas in the house. Food storage is not sealed and so rodents, bugs and other animals may get to it. Trash is thrown out at will with no collection. There is no designated way to manage waste and refuse. No electricity is available in the village and the watershed area is susceptible to contamination.

Lastly, as far as access to market, Chanzou falls into phase I in all of the different subcategories. Hence the villagers almost exclusively rely on farming, animal husbandry, and being workers or indentured-servants for other farmers and land owners. Wages are not fair, people are underpaid. There is no real radio or telephone communication. Most people barter as money or cash is not used frequently and businesses outside of farming are practically nonexistent. There is no savings program in place and credit is very hard to come by, making business ventures difficult to initiate. Life is about survival and the basics. In absolute terms, Chanzou is similar to Mulunguni, both of which are below Mdomo, but we will see that in terms of rates of improvement Mulunguni far exceeds Mdomo and Chanzou and identify the role social capital and leadership lay in this.

### **CHAPTER 3: Later Phase Reports**

Mulunguni has shown tremendous improvement at an astounding rate based on the numeric values of the phase evaluations. In just five months, they increased from a total average of 1.29 to 2.7. This is an increase of 1.41, approximately .28 per month. To give a sense of comparison, Mdomo, increased from 2.17 to 2.57 in approximately a year and Chanzou increased from 1.31 to 1.72 in 14 months (from April 2008 to June 2009). The last two villages increased by about one fourth of Mulunguni, in more than twice the amount of time. These numbers are important to give a quantitative sense of rates of improvement, but now a more in-depth look at what improvements actually took place will provide more necessary information. An explanation of how these improvements occurred and whether or not social capital can explain them will follow later.

#### **I. Later Phase Report: Mulunguni**

Mulunguni experienced great improvement in all categories, but especially in the leadership category with many of the subcategories jumping from ratings of phase I and II to phase III and IV. This is significant especially because in phase IV, CHOICE's help is no longer seen as necessary – the village can advance their development goals on their own in this category.

More specifically, family participation in the village leaped from 1 to 3. This means that there is now a high level of cooperation among the community and they are willing to make sacrifices for not just individual gain but the betterment of the village as a whole. In community development projects at least 90% of villagers are participating. Next, in the area of village organization, Mulunguni advanced from a score of 2 to one of 4. This indicates that now there is a village development committee (MUDO in this case) which works with other village

development committees to form a larger base to voice demands and needs for the village and the greater area. This development committee operates under the SIDEPE program, an organization which brings together development committees from various villages to give them a stronger voice and broader base to work from. This may include projects such as better infrastructure and electricity which are projects the government typically needs to facilitate. The village development committees make the government aware of their needs and help get funding from private as well as public funding and NGOs. Their leadership skills have also improved by two phases (from 2 to 4), signifying that they now have very strong and developed leadership which works toward developing the village and is very capable of interacting with outside organizations to further their development goals within the village.

The village also is now in a phase IV for vision. This symbolizes that the village has a very strongly developed common goal and vision and they have created a Community Action Plan which shows how they are to proceed to achieve their development goals. In project management and women leaders, Mulunguni went from a rating of 1 to a rating of 3. For project management this means that 80%-100% of the projects being done in the village are being managed by the villagers and their leaders. Very little outside leadership (particularly from CHOICE) is needed. For women leaders, this is a very large and important development. It shows a large change in the mindsets of the villagers. Now around 50% of the leaders in community organizations and government are women and they are becoming more accepted as equals. There is no longer the prejudice against women holding leadership positions. This is very important as it not only brings about greater community involvement, but shows a change in the way people are thinking in the village.

In the area of education, Mulunguni showed particularly strong growth in primary education and girls' attendance in primary school. Primary education went from a 2 to a 4. This means that within the village schooling is available through eighth grade and virtually all kids go to school. Teachers are effective and also progressive and almost all (male) children complete a primary school education. Girls' attendance in primary school also increased from a 1.5 to a 2. This means that now at least 50% of girls in the village attend primary school (likely much more than 50% attend). Based on the scoring for primary education, they also finish it. The PTA organization experienced a small growth, but some nonetheless, from 2 to 2.5 signaling a move toward phase III which means that many parents are becoming more involved with the schooling, and share a more regular relationship with teachers involving more frequent interaction.

As far as health care goes, Mulunguni most improved in nutrition and hygiene, vaccines, most prevalent health problems, childhood mortality, and latrines. In nutrition and hygiene, Mulunguni went from a 1 to a 3. Thus now the majority of the village is aware of and works toward achieving proper hygiene and nutrition for themselves and their families (versus less than 20% previously). The vaccinations for the most common diseases in the area went from a 3 to a 4. This shows that almost all villagers are vaccinated against common diseases (much more than 50%). For the most prevalent health problems, they went from a 2 to a 3. This means that over half of the villagers are taking preventative measures to fight these diseases and problems. In childhood mortality, they now score a 3 (previously a 2) showing that they are under the national average for childhood mortality (of children under age 5). Lastly, they still remain in phase I for latrines. This means that they are still not very commonly used (with only 20% or less of the

villagers using them). Other health categories experienced similar improvement of between 0.5 to 0.9 but not moving into different phases.

In terms of the living system, the areas which stand out most are kitchen sanitation, living area, and waste management. In kitchen sanitation they went from a 2 to a 3, showing that cooking areas now are kept clean. The villagers now usually wash their hands before preparing their meals and the food is kept in a place protected from insects. In terms of living area, they improved from 1.5 to 2. This means that now the cooking and sleeping areas of the house are closed off to livestock. In waste management, there was a tremendous jump from 0.5 to 2. This means that now trash is collected in a central village location and then it is burned and buried, and all villagers participate in this.

Lastly, in the category of access to market, Mulunguni showed relatively drastic improvement across the board. In terms of food supply, they went from a 2 to a 3 symbolizing that they have greater access to outside resources and are no longer simply doing subsistence farming but are producing excess. Less than 50% of villagers are dependent on their land as some small enterprises have formed which generate income. Roads and communication developed hugely from 1.5 to 4 for both. This means that now there is regular public transportation to and from the village directly, on relatively good roads, and now almost every villager or family has a cell phone allowing for increased contact with places outside the village. Family income source has gone from a 1 to a 3 and access to credit went from 0.1 to 3. This means that now there are now a lot of family businesses which are generating enough income for the families to live off of and there is regular commerce with businesses trading goods with other villages. There is also a formal bank and micro-credit program in the village so entrepreneurs have more opportunities. Everyone has access to credit through YEHU Microfinance Trust and

at least 30% of villagers are utilizing this (some of which are women). Going along with the micro-credit, there is also a strong saving culture now in place which allows for many micro-credit transactions. Hence Mulunguni has made great strides in many areas, but especially in leadership and access to market. And all of this occurred in only five months. While this improvement may seem unlikely or unrealistic and it is possible that some of the numbers are off – either too low to begin with or too high to end – with the overarching trend and fact that there was great improvement in Mulunguni cannot be ignored.

## **II. Later Phase Report: Mdomo**

Mdomo is interesting because it is the village which started out with the highest total score or phases, but its improvement has been very slow compared to Mulunguni. It may be argued that the more developed a village becomes, the slower further development is. However, Mdomo was far from being totally developed and it seems that they should have been able to improve more as Mulunguni surpassed the absolute levels of Mdomo in some categories. Mdomo generally experienced very small changes throughout the categories, some of which may be significant, some of which may not.

To start with, in terms of leadership and self-development, Mdomo did experience rather good growth from phase II into phase III for many indicators. Interestingly enough, however, many of the indicators in phase II were at the higher end of phase II, as will be seen in more detail. To start with family participation went from a 2.8 to a 3.2 so now more than 90% of villagers are participating in projects and there is a very high level of cooperation among the community to make improvements which benefit the village as a whole and not just individuals. As far as village organization goes, they improved from a 2.8 to a 3. This is a small jump numerically, but it is more significant as they moved from being in phase II in this category to

being in phase III. This means that they now have a village development committee which is present and working all the time and as needed, various sub-committees are formed for various, specific problems such as water. The elected and natural leaders of the village work together to advance goals and hold a lot of respect from the villagers.

Leadership skills also improved but just from a 2.9 to 3.1. This does symbolize, however, that now leaders within the village understand how to use the resources they have available to them to develop the village but the change may be statistically insignificant considering they were so close to being in phase III already. The leaders also are able to keep villagers motivated in their development and CHOICE staff is no longer needed to manage projects (this is also seen in the improvement in the project management category from 2.9 to 3.2). Vision remained in phase III as before. Women leaders experienced improvement moving from 1.5 to 2 showing that now women are starting to be recognized as leaders in the village, but only 20% of the leaders in the village are actually women.

As far as education goes, Mdomo started with relatively high scores, with many sub-categories were already in phase III. Most significantly, Mdomo improved in girls attending primary school and secondary education. In both of these categories, they moved from phase II to phase III. Girls' attendance started at 2 and improved to 3 which means that now over 80% of the girls in the village are attending school and most are completing it. Secondary education also moved from phase II to phase III, but with a much smaller improvement (going from 2.9 to 3) showing that the actual change was very small, despite a phase change. This does show, however, that now there is a secondary education facility within 30 minutes by foot and many of the children in the village are attending a secondary school. The PTA organization of Mdomo also showed relatively significant improvement going from 3 to 3.8. It still remains in phase III,

but it is strong and shows that parents are regularly interacting and communicating with teachers and are invested in their children's education, as are the teachers. In the other areas of education, especially adult literacy, Mdomo made very little progress. They remain in phase I which means that less than 20% of adult villagers are literate. Other progress made in primary education, post secondary education, and teachers was small, in the 0.2 to 0.6 range.

Next, in looking at healthcare, Mdomo did have improvement in many areas from phase I to phase II. In doctor and nurse visits, it went from 1.8 to 2.4. Thus now there are monthly visits from nurses and doctors to the village, providing more regular health care. Water supply also improved greatly, from 1.5 to 2.8 which means that they have a storage system in place to provide them with adequate water during the dry season. No other village has this. Nutrition and hygiene also got better going from 1.8 to 2. Once again a very small numerical change. This means that around 50% of villagers are aware of what good nutrition and hygiene is and are trying to change their habits to achieve it. Balanced diet and food access for women also went from phase I to phase II. This means that now there is greater awareness of what a proper diet is (this goes in conjunction with nutrition and hygiene) and also that it is recognized that both men and women need food, thus women are gaining more equality. The childhood mortality score went from a 2.5 to 3.2 so now it is actually under the national average mortality. In many of the other categories, there was some improvement, but once again it was small (less than 0.5) and there was no change in the phase. This held also for the health post, latrines, and vaccines. Hence there was a general trend of relatively good improvement in health, but some areas still lagged behind with very small changes.

In living environment, there was improvement most notably in living area from 1.5 to 2. This means that now there are barriers to prevent livestock from entering the living areas. The

walls are plastered and the roofs are tin or another material better than natural roofs. In the other categories of living environment such as indoor air pollution, kitchen sanitation, waste management, and electricity, however, there was no phase change and they remained in phase I – very basic and in some cases dangerous. There were small improvements in many categories (nothing remained exactly where they were to begin with) but they seem quite insignificant (in the range 0.1 to 0.5). The living environment, hence, has seen very little improvement overall.

Lastly in access to market indicators, Mdomo did see some improvement in communication and roads, family income source, access to credit, and savings program. Communication and roads moved into phase III due to the increase in cell phones among villagers and public transportation comes to the village one or two times a week as well as an improvement in the roads. Family income source improved from 1.8 to 2. Once again a small numerical change, but a shift into a higher phase. Now, there are some small family businesses starting up in the village and business ventures are providing up to 50% of villagers with their income. The savings program improved from 1.5 to 2 meaning that now there are savings programs in place in the village and a fair number of villagers (a little less than 50%) are participating in them. There was thus a fair amount of improvement in this category. Food supply, however remained in phase II showing that the village is still very dependent on agriculture for their livelihood whether it be from their own land or working on other people's land for fair labor wages. Overall, however, their development in terms of economic access improved rather significantly. Once again all of the changes for Mdomo, however, occurred over a year. Their growth is rather good, but does not equal Mulunguni in many aspects despite the fact that the phase reports are over a longer period of time.

### III. Later Phase Report: Chanzou

Compared to Mulunguni and Mdomo, Chanzou has had some success, but it has been much more limited. To start with, in the realm of leadership, they have experienced little development. Leadership skills have, however, improved from a 1 to a 2. This means that now there are leaders in the village working toward developing a common vision among the villagers but this leadership is shared with CHOICE staff which still plays a large role in mobilizing the community and managing the projects the village does. Vision in the village improved from a 2 to a 3 so there is a strong common community vision. In order to materialize this vision they have created a Community Action Plan which outlines how they will achieve their vision. Interestingly, in village organization and family participation, they did not improve at all, but remained in phase II where they were the previous year meaning that villagers will cooperate on projects to better the village as a whole but participation in these projects is only around 60%. It remains that village officials have some, but not total respect and committees for development are formed only around specific projects and needs and do not exist all the time. They are intermittent. The other categories of project management and women leaders made only small improvements of 0.5 and remain in phase I.

In the realm of education, Chanzou saw extremely limited improvement, in fact the only area to move into a higher phase was that of attitude about education. Here Chanzou moved from a 1.5 to a 2 signifying that now villagers recognize the value and importance of education but parents still are not willing to really sacrifice to get their children proper and adequate schooling. Primary education remained in phase II but did increase to 2.5. The other categories such as girls attending primary school and adult literacy also saw very limited growth in the range of 0.2 to 0.5. Girls attending primary school, secondary education, post secondary

education, adult literacy all remain in phase I. Some are nearing phase II but for the most part still are around mid or low phase I.

In terms of health and access to health care, Chanzou developed more significantly than education, but still not nearly as well as Mulunguni. Most notably was the improvement in doctor and nurse visits, village health worker, and childhood mortality. As far as doctor and nurse visits go, Chanzou increased from a 1 to a 2. Thus there are now monthly or quarterly visits to the village versus virtually none, a significant improvement. In terms of a village health worker, they also went from a 1 to a 2. This signifies that there is now someone in the village who is trained with basic first aid and there are basic emergency supplies. Also there is a link to a local health post, although this health post is still a couple of hours away. In childhood mortality, they once again improved from 1 to 2. Being in phase II for childhood mortality means that the childhood mortality is equal to the national average (versus being above). In the rest of the categories regarding health care, Chanzou experienced either no improvement (in the case of prevalent health problems and water supply) or very little development (in the range of 0.2 to 0.5). Thus there was some development, but overall Chanzou's health situation remained little different.

In terms of living environment there was not a single category that moved out of phase I. All living conditions remain about the same as they did the previous year, meaning they are still very poor. Advances in this sector are very minimal, typically around 0.2 (although for a couple such as food storage they did go from 0.5 to 1). Overall, however, I would deem that improvement made in this sector is negligible. The villagers of Chanzou were still living in houses open to insects and livestock which could easily contaminate the living and cooking spaces.

Similarly, there was very little significant change in access to market indicators for Chanzou. Chanzou was in phase I for all indicators in this section and the only one to move out of phase 1 was communication which now has a score of 2, likely due to the increase in cell phone ownership prevalent throughout the country. Everything else experienced small increases by .01 to .05, thus Chanzou over year after the initial report remained very isolated from the outside world, with a great reliance and practice on subsistence farming, virtually no access to credit and no entrepreneurial ventures. Hence in over a year, very little significant and tangible improvement that can be seen was made in Chanzou. But how these improvements, or lack thereof, can be explained requires looking at the different projects conducted and the variation in social capital in the villages. What will also be important to note is the role leadership plays in development as this presents itself as a significant variable. First though, the changes and rates of changes in the villages must be looked at side by side.

## **CHAPTER 4: Phase Analysis and Conclusion**

### **I. Analysis**

What is most striking about Mulunguni's improvement is how quickly it happened. The changes Mulunguni experienced in five months were equal or greater than those experienced by the other villages in a year or more. What also stands out about the progress Mulunguni made is that the category on the phase reports in which they improved most in was leadership. Mdomo and Chanzou had leadership improvement at the lower and middle end of range of improvement respectively. Thus, this poses the questions, if there is good leadership, does development follow? And how does good leadership come about? As a general pattern access to market seemed to be the area where villages made the most improvement, followed by health, education, and then living environment. It was leadership which varied the most, ranging from the most improved in Mulunguni, to the least improved, in Mdomo (See Tables 4.1-4.3).

As stated before, Mulunguni had the most tremendous improvement in leadership, but overall their rates of improvement were still much greater than the other villages. What is also striking is the number of subcategories which had reached a phase IV or V in Mulunguni. By the later phase evaluation, they had eight categories which had reached a phase IV or V rating. This is a level of virtually complete development for those factors. By comparison, Mdomo did not have a single subcategory in phase IV or V and Chanzou had only one.

In terms of leadership, Mulunguni made huge improvements moving from phase I to phase III, improving by 0.41 per month. Mdomo on the other hand, only improved by 0.03 per month and remained in phase II the whole time. Chanzou moved from phase I to barely phase II with a score of 2.0, improving by 0.03 per month as well. It is important to note that leadership does make Mulunguni's overall improvement seem infinitely greater than other villages. When

accounting for the other four factors (education, health, living environment, and access to market) however, Mulunguni still has improved substantially more than the other two villages, improving 0.78 overall versus 0.45 in Mdomo and 0.39 in Chanzou and in five months for Mulunguni versus a year or more for the other two villages.

This pattern is seen throughout the other categories. In the realm of education, Mulunguni developed by an average 0.1 per month, Mdomo by 0.04, and Chanzou by 0.03. Once again, Mulunguni's progress was much greater than the other two villages. Mulunguni did stay in phase I, while Mdomo was able to move from a phase II to phase III, but Chanzou also remained in phase I. Mulunguni surpassed Chanzou in its actual rating (1.81 versus 1.75). Mdomo however, started off with better education and remained higher in that aspect. In terms of health, Mulunguni's progress was much greater than the other villages as well. It improved by 0.12 per month whereas Mdomo and Chanzou improved by only 0.04. Next is the category of living environment, which seems to be one of the most difficult for villages to improve in. Mulunguni made an average improvement of 0.08 per month – its slowest improving factor. Mdomo improved by 0.03 per month, while Chanzou improved by 0.02 per month. The last category is the area of access to market. Here Mulunguni made huge strides, improving by 1.61 over five months, approximately a 0.32 increase per month. By comparison, Mdomo increased by 0.05 per month while Chanzou lagged behind still, increasing by 0.03 per month. While there are many things which can be drawn from these numbers, what stands out is that Mulunguni's leadership advanced immensely, and with that it seems the rest of the categories evaluating their development did as well.

These numbers represent a linear path taken by each village, however this does not seem to necessarily be the case. Rather, there seems to be a very rapid increase in ratings in the time

right after their first phase report, the rate of improvement then plateaus. This may be due to the fact that as a village reaches higher levels of development, it can become more and more difficult to improve and develop and more expensive. In other words, the lower a village starts, the more room there is for improvement and the initial improvements can be easier to make because they can be changes in awareness and hence require less actual monetary investment. This idea can be seen in Mulunguni with its astoundingly fast improvement over five months, and also in Mdomo which seems to have rather slow growth, but started out more developed. The other possible reason for this rapid initial increase is shown by Mdomo.

Mdomo is unique because it had an extra phase evaluation completed for it only two months after its initial one. This phase report showed Mdomo making huge leaps in its development as well, improvements more along the size of Mulunguni though still smaller. For example, the overall change in its phase evaluations went from 2.17 to 2.42, a change of 0.13 per month. Mulunguni improved by 0.28. Where Mdomo lagged greatly behind Mulunguni was leadership (which once again is measured by various indicators such as village organization and participation as well as leadership skills), showing an improvement of 0.09 per month for the first two months versus Mulunguni's 0.41 change per month over five months. In the other categories, however, Mdomo was very close to Mulunguni for its rate of change in its first two months after its initial phase report. Over the next ten months, however, Mdomo changed by only 0.15 total. What this may symbolize is that the initial changes brought about by CHOICE involvement may be large, but afterwards it is hard to sustain the rapid rate of improvement. This idea may also be supported by Mulunguni which improved greatly, but the time frame is rather short – only five months. Mdomo also seems to have experienced the bulk of its improvement charted by the phase reports in the first two months. This may also be the case in

Chanzou where initially improvement was tremendous but then the rate of improvement decreased but without further phase reports it is unknown. While this may be one reason for the high rate of improvement for Mulunguni, it cannot explain entirely the large improvement in the village as the absolute changes in Mulunguni are in fact bigger than the other two villages.

Below are tables highlighting the changes found in the phase reports.

<b>Mulunguni</b>	Initial Report (3/5/2008)	Later Report (10/24/2008)	Change	Change per month
Total	1.29	2.70	1.41	0.28
Leadership	1.39	3.44	2.05	0.41
Education	1.31	1.81	0.5	0.10
Health	1.22	1.82	0.6	0.12
Living Environment	1.11	1.50	0.39	0.08
Access to Market	1.09	2.70	1.61	0.32
Subcategories in phase III	1	11	10	
Subcategories in phase IV/V	0	8	8	

Table 4.1 Improvement experienced by Mulunguni

<b>Mdomo</b>	Initial Report (8/8/2008)	Later Report (8/20/2009)	Change	Change per month
Total	2.17	2.57	0.41	0.03
Leadership	2.46	2.80	0.34	0.03
Education	2.61	3.06	0.45	0.04
Health	1.89	2.36	0.47	0.04
Living Environment	1.41	1.70	0.39	0.03
Access to Market	1.60	2.21	0.61	0.05
Subcategories in phase III	6	15	9	
Subcategories in phase IV	0	0	0	

Table 4.2 Improvement experienced by Mdomo

<b>Chanzou</b>	Initial Report (4/18/2008)	Later Report (6/15/2009)	Change	Change per month
Total	1.31	1.72	0.41	0.03
Leadership	1.56	2.00	0.44	0.03
Education	1.31	1.75	0.44	0.03
Health	1.29	1.79	0.50	0.04
Living Environment	0.78	1.00	0.23	0.02
Access to Market	0.88	1.25	0.37	0.03
Subcategories in phase III	1	2	1	
Subcategories in phase IV	0	0	0	

Table 4.3 Improvement experienced by Chanzou

## II. Explaining the Improvement

How though, did these changes happen? The projects each village conducted can help to explain the changes they experienced. For example, Mulunguni has built three classrooms and hired more teachers for these classrooms to improve education. Chanzou focused on building desks for the classrooms also to improve education. Mdomo has not done as much with education, likely because they already had a relatively high level of education since the village was founded around a school but instead has built pit latrines to improve their hygiene and the health of the village. The question is whether or not the simple projects and involvement with CHOICE can really account for the improvement in each of the villages or whether there were other factors at work including social capital or the phase reports were incorrect?

First of all, in order to understand the improvements made, especially through the projects which took place, it is important to understand how CHOICE Humanitarian works on the ground. In the villages, CHOICE Humanitarian provides a variety of services which range from simple funding of projects to leadership training and project management. What they do, however, depends on the village, their certain needs, and the specific project. For example, if a village has funding from the government for a new classroom but lacks the management to actually build it, CHOICE will help in overseeing the project. If the village is lacking in leadership, they may not provide them with funding, but rather with training in leadership skills. Or if they have a plan and the leadership to complete a necessary project such as a water tap, yet lack funding, CHOICE may help finance it. CHOICE's tasks vary by need. They center around building greater leadership in a village and economic development, but the form this takes, whether human or monetary investment, depends on what the village is most lacking. The CHOICE Field Staff works with the villagers to decide what they really need and this is what

CHOICE helps to supply them with. In order to greater understand the variety of shapes CHOICE's actions can take we must look at what has occurred in each village.

To start with is Mulunguni. As stated before, their greatest improvement was in leadership. While there seems to be a greater natural capacity in Mulunguni for strong leadership, their level of leadership was also increased by training from CHOICE. They performed leadership training workshops which work to help the village develop their leaders so they can utilize the resources they have and reach out to get those they do not have but need. The great improvement in leadership skills in Mulunguni can be at least partially explained by the fact that they did receive training in this area over these five months from CHOICE. However, their improvement in this area is likely enhanced by the fact that they do have good, strong leaders to begin with who were thus able to harness what they learned more effectively than other villages.

The next area where Mulunguni experienced great improvement was in access to market. This is due in part to the fact that the women were able to set up a savings program and become more involved with a micro-credit program called YEHU Microfinance Trust which works with CHOICE, as well as Kenya Women's Microfinance Trust. In terms of roads and communication, the village was in phase IV. For roads, this may be an overestimate or rating of them, however they have improved at least somewhat due to the government purchasing a grader for the region which periodically grades the roads and smoothes them out. When talking to the CHOICE Kenya field team, they said that all of the roads were pretty bad for all of the villages, what varies however, and makes a difference is the proximity of a village to the main highway and Mulunguni happens to be closer to the main road which has improved due to government work. In terms of communication, what is shocking is that actually all of the villagers have a cell

phone. “Even the poorest of the poor have cell phones in Kenya” and these are useful for organizing meetings and bringing people together (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 25, 2010). This explains the high score for communication. The change is probably due to the growth in the cell phone industry which has occurred making them more widespread over the past year or so, otherwise the big leap in communication cannot be explained at this point. As far as family income source and food supply this is because there are more small businesses which are forming. One of these is part of the women’s group which is starting to make Aloe Vera soap to sell. They also are in the midst of creating a boarding house for teachers which would bring more teachers to the village as well as provide income (E. Franson, personal communication, January 15, 2010). Food supply is in phase III which means that no longer are villagers simply reliant on farming but due to their businesses and trade are able to get food from other sources as well.

After access to market, Mulunguni experienced most improvement in health. This is because nutrition and hygiene knowledge, dealing with the most prevalent health problems, childhood mortality, and vaccination for common disease all improved. Nutrition and hygiene knowledge can be improved through simple workshops and meetings which bring awareness to the subject and teach the villagers what proper nutrition and hygiene is. Also in dealing with the most prevalent health problems, their improvement has been made by increasing awareness and so people are taking action to try to prevent them. The women’s group is instrumental in this increasing awareness of proper hygiene and disease prevention as they discuss it at their meetings and educate the women. Childhood mortality has decreased due to a program by the larger regional organization SIDEP which has worked to improve the education and skills of village health workers, and has led to improved general health in the villages, especially in terms

of childhood mortality (S. Mwakilesho, personal communication, April 12, 2010). In terms of vaccination for common disease, this is due to the program run by the government which continues to vaccinate throughout the region. The funding for this, however, comes from UNICEF, the Bill Gates Foundation, and the Rotary Club (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 3, 2010).

Following health in improvement was education. Mulunguni made huge improvement in primary education. This is due to two main factors. The first is that with the help of CHOICE and the government, the village obtained funding for and built three additional classrooms for their primary school. The second factor is due to the character of the village and the fact that “they are just a good group” of people and according to field team, when you tell them to do something, they do it (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 25, 2010). Hence, when it came to education the CHOICE staff told them that their children needed to attend school – and stay in school. So far, the village has heeded this advice and with the addition of the classrooms has greater capacity for educating more students so now they have a high retention rate and almost all children in the village are completely school through eighth grade. This does seem like a rather large improvement to be made in such a short time and thus the numbers may be somewhat inflated, but overall there was a generally large improvement in terms of education enrollment and retention. In the long term though, these numbers may dwindle. Beyond eighth grade it is difficult because the high schools are farther away and cost more money. They also improved in the attendance of girls in primary school as well as the attitude about education. These improvements are due to the advice from CHOICE staff that the villagers need to educate their children and helping them to realize the importance of education. This is not typical that simply hearing this information would change a village, but this is part of what makes

Mulunguni unique and outstanding, they are extremely responsive and receptive to help and when they are told to do something, they do it.

The area improved the least in Mulunguni was living environment and eco-system. Here there was only very significant improvement in kitchen sanitation, ecosystem, and waste management although as seen before the other categories also experienced some improvement. Kitchen sanitation was greatly improved due to the women's group which, when they meet, talks about clean and safe household practices (S. Mwakilesho, personal communication, April 12, 2010). In terms of ecosystem and waste management these are once again an awareness issue more than anything at this stage of improvement. In terms of ecosystem they are now aware of basic environmental and sustainable practices in farming and resource use. They have been made aware of the land they live in and the problems facing their ecosystem, however this knowledge is still at the very basic level. In terms of waste management, it is again an issue of awareness coupled with a little management. They have been taught by CHOICE to recognize trash as trash. Before they would just throw out garbage, not really recognizing that something should be done with it. Now, they recognize it as trash and recognize that it needs to be managed and so they take it to a central location where it is burned. Hence overall most of the improvement made by Mulunguni has been due to an improvement in awareness. This awareness has been brought about by their involvement with CHOICE, but it is spread through the village through the leaders who encourage and teach the villagers what to do. Without strong leadership and good organizations in the community and social networks, and hence social capital, this diffusion of information would not be as prevalent and so development, even at the basic level where only awareness is required, would not take place as quickly.

In Mdomo, the area where they improved the most was access to market. This was

largely due to roads and communication. In terms of roads, it was also a government initiative that improved the road in the area. Mdomo is also located directly on the main highway linking Samburu and Kinango so it benefits from being closer to a road that is kept and maintained by the government. Communication likely improved due to the increasing prevalence of cell phones as stated before. Everyone now has one as in Mulunguni. Their savings program also moved from a phase I to phase II. This is likely due to a growing awareness of microfinance institutions and growing access to them with CHOICE's help and connections such as with YEHU, as stated before for Mulunguni. Also the villagers may belong to merry-go-round style credit organizations in which a different member of the group gets the money each month. There is no interest and no repayment in this situation but people contribute monthly which creates a larger pool of money that is then given to the different members.

The area which had the second highest level of improvement was health. Doctor and/or nurse visits increased and improved significantly, as did the water supply. This is not surprising because the village is very focused on building and digging dams to maintain their water supply year round. What explains the improvement in their water supply, however, is largely the fact that they have a tap which delivers water for the whole village and school. Water is also vital to their nutrition as when there is water, there is plenty of food, but when there is little, food is scarce. What can be seen in this category and what is characteristic of Mdomo is that there are very little large changes made. While Mulunguni experienced large jumps in development, but maybe in only half of the subcategories of an indicator, Mdomo experienced very small improvement, but across the board. Hence there is nothing which greatly improves and which stands out, but it is still moving in the right direction. This goes for health also where many small improvements were made in the categories but nothing experienced a very large and

drastic change.

This trend continued in the category of education. They did, however, greatly improved in the area of getting girls to attend primary school going from phase II to phase III. This is largely an awareness factor and can be changed with a change in perspective. By encouraging girls to attend school and making parents realize daughters need education this can be obtained. This has been done by SIDEP as well as due to a larger push by the government encouraging parents to send their daughters to school (S. Mwakilesho, personal communication, April 12, 2010). This was also likely helped by the fact that they have been working on getting more desks and more classrooms to accommodate more pupils. Other than this, however, Mdomo experienced small amounts of improvement or development in the subcategories of education.

The area following education in terms of improvement is living ecosystem. Once again, however, there is no category in which there was an astounding amount of improvement. All of the subcategories did improve over the year, but by very small amounts, ranging from 0.10 to 0.60. The largest improvement was in ecosystem. This is likely due to their implementation of a tree planting program. This works with the school and the whole community. They plant trees to help preserve their surroundings and the land they live on. This project has created greater awareness about their ecosystem and sustainable practices they can adopt.

The area in which there was the least improvement in Mdomo was the area of leadership. This is interesting considering Mulunguni's greatest improvement was in this area. There are two main factors which can explain this. The first is that Mdomo did not receive the formal leadership training that Mulunguni did until after their later phase report, however they have been working with CHOICE's and were able to set up a community development committee with CHOICE's help. This can help in village organization and such. The second factor is that

there are not natural-born leaders who strongly unite the village and are proactive in developing the community. This is what Mulunguni has. In Mdomo they are not as self-motivated and require greater outside assistance to get things done. The leaders in the village will not take action by themselves. “Mdomo waits” whereas Mulunguni acts (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 25, 2010). It is important to remember in looking at Mdomo, however, that it did start at a higher level of development than the other villages. Starting at a higher level of development means that further development may cost more money and improvement may be smaller and hence slower. Also, it is important to highlight the pattern of Mdomo’s improvement which is widespread, but in very small increments. Many of these small improvements can likely be attributed to the simple awareness the village has of trying to better their situation. This pattern will also be seen in Chanzou.

Chanzou improved the most in the area of health. This can be explained because health was a primary focus of their work in the time of the phase reports. During this time, they worked on putting up a dispensary for the village and getting doctors and nurses to visit more frequently and training a village health worker with help from CHOICE. Other than these categories, however, there was small or no improvement made in the health indicator subcategories. This is not surprising since Chanzou overall experienced very little improvement over the fourteen months between its phase reports.

The area next most improved for Chanzou was a tie between education and leadership. The improvement in education mostly occurred in the primary school and can be accounted for by their focus on improving the learning environment and getting more desks for their students to make the school more adequate as well as constructing two new classrooms. This is also due to a heightened awareness of the value of education which is reflected in the improvement in

their attitude about education. In the other education subcategories, however, there was very little improvement. There was a steady incline, but nothing remarkable and the pattern can likely be explained by the simple fact that the village is trying to better their positions although they may not have all the resources and power they need to do so. They are becoming more conscious of what they should do and an increase in awareness can lead to small improvements.

In leadership, Chanzou improved most in vision and leadership skills. This is due to leadership training with CHOICE which occurred in November of 2008. In terms of vision and leadership skills, with CHOICE's help these can be easy to improve because they require simply a change in mindset and an acquisition of knowledge and skills to get the resources they need to develop. Simple training in how to lead the community can create a large change in this area.

The next area which improved the most after education and leadership was access to market. This once again was marked by a large improvement in communication from a phase I to a phase II and is once again likely due to the increasing spread of cell phones in Kenya. Now every family in the village has a cell phone (or phones) despite living in poverty. This improves their communication with the outside world and hence improves their access to market. They also made improvements in other areas such as savings programs and access to credit, both of which may be due to the development committee which can bring attention to the importance of savings as well as micro-credit programs. Overall, however, there was very little improvement in the subcategories and all of them, with the exception of communication, remained in phase I.

The area in which Chanzou was least improved was living environment. This is likely due to the fact that to improve this area requires greater overall improvement in the village as well as in each individual family. To improve one's house, they need extra money, and Chanzou has not developed to the level where the villagers have the extra income to make such changes.

In the other areas, such as health and education, they benefit the community as a whole, but when it comes to the individuals really working to improve their own situations it is harder for them to get resources and so in Chanzou we see that very little change or improvement has occurred. Some of the villagers are more aware of what their living environment should be like and more sustainable farming practices, but even fewer are actually implementing these practices and making changes. Improvement here is harder to obtain without greater improvement in the other areas, and Chanzou has not had that.

Hence, the improvements in the various villages can be explained based on various projects, but the magnitude of each village's improvement still varies. Why these villages vary in their improvement will be explored in the next section.

### **III. Explaining Factors**

What is so different within these villages which can explain the variation in improvement and the non-linearity of development? It is time to go back to the four factors identified as being influencers and manifestations of social capital: ethnicity, family, community, and public goods. In terms of ethnicity, Mulunguni and Mdomo are both very homogeneous, composed entirely of members of the Duruma tribe. This homogeneity should help foster social capital within the villages. Chanzou, however, is ethnically heterogeneous with 25% of the village being Giriama and the remaining 75% being of the Duruma tribe. While these two groups hail from a common group, the Mijikenda, they are two distinct sub-groups and ethnicities. While heterogeneity does not always have to mean a lack of social capital, it does in fact generally tend to make it more difficult for it to occur naturally. Habyarimana, Humphreys, Posner, and Weinstein found that coethnicity is important in public goods provision (and hence social capital) because it fosters greater cooperation “because they adhere to in-group reciprocity norms – norms that are

plausibly supported by expectations that non-contribution will be sanctioned and by an ethnic technology, ‘findability,’ that facilitates sanctioning among co-ethnic pairings” (2007, 724). Greater homogeneity lends itself to greater cooperation and greater cooperation will help to create greater and faster development. This greater cooperation is in its essence social capital.

Within these villages, there are two main religions: Christianity and Islam. All of the villages are about 70% Christian and 30% Muslim. According to the CHOICE workers, however, this does not cause a lot of social problems and people of the two religions coexist and cooperate very peacefully and respectfully of one another. What this signifies is that there is bridging social capital. Recall that bridging social capital is the development and existence of relationships among diverse groups, groups which may not adhere to ethnic or religious lines. Hence this is present in these villages, but likely to different extents. The presence of bonding social capital is also vital. This means there are networks of social relations between people with similar backgrounds (for example two families which are from the Duruma tribe and which are Muslim).

In order to create the most hospitable environment for cooperation on a large scale there should be high levels of both bonding and bridging social capital. As seen from the ethnic makeup of the villages, bonding social capital is likely to be higher in the homogeneous villages of Mulunguni and Mdomo. Chanzou will likely have less natural bonding capital due to its ethnic heterogeneity. Mulunguni and Mdomo should thus more effectively harness the physical and financial capital they receive. This would seem to be true given their rates of improvement as evaluated by the phase reports.

The next factor is that of family. In all of these communities, family structures may differ in that there may be one man with multiple wives or else one man with one wife. Either

way, however, extended family plays a very large role. All of the families live in compounds with extended family around them. This provides a support system and also allows for the formation of more relations within the family. The greater number of relations within the family, the more networks and ties are formed which can create a stronger basis for social capital within the community. It also tends to signify a more outwardly reaching family as they are not a small, isolated unit, but rather each nuclear family is living as part of the larger, extended family. Accordingly, the family structures in the village should foster greater social capital, which should allow for more development. If there is a greater emphasis on extended family, it is possible however that these relationships could crowd out the formation of social capital as the families look inward and do not reach out to the community. In speaking with the CHOICE team, though, the families in the villages interact well and cooperate with one another. The fact that each village has similar family structures, however, means this cannot be isolated as a single cause for existence, or lack thereof, of social capital, but ethnicity does seem to play a role.

Next is to look at the manifestation of social capital in each village in the form of public education. The more education the village has made available to the villagers, the higher their level of social capital should be. This is because education is a public good and public goods have a greater presence where there is higher social capital because the village or community must work and interact with one another to establish them. While each village has a school and is aware of the value of education, it was in Mulunguni that the greatest emphasis was on education and this is where the most action was taken. They improved from a 2 to a 4 – a huge improvement in terms of primary education, as they built three additional classrooms. The value placed on education is high in this village. Another way in which their public goods can be seen is their implementation of a waste management system in which everyone participates in

regularly taking their trash to be burned.

Lastly is interaction within the community, which is also a demonstration of the social capital within the village and is what produces public goods. A village with a lot of social capital will have members of the community interacting with each other frequently, reaching out to various groups, and helping one another, placing a high value on the village as a whole, not just the individual. While in all of the villages there is interaction among all of the families and they will help each other out, in Mulunguni, there is the greatest organized interaction. The village itself is comprised of eight sub-villages. Each of these has a representative, an elected village elder. Mdomo has six sub-villages, and Chanzou has two. However, all of these villages have about the same number of inhabitants (around 4,000 or so). This means that there are naturally more leaders per person and they are more respected in Mulunguni than in the other villages, hence there is already a greater pool of leaders which can explain why the leadership in Mulunguni is stronger than in the other villages. While some people may argue that more leaders may actually lead to greater conflict, in this case more leaders is beneficial because it signifies a greater underlying organization of the village and allows for easier diffusion of ideas. This greater organization in the villages also allows for easier mobilization of the villagers which greatly aids in projects and gives more villagers a voice. Additionally, it shows that there are not just horizontal but many vertical social networks in the village – which is what is wanted to create beneficial social capital. The leaders in the village also serve to represent various facets of development such as education or healthcare therefore eliminating great conflicts regarding what should be done as each has their own focus. The organization among the villages is also representative of more intricate and stronger social networks and hence of greater social capital. Having several leaders interacting and organized shows greater established social networks in

place, hence with more leaders and sub-villages, there is more social capital, which should then lead to greater improvement or development. This is shown by Mulunguni and the diminishing rate of improvement in Mdomo with six sub-villages and Chanzou with only two.

On top of this, Mulunguni also has a strongly developed women's group which was in place before CHOICE arrived. This group was actually responsible for contacting CHOICE in the first place. Women's groups are present in all of the villages (they are encouraged to be formed by the government) but the group in Mulunguni is especially proactive and responsible for a lot of the changes taking place in the village (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 25, 2010). In fact some of the women had belonged to a micro-credit organization called YEHU prior to their direct involvement with CHOICE, thus they were actively trying to improve their situation when they contacted CHOICE and brought YEHU to the village. The idea of the women's group is nothing new in Africa, but it is gaining new power. They are particularly helpful in development as "women frequently [have] more experience than men in creating and sustaining associations, having participated in church-related activities, savings clubs, income-generating groups, self-help associations, community-improvement groups, and other informal organizations and networks" (Tripp, 2001, 144). Thus having a women's group which is strong means the community has a pre-existing organization ready to take on tasks of development as well as providing a model for leadership and community organizations. It also brings together women from different families and religions as well as similar ones, a manifestation of both bridging and bonding social capital. Having such an established social network in place will help to foster greater social capital and hence greater development.

This has outlined the significance of each variable individually. If we look at them together, we can get a better sense of the broader picture of each village. Family structure is a

constant through all of the villages. What varies is ethnicity, community, and public goods. Hence we see that Mulunguni is homogeneous, has strong community interaction and organizations, and relatively high provisions of public goods with their waste management. Mdomo is homogeneous, has weaker community interaction and organizations and typical public goods for the area in terms of education. Chanzou, however, is heterogeneous, has weak community organizations, public goods similar to that of Mdomo or Mulunguni, but that do not go beyond education. This seems to show that what really matters is ethnicity and community.

Turning back to Mulunguni's success it may also be explained by the fact that CHOICE also helped them develop MUDO, the Mulunguni Development Organization, which coordinates development activities for the village and actively seeks out opportunities to advance the village's position. This organization has done "classroom construction, pit latrines, aloe vera plantation, and village dam" rehabilitation and construction (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 3, 2010). On the other hand, the other villages have had different focuses.

Mdomo only created a committee in 2009, a year later than in Mulunguni and its focus has only been to plant trees for the school and to improve the environment. Chanzou's group has focused on "rehabilitating the village dam, *starting* to construct classrooms, starting a local health post, and an aloe vera farm" (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 3, 2010). Most importantly, however, there seems to be a greater amount of natural leadership in Mulunguni than in the other two villages. When asked what stands out most about working with Mulunguni, the answer from Rita, the CHOICE Kenya In-Country-Director, was "The strong support from the leadership" and the fact that the "Community is open to change and has very strong leadership" is the reason it has changed more drastically than the other villages (R. Lugogo,

personal communication, March 3, 2010). When asked this about the other villages, there was recognition that there is a strong community spirit, but the leaders are not strong. Instead the “community makes sure that the leaders do their part” rather than the leaders making sure the community does its part (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 3, 2010).

As far as interaction with other NGOs goes, this does not seem to play a significant factor in the development rate of the villages. All of the villages have been involved with several NGOs including World Vision, the Red Cross, and UNICEF. The NGOs involved in the villages are the same or similar across the villages (not surprising since the villages are all located relatively close to one another in the same region). This does not thus seem to have an impact on the rate of development in each village both numerically and in the feeling of working with the villagers. Because the villagers come to CHOICE to ask for their help, they have prior knowledge of CHOICE’s methods. They “know CHOICE doesn’t work that way,” in the way or method of simple handouts that many other NGOs do and so the CHOICE team does not encounter problems in the field due to a village’s prior interactions with NGOs (B. Jaffar, personal communication, March 25, 2010). Significantly though this shows that the number of NGOs a village is involved with does not mean less or more development. Both Mulunguni and Chanzou are or have been involved with approximately nine other NGOs and the government and yet they are experiencing great variation in the rates of improvement in each village.

In terms of explaining the trend which is seen that there is a large initial improvement in a village, there are three factors I can identify. The first is the fact that the lower a village starts, the more room for improvement there is and the first steps for improvement will likely cost less. For example, going from no form of bathroom to a pit latrine costs less money than going from pit latrines to indoor plumbing toilets and can be done a lot faster. This change is something

which can be done in a week or two with the help and money of CHOICE or another NGO, yet which can also make a drastic and lasting improvement in living conditions. Hence many improvements that the villages experience may seem large, but in fact they really can happen in a month or two.

Another factor is that what is not expressed in the phase reports is the planning which went into them before. This may have taken months (or even years) for the village to plan a project and gather the resources it needed. Hence many of these changes can occur quickly and do and the phase reports capture that. What they do not capture, however, is the preparation that went into making the changes so while a village may have taken a year to get latrines installed (from the conception of the idea to the actual construction of them), what is reflected in the phase reports is just the construction so that in a couple of months or so their hygiene score drastically improved.

The third factor or explanation for the non-linearity of development in the villages is simply enthusiasm. For the first projects, the villagers are enthusiastic, ready, willing, and eager to help and do their part to help with various projects. But as the work continues, “enthusiasm goes down” (R. Lugogo, personal communication, March 25, 2010). So while the resources may still be there, the motivation begins to lose its strength. This can partly be due to simply getting tired, losing interest, or the fact that villagers have accomplished what they sought out to and cannot quite see the next step and so cannot get excited about helping out and moving the village closer to development. All of these factors play a role in the various improvement in each village, but their specific weight and value will be discussed next and conclusions about these case studies drawn up, especially regarding social capital and leadership.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Thus, what can be learned from the cases of Mulunguni, Mdomo, and Chanzou? These villages showed that surprisingly leadership is very important to development. Contrary to what I expected to find, however, there were not strong ties between ethnicity and public goods, and family and community. These case studies though did support the theory that the greater social capital there is, the greater the benefits of investment will be. This is not surprising given Robert Putnam's definition of "social capital as 'features of social organization, such as networks, norms, and trust, that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit'" (Flora et al, 2004, 52). If there is greater trust and networks which facilitate greater cooperation, the village should be more likely to work together towards development.

This is seen especially in Mulunguni. In Mulunguni, there was a greater pre-established social network in the village, with greater organization. This is due to the fact that the village was divided into eight groups. While the villagers in each group interacted with one another, they also could more easily organize and cooperate within each group as it consisted of a fewer number of people. Hence, there were both strong horizontal and vertical relationships. There was also a very strong organization among the women in Mulunguni who had formed a women's group which is very proactive and responsible for contacting CHOICE. This social group brought together the women of the village and allowed for coordination of projects as well as identification of areas in need, and teaching villagers what they can do to improve their lives. Mulunguni had the basic community interaction typical of the other villages, but it also had greater interaction among people, and people already working toward the cause of development and thus more social capital. The cooperation among the women established relationships and trust which could be utilized later with NGO involvement.

Mulunguni has high levels of both bonding and bridging social capital – which is ideal. But what accounts for the high level of social capital in Mulunguni? There are relationships based on ethnicity, family, or having other similar traits, as well as relationships based on utility such as in development committees. Family provides a strong amount of bonding social capital especially due to the value of the extended families in these villages. In terms of family, the extended family may foster creation of greater social capital as there are more relationships formed naturally and more intricate social networks. However, Mulunguni's family structures did not vary from the other villages so it is difficult to isolate this as a single cause for social capital or lack thereof. What Mulunguni does support, however, is the idea that ethnicity impacts social capital. The argument is that the greater homogeneity in a village, the more social capital there should be. Mulunguni is virtually completely homogeneous, with everyone descending from the Duruma tribe. Hence this bodes well for the formation of social capital in their village as there are not ethnic differences to hinder or prevent relationships and trust from developing and there are ethnic norms which people abide by and which fosters greater trust among the villagers.

This idea of ethnicity influencing social capital and hence economic development can be seen in the other two villages of Mdomo and Chanzou. While Mdomo is also ethnically homogeneous, Chanzou is not. Chanzou also had the slowest rate of improvement. People of the same ethnicity will generally interact and relate to one another more easily and are less reluctant to reach out to each other. Thus, Chanzou with its ethnic heterogeneity is at a disadvantage in building social capital. This is not, however, to say that the heterogeneity of Chanzou is not peaceful. With less social capital, it is likely that there is less cooperation and hence foreign aid investment will not go as far as in a village like Mulunguni. This indeed seems

to be the case in Chanzou. Their ethnic heterogeneity will hinder the natural bonding capital while the lack of organization among the community (they are divided into only two groups and lack a strong women's organization or any other development organization) hinders their bridging social capital. They are lacking in horizontal and vertical relationships. They thus have lower levels of both types of social capital than Mulunguni, which can make them less efficient in harnessing the foreign aid investment they receive. Mdomo lies in between Mulunguni and Chanzou. Mdomo is ethnically homogeneous, but lacks the strong community organizations that Mulunguni has, thus there is more bonding capital than bridging capital, not an ideal situation for economic development.

Hence we can very obviously see the impact of ethnicity on social capital and economic development. What is also seen is that community interaction is very important in terms of a village's social capital and hence effectiveness in using foreign aid investment. This is demonstrated by all of the villages as Mulunguni had the most community organizations, strongest interactions and greatest improvements. Mdomo had weaker community organizations but similar community interactions to Mulunguni (due to their ethnic homogeneity) and subsequently was in the middle in terms of improvement. Chanzou had the weakest community organizations and inherent interactions and also the slowest rate of development. The pre-existing women's group and various sub-villages in Mulunguni, bring together leaders and families who might not normally interact. This creates strong interaction among the community and interaction among community is a manifestation of social capital. Thus we see that Mulunguni had the most social capital, Mdomo had less, and Chanzou had the least (also due to their ethnic heterogeneity) and they respectively had the highest, middle, and lowest rates of improvement, upholding the hypothesis that social capital does enhance foreign aid investment.

Initially, I thought that there would be stronger ties to draw between ethnicity and public goods, and family and community. At this level, public goods are so basic and primitive however, it is difficult to evaluate it as a true barometer of the social capital in a village. Mulunguni did seem to have slightly more public goods with its trash management, but in terms of education the villages were not significantly different in their public goods provisions. They did have varying levels of results of education enrollment and retention, but not of what was provided. Also because the family structures of all of the villages are the same, it did not seem to impact the community organization and interactions as hypothesized. The villages all had the same family structures but varied greatly in their social capital as demonstrated by the interaction among the community.

What was not identified as a vital factor of social capital and economic development in the beginning, but which has shown itself to be important as such is leadership. In Mulunguni, they have very strong natural leadership. While it is difficult to account for the reason and root of this, the bottom line is that there is greater leadership in Mulunguni. In fact this factor seems to be more important than that of community. In Mulunguni, the leadership is able to organize, motivate, and mobilize the community to do what it needs to become further developed. In the other villages, however, the community pushes the leaders. While this may signify community interaction, it really is demonstrative of a lack of strong leadership and this appears to have a negative impact on the development of the village. If there are not strong leaders to utilize and obtain necessary resources as well as identify what needs to be done, the community interaction does not matter. Without strong leadership, there may be a lack of direction, motivation, or both and this can result in stagnant development. It can also make it much more difficult to network outside of the village in order to obtain more resources and aid. This is not to say, however, that

community interaction does not matter. It does and is vital to the development of the village for if the community does not cooperate, leadership cannot force it to act. But community organization must be accompanied by some leadership to reap the full benefits of the cooperation of the village. Mulunguni has both strong leadership and strong community interaction and organizations and has subsequently had very quick and impressive improvement. Mdomo does not have the strong leadership and has lesser community interaction and organization and has not seen the results Mulunguni has. Chanzou, has improved the least and is lacking strong leadership and community organization. Once again, the cause and how to develop leadership is unknown but greater natural leadership in a village does matter and play an important role in the village's development. While it should be noted that CHOICE's main focus is developing leadership and human capacity, thus these studies could be reflective of that, once again the overall trend is hard to deny – the greater the leadership in a village, the faster the development.

What can also be seen is that interaction with various and numerous NGOs does not seem to have an impact on the development of a village. All of the villages had previously (or concurrently) dealt with several other NGOs and the government to try to develop. Despite this constant, the villages experienced very different rates of improvement. Hence, this factor does not seem to matter. A village's economic development does not depend or differ due to the amount of NGOs it has dealt with.

It is interesting to note, however, that the social dynamics of the villages do impact the NGO and their dealing with the village. Based on feeling, CHOICE actually thought Chanzou was doing better than Mdomo because they enjoyed working there more. This is a simple preference and cannot be quantified. The numerical data, however, proved otherwise, that in fact Mdomo is improving at a faster rate than Chanzou. This just goes to show that the interactions

the NGO has with the village are important because it will influence their feelings toward the village and can also impact future support although their feelings may not always accurately reflect the improvement or development being made by a village.

This study has thus sought to show how various factors and characteristics in a village can impact the amount of social capital they have and subsequently how effective foreign aid investment is in a given village. Ethnicity, family, public goods, and community were outlined as key factors which influence and demonstrate the amount of social capital in a village. Ethnicity seemed to definitively play a role in social capital and development as the ethnically homogeneous villages improved at a faster rate than Chanzou, the ethnically heterogeneous village. Family and its structure cannot definitively be seen to foster or hinder social capital building as all of the villages had the same family structures. In terms of public goods all of the villages had schools, although the importance of schooling did vary between villages and the percentage of the village educated varied as well. Mulunguni, however, had a greater showing of public goods with its waste management program which requires community involvement and coordination and facilitates better quality of life. As far as community goes, greater community interaction and presence of organizations did show a greater amount of social capital and hence faster improvement. Mulunguni had strong community organizations in place working toward development while the other villages were lacking (at least initially). There are sure to be small flaws and errors in the data and there may be a case to be made that Mdomo did not experience as rapid of improvement because it started at a higher level of development. The general trend, however, cannot be denied. Ethnicity matters in creation of social capital and community interaction is indicative of the amount of social capital in a village and thus how efficiently they will harness physical and human investment from foreign aid. What was discovered as well is

the importance of leadership in development. This suggests that further study should be done to determine how to foster greater leadership in a village as well as the ideal balance between leadership and communal power in order to achieve the full potential of foreign aid investment in a village. What was determined is that social capital does in fact enhance foreign aid investment.

## References

- Adler, P. S. and Kwon, S.W. (2002). "Social Capital: Prospects for a New Concept." *The Academy of Management Review*, 27, 17-40.
- Boix, C. and Posner, D. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Effects on Governmental Performance. *British Journal of Political Science*, 28, 686-693.
- Bovard, James. (1996). The Continuing Failure of Foreign Aid. *The CATO Institute*. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=931&full=1](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=931&full=1)
- Brautigam, D. and Knack, S. (2004). Foreign Aid, Institutions, and Governance in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Economic development and cultural change*, 52, 255-285.
- CHOICE Humanitarian. (2005). *Who We Are*. Retrieved April 25, 2010 from [http://choicehumanitarian.org/index.php?s=content&p=who\\_we\\_are](http://choicehumanitarian.org/index.php?s=content&p=who_we_are)
- CHOICE Humanitarian. (2009a). *CHOICE Indicators*. Salt Lake City, UT: Author.
- CHOICE Humanitarian. (2009b). *The CHOICE Method*. Salt Lake City, UT: Author.
- Collier, P. (1998). *Social Capital and Poverty*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Coleman, J. S. (1988). "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *The American Journal of Sociology* 94, Supplement S95 – S120.
- De Waal, A. (1997). *Democratizing the aid encounter in Africa*. *International Affairs*, 73, 623-639.
- Easterly, W. R. (2008). Introduction. In W. Easterly (Ed.), *Reinventing Foreign Aid* (pp. 1-43). Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Easterly, W. R. and Levine. R. (1997). Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112, 1203-1250.
- Ekeh, P. (1975). Colonialism and the Two Publics in Africa: A Theoretical Statement.

*Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 17, 91-112.

Flora, C. B., Flora, J.L., Fey, S. (2004). *Rural Communities: Legacy and Change*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Habyarimana, J., Humphreys, M., Posner, D., Weinstein, J.M. (2007) Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision? *American Political Science Review*, 101, 709-725.

Habyarimana, J., Humphreys, M., Posner, D., Weinstein, J.M. (2009) *Coethnicity: Diversity and Dilemmas of Collective Action*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation Publications.

Knack, S. and Keefer, P. (1997). Does Social Capital Have An Economic Payoff? A Cross Country Investigation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112, 1251-1288.

Manor, J. (2007). *Aid that Works: Successful Development in Fragile States*. Washington: The World Bank.

Ovaska, T. (2003). The Failure of Development Aid. *CATO Journal*, 23, 175-188.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2009). *Partner*. Retrieved December 2, 2009 from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/partner>

Mosley, P. (1996). The Failure of Aid and Adjustment Policies in Sub-Saharan Africa: Counter examples and Policy Proposals. *Journal of African Economies*, 5, 406-443.

Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24,1-24.

Posner, D. (2004). Civil Society and the Reconstruction of Failed States. In R. Rotberg, (Ed.) *When States Fail: Causes and Consequences*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Shah, A. (2009) Poverty Facts and Stats. *Global Issues*. Retrieved December 14, 2009 from <http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats>
- Tarp, Finn (Ed.) (2002). *Foreign Aid and Development: Lessons Learnt and Directions for the Future*. New York: Routledge.
- Tripp, A. M. (2001). The New Political Activism in Africa. *Journal of Democracy*, 12(3), 141-155.
- Van de Walle, N. (1999). Aid's Crisis of Legitimacy: Current Proposals and Future Prospects. *African Affairs*, 98, 337-352.
- Woolcock, M., and Narayan, D. (2000). Social Capital: Implications for Development Theory, Research, and Policy. *The World Bank Research Observer* 15, 225-249.
- World Bank. (2009a). *Social Capital and Ethnicity*. Retrieved December 2, 2009, from <http://go.worldbank.org/TPRDBCUC3L0>
- World Bank. (2009b). *Social Capital and the Community*. Retrieved December 2, 2009, from <http://go.worldbank.org/CAF1QXOAE0>
- World Bank. (2009c). *Social Capital and the Family*. Retrieved December 2, 2009, from <http://go.worldbank.org/KSMPARN0G0>
- World Bank. (2009d). *Sources of Social Capital*. Retrieved December 2, 2009, from <http://go.worldbank.org/XR8TFW7L20>
- World Bank Group (2004). *Glossary*. Retrieved April 25, 2010, from <http://www.worldbank.org/depweb/english/beyond/global/glossary.html>