

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL STUDIES

Working Paper Series No. 287

**THE RIDDLE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: FACTORS INFLUENCING
ORGANISATION, PARTICIPATION AND SELF-MANAGEMENT IN 29 AFRICAN
AND LATIN AMERICAN COMMUNITIES**

Nicholas Awortwi

February 1999

Nicholas Awortwi was a participant in the MA Programme (PADS 98/99) at the Institute of Social Studies.

This paper was submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts in Local and Regional Development.

Supervisor: Dr. Erhard Berner

Supervisor: Dr. Bert Helmsing

Comments are welcome and should be addressed to the author:
c/o Publications Office - Institute of Social Studies - P.O. Box 29776
2502LT The Hague - The Netherlands

The Institute of Social Studies is Europe's longest-established centre of higher education and research in development studies. Post-graduate teaching programmes range from six-week diploma courses to the PhD programme. Research at the ISS is fundamental in the sense of laying a scientific basis for the formulation of appropriate development policies. The academic work of the Institute is disseminated in the form of books, journal articles, teaching texts, monographs and working papers. The Working Paper series provides a forum for work in progress which seeks to elicit comments and generate discussion. The series includes the research of staff and visiting fellows, and outstanding research papers by graduate students.

For a list of available Working Papers and how to order them see the back of this Working Paper.

For further information contact:

Publications Office - **Institute of Social Studies** - P.O. Box 29776
2502LT The Hague - The Netherlands - FAX: +31 70 4260799
e-mail #**publication_dept@iss.nl** (Attn: Publications Assistant)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables.....	i
List of Abbreviations.....	ii
CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Research Problem.....	1
1.2 Hypotheses.....	2
1.3 Objective.....	3
1.4 Methodology.....	3
1.5 Scope and Limitations of the Study.....	3
1.6 Organisation of the Research.....	3
CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK.....	4
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.1.1 The concept of Community.....	4
2.1.2 Community Development.....	5
2.1.3 Community Participation.....	6
2.1.4 Community Organisation.....	8
2.1.5 Community Management.....	9
2.1.6 Indicators of Community Participation/Community Management.....	11
2.2 Contextualisation of the Hypotheses	12
2.2.1 Socio-economic Characteristics of households and CP/CM.....	12
2.2.2 Structure of CO and its effect on CP/CM.....	14
2.2.3 Sustainable CP/CM.....	16
2.2.4 Type of settlement and its effect on CO and CP/CM.....	17
CHAPTER THREE: SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH COMMUNITIES AND HOUSEHOLD SAMPLE.....	19
3.0 Introduction.....	19
3.1 Socio-economic Profile of Households.....	19
3.1.1 Occupation and Income Status of Households.....	20
3.1.2 Educational Level of Households.....	21
3.1.3 Housing Status (Owners and Renters).....	22

3.1.4	Family Type (Extended and Nuclei Families).....	23
3.1.5	Household Size.....	25
3.2	Demographic and Cultural Characteristics of Research Communities.....	26
3.2.1	Perceptions by Rural-Urban Households on CO and CP/CM.....	26
3.2.2	Leadership Split in Rural-Urban Communities.....	28
CHAPTER FOUR: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION/COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT		29
4.0	Introduction.....	29
4.1	Structure of CO and its Effect on CP/CM.....	29
4.1.1	Origin and Goal establishment of CO.....	30
4.1.2	Statutes, Regulation and Legality of CO.....	32
4.1.3	Type of Leadership in CO.....	32
4.1.4	Sub-committee of CO.....	34
4.2	Effective and Sustainable CP/CM.....	34
4.2.1	Capability of Community Leadership.....	36
4.2.2	Relationship between Members and Leadership.....	36
4.2.3	Relationship between Leadership and Local Government officials.....	37
4.2.4	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation.....	38
4.2.5	Stimulating factors of sustainable CP/CM.....	38
CHAPTER FIVE: DETERMINING FACTORS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION		
or MANAGEMENT.....		39
5.0	Introduction.....	39
5.1	Socio-economic Characteristics of Households affecting CP/CM.....	40
5.1.1	Income Differentials of households and CP/CM.....	40
5.1.2	Illiterates also Participate.....	41
5.1.3	Renters and House Owners.....	41
5.1.4	Extended and Nuclear Families.....	42
5.5.5	High versus Low household size and CP/CM.....	42
5.2	Breaking the Rural-Urban Myth of CP/CM.....	43
5.2.1	Rural-Urban Differences in CO and CP/CM.....	43
5.3	Internal Structure of CO and CP/CM.....	44
5.3.1	Origin and Purpose of Establishment of CO.....	44
5.3.2	Formal Recognition of CO.....	45

5.3.3	Committee Type of Leadership and Centrally Controlled Leadership.....	45
5.3.4	Democratic Leadership.....	46
5.3.5	Participation of Women.....	46
5.4	Influencing Factors of Sustainable CP/CM.....	47
5.4.1	Accountable and Trust worthy Community Leadership.....	47
5.4.2	Good Information Dissemination.....	48
5.4.3	Institutionalised Sanctions.....	48
5.4.4	Supportive Government Structures for CO/CM.....	48
5.4.5	Planning and Priority Establishment.....	48
5.4.6	Not only Government, the People have the Capacity.....	49
	CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS & CONCLUSION.....	49
6.0	Introduction.....	49
6.1	Major Findings.....	50
6.2	Synthesising Best Practices of CP/CM.....	53
6.3	Conclusion.....	53
	Appendix.....	55
	Bibliography.....	62

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Occupational and Income Status of Households.....	28
Table 2	Educational Status of Households.....	29
Table 3	Housing Status of Households.....	31
Table 4	Household Set-up (Family Type).....	32
Table 5	Average Household Size of Communities.....	33
Table 6	Rural-Urban Perceptions on stimulating Factors of CP / CM.....	35
Table 7	Rural-Urban Split in the structure of Community leadership.....	37
Table 8	Composite Index of Significant Differences in the Origin of CO.....	40
Table 9	Composite Index of Significant Differences in Duration of CO.....	40
Table 10	Composite Index of Significant Differences in the Goals of CO.....	41
Table 11	Composite Index of Significant Differences in Types of Leadership in CO.....	42
Table 12	Composite Index of Significant Differences in How Election is organised.....	43
Table 13	Composite Index of Significant Differences of How Leadership Changes in CO.....	43
Table 14	Composite index of Significant Differences in Women-Sub Committee.....	44
Table 15	Composite Index of Significant Differences in Consensus Seeking.....	47
Table 16	Composite Index of Significant Differences in Information Sharing.....	47
Table 17	Composite Index of Significant Differences in Whether CO have Plans.....	49
Table 18	Composite Index of Significant Difference in Households' Perception of their capacity to improve their settlement.....	50
Table 19	Composite Index of Significant Difference in Households' Perception on Government Initiatives in LIS.....	51
Table 20	Composite Causalities of Household Socio-economic and Cultural Characteristics and its correlation with the elements of CP/CM.....	52
Table 21	Rural-Urban Split in CP/CM.....	56
Table 22	Causality of Independent and Dependent Variables of the Structure of CO and CP/CM.	57
Table 23	Causality of Independent and Dependent Variables of Sustainable CP/CM Practises.....	60

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BRAC	Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee
CD	Community Development
CL	Community Leader (ships)
CM	Community Management
CO	Community Organisation
CP	Community Participation
CDP	Community Development Programme
EG	Enabling Government
FAO	Food and Agricultural Organisation
ISSAS	Institute of Social Studies Advisory Service
LG	Local Government
LIS	Low-Income Settlements
MLGRD	Ministry of Local Government and Rural Development
PME	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
SCMP	Strengthening Community Management Programme
UNCHS	United Nations Centre for Human Settlement
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Education Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

CHAPTER ONE: GENERAL INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

The search for the evolution, conceptual validity, practical effectiveness of community participation (CP), community management (CM) and enabling government (EG) as they are linked to community development (CD) was initially commissioned by United Nations Centre for Human Settlement (UNCHS) in collaboration with Institute of Social Studies Advisory Service (ISSAS). As a compliment to their findings, this research further investigates some variables considered as momentous in determining the processes and outcomes of CO, CP/CM and subsequently, the promotion of CD. It uses some of the field data from UNCHS-ISSAS's research communities in 5 Developing Countries: Uganda, Ghana, Zambia (Africa), Bolivia and Ecuador (Latin America). These communities have over the years initiated, implemented and maintained some development programmes and projects with or without the assistance of external agencies. In some cases, the communities' organisation, participation and management have failed to promote local development, whilst in others, it has been a major success.

As a departure from traditional approaches, some external institutions and development agencies like Local Government, UNCHS, NGOs etc. have sought to equip the local people and their leaders with various skills and community mobilisation strategies needed for the implementation and management of their own community projects. However, local and external organisations' understanding of households' behaviour in promoting collective actions in their communities is still unclear. Developing a framework that can respond to local management of economic growth, social development, and individual well being is now inevitable. However, this depends very much on our understanding of some intrinsic characteristics of households that form the community, their perceptions and how these two influence and determine the viability of CO and CP/CM.

1.1 Research Problem

CP/CM is increasingly becoming a predominant approach to the development of local areas that can take many forms. In the approach being developed by many development organisations like UNCHS, USAID, UNDP, FAO, Local Governments, etc., CP/CM means that the communities take the leading role in the local development process. Such a role obviously demands the empowerment of community members and local leaders to move away from their traditional passive and lethargic roles to become the engine in community or local development. Nevertheless, there remains most critical, the element for defining strategies for achieving such sustainable CP/CM.

A major problem for research as well as for practice is that the concepts of COs, CP/CM has conceptually and logically proven to be instrumental in stimulating the processes of CD. However, the processes of this institutional change at the community level have not been researched into and properly documented. For instance, UNCHS-ISSAS evaluation

report by Wils and Helmsing (1998) on practical effectiveness of CP/CM in 7 developing countries where the organisation has undertaken CD programmes have shown some good results between CP, CM and EG. On the other hand, little effort has been made to collate and harmonise similarities and differences of households in these communities who determine to a very large extent the success of CP/CM. Gaps like these raise numerous questions, not only for development organisations or agents but also to the field of CD practises in general. This is because there are inherent households' characteristics and perceptions that influence the success of CD. Until such features are highlighted, effective and intensive CP/CM will still be elusive.

1.2 Hypotheses

Effective CP/CM implies more than allowing people to participate in the construction of physical assets or raising of funds. It means local people and their legitimate organisations having the necessary capacities to transform the local development process to generate more equitable distribution of benefits, increased skills and income, and improve local sustainability. It means stimulating local self-reliance and reducing dependency on outside agencies. The hypotheses being tested here are:

1. Low internal socio-economic status or characteristics of households like: level of education; income; household size; household set-up; and housing status have a negative correlation with participation in membership and other factors that determine the intensity of CP/CM.
2. The internal structures of CO have strong influence on CP/CM. Where CO is democratically structured and legally recognised, more households relate to CO and are motivated to participate in self-help programmes.
3. The relationship between leaders of COs, households and local government influences sustainability of CP/CM. It is only when this relationship is strong and cordial that sustainability of CP/CM is achieved.
4. CP/CM is better organised in rural communities than urban communities as evidenced by many projects, like BRAC's successful operation in rural Bangladesh (Negggers et. al 1987), experience of community construction contract system in Sri Lanka (UNCHS, 1994), the failure of Lusaka urban squatter upgrading and site services to recover cost (Sanyal, 1985. The reason is that CP/CM is a social asset of the poor which relies heavily on collective actions, solidarity, homogeneity, internal group pressure of members, long lived family and kinship relations etc. (Lee, 1994). These characteristics are usually rather found in the social structure of rural communities than urban ones. And since strong and effective actions at grassroots level rarely happen spontaneously (Friedmann and Salquero 1988,19; UNCHS, 1991,) CP/CM is postulated to be more intensive in rural communities than in urban ones.

1.3 Objective

The overall objective of this research is to explore deeply the analytical triangle of community characteristics, COs, and CP/CM, and to examine how these three variables reinforce each other in promoting the process of CD. Providing answers to the foregoing hypotheses, this research provides additional knowledge on CD skills that will facilitate mass participation in the development process of developing countries. It clarifies some general assumptions and assertions of CP/CM and makes them more acceptable to CD paradigms.

1.4 Methodology

Tested are hypotheses about relationships between Community characteristics, CO, CP/CM and EG. Within these concepts and relationships, there are variables that determine their effectiveness in promoting CD. This research uses field data on the evolution, conceptual validity, and practical effectiveness of CP/CM and EG in 29 communities in 5 developing countries to examine some of these concepts. A systematic random sampling method was used to identify 467 households and 64 community leaders. (See appendix 1 for total breakdown). It further tests some related variables in the concepts of community characteristics, CO, and CP/CM. This was done using statistical packages. The unit of concern and analysis of this research are the responses from the structured questionnaire given to households and community leaders.

1.5 Scope And Limitations Of The Study

This research uses responses from socio-economic, political, cultural and institutional survey of UNCHS project and non-project communities to test a number of hypotheses related to CD. Though the concepts of CP/CM are theoretically linked to an EG (or a degree of decentralisation), this research does not delve deeply into the latter. It does not test the relationship between EG and CP/CM. However, suffice to say here that results of the analysis could be influenced by this particular factor. Another limitation of the study is that it is mainly based on quantitative data from household and leadership questionnaires. The author's inability to be part of the survey team in all the countries made it impossible to obtain some qualitative data that could have corroborated and also enriched the quantitative data.

1.6 Organisation Of The Research

This research paper is divided into 6 chapters. Chapter two provides the conceptual framework based on which causalities of the variables related to the research hypotheses are investigated. It also discusses the indicators for assessing CP/CM as used in the research. The survey's empirical results in the 29 selected communities that represent independent variables of the four hypotheses are discussed in Chapter three and four. Chapter five reviews the hypotheses based on the analyses of empirical evidence from households' and community leaders' responses. The last chapter takes stock of the evidence generated from the hypotheses. It provides a synthesis of what can be described as best practises of CP/CM and then draws conclusions from the major findings.

CHAPTER TWO: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Introduction

“Development is perhaps more about critically reassessing our ways of understanding and looking at communities and getting a more in depth and thorough understanding of what makes communities tick and survive, often in face of impossible odds” (Peterse and Simone 1994:115). It also concerns the multiple layers of informal, non-linear and invisible tiers, which organise and exercise influence in communities. In this way, individuals, households and communities, determine what is possible, efficacious, and just for their own survival and the survival of the community as a whole. According to Peterse and Simone, once answers to these ways of looking and interpreting become clearer, or at least the complexities of the process more fully appreciated, it is more possible to comprehend the interactions among CD and governance. A broader understanding of these processes is attempted in this chapter using the concepts of community, CO, CP and CM within a conceptual framework that draws attention to the objectives, intensity and instruments of CD. It must be noted here that the concepts of CP and CM are discussed separately in the conceptual framework. This was done to give the two concepts a broader understanding, but in the subsequent text, they are not separated. The latter part of this chapter provides the theoretical and conceptual basis of determining causalities in the hypotheses. References are made to both earlier and current findings by researchers that relate to the hypotheses.

2.1.1 *The concept of Community*

The most common sense of the concept of community is that it involves people living in an area. However, Smit argues that “the notion of a community is always something of a myth. A community implies a coherent entity with a clear identity and a commonality of purpose. The reality is that communities, more often than not, are made up of an agglomeration of factions and interest groups often locked in competitive relationships” (Smit, 1990:1). In addition, Moser observes that at the policy level, the tendency has been to conceptualise “the community” in homogenous terms, and to assume that everyone is empowered, without clarification as to whether this refers to a spatial or a social grouping or to the local power structure (Moser, 1989:306). She argues that in urban areas where the community may vary in size from street to block to neighbourhood level, there is a tendency to assume that projects are for house owners exclusively, and consequently tends to exclude renters and squatters, who are therefore ignored in any community level decision making.

In this research, not only the people and the area are important but also the relationships, interdependencies, and interactions among them. This is because the internal structures of group relations, informal organisations, and institutions have certain characteristics, which allow each of these social entities to act as a unit. This means that

individuals, either in terms of numbers or characteristics, strongly influence community behaviour. Although community is a discrete social structure, this does not imply necessarily that all communities are alike. There are certain identifiable characteristics that are common to most communities for example, a system of organisation, occupation of the people, community structure etc. Each of these variables influences differently the social action taken by the community in defining and solving their problems. For example, it is a known fact that residents of informal settlements have to increasingly rely on their own initiatives on a self-help basis.

In other words, “community” can denote a social entity, organised in some fashion, however loose and informal. The residents might have a sense of common identity that transcends local geographical boundary. Given this description, community as a group of people with some traditional structural ties and associations, as Oakley puts it “can progressively transform their environment with the help of, but not dominated by, external agents” (Oakley, 1991:161). Another dimension that is important for research consideration, is the developmental process of communities in a wider economic, political, social, and cultural context. However, it must be emphasised that communities are not simply a locus for the provision of certain standards of shelter, water, and electricity. In this research it is taken that the presence or absence of these resources and standards certainly shape the everyday lives of residents, constituting parameters of what people can do, define tasks and interactions that promote their own process of CD.

2.1.2 Community Development (CD)

Conceptually, CD can be defined as the organisation of people in a settlement to deal themselves with problems and opportunities that affect their lives and patterns of living. It can therefore be described as a community-driven development process that involves groups of people at the community level (rural or urban) to come together to initiate collectively some action to improve their well-being. This seems to be the vision of society for CD - where each individual accepts personal responsibility for the well being of the community and each other.

The rationale for considering CD as a process is that, it begins before there are any specific substantive activities that represent programme. Residents build on this initial process and transform it into a substantive programme that improves their life. When considered as a movement, it can occur in the absence of consciously applied procedures that would represent method. Although participants may have an emotional commitment similar to that found in social movements, its operation at the community level does not have the scope usually associated with social movements. According to Vansan (1970), CD as a movement is a way of returning to the people a greater measure of control over their own destinies. This assessment can be described as optimistic and utopian. However, one thing is clear, considering CD as a process tends to focus upon the dynamics inherent in the interaction among community members or households who seek to deal with community change, and such interaction is present whenever CD occurs.

Among the common elements identified in these definitions are: community as the unit of action; community initiative and leadership as sources; the use of both internal and external resources; inclusive participation; an organised, comprehensive approach that attempts to involve the entire community; democratic, rational task accomplishment. Several criticisms have been levelled against these CD definitions. Among them are:

1. The CD strategies focused on local communities, mostly rural areas, and perceived as harmonious and homogenous units. "Little if any attention was paid to intra-communal differentiation based on class, gender and power"(Wils and Rijn, 1998:8). For instance Gittel argues that the process of CD is impeded by a variety of factors and forces that are inherent in the very nature of the community. The value system, the interdependence of elements and dimensions, powers, and the institutional and organisational structure of the community all serve to retard the process of change. (Gittel, 1980,36) Yet, at the same time, these factors may strengthen the process of development. Foster also pointed out that Community Development Programmes (CDP) are based on "unrealistic assumption that Third World rural communities are a homogenous, unfactionalized mass of co-operative persons who need only an outside motivator to initiate their communal development activities (Foster, 1982:190)
2. The CD strategies imply a micro-level approach taking local communities as autonomous social entities, that is, as worlds on their own, neglecting the wider socio-economic, political and institutional systems in which these communities are embedded.

In this research, the concept of CD implies a broad participation by members of the community to promote their own collective development. In fact, the concept is identified with or measured by many variables within the concepts of CO, CP/CM rather than by any other single variable like the mere attendance at meetings of CO. Following this, a baseline is provided for subsequent review on "why, who and how" of CP/CM as pointed out by Korten (1986). The reason being that any measure of CP/CM should be guided by the rationale behind the collective action, 'who' in the community conceived the idea, and 'how' the implementation of the idea is being conducted. Once answers to these questions are found, it becomes easier to assess its intensiveness.

2.1. 3 Community Participation (CP)

Focusing on the poor is one thing, bringing them together to actively participate in their own process of development is another (Bamberger, 1988, 9). "Participation" means different things to different people, and the term is often used to describe anything from political empowerment to cost recovery in service provision (UNCHS, 1991). Dudley argues that "with the realisation that the scale of the problem is too great for government to handle by conventional means, participation has become an economic necessity"(Dudley, 993:8). This has given impetus for many development actors and institutions to include CP in all their programmes at the grassroots level, however, with diverse aims. Among them are World Bank, UNDP, USAID, UNICEF, FAO, UNCHS, Local Governments, etc. The United States

International Co-operation Administration for instance defines CP:

“As process of social action in which people of a community organise themselves for planning and action; define their common individual needs and problems; execute these plans with a maximum reliance upon community resources; and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community (Foster, 1982:184)”

Governments and International Agencies generally describe CP less elaborately as a method to accomplish physical tasks both more cost- effectively and with a greater likelihood of sustainability. The UNCHS for instance believes that the active involvement of the community in the provision of its physical projects would enhance the sense of responsibility of the community for the operation and maintenance of the amenities, and this would result in a longer life span of the amenity (UNCHS, 1994). Yet, despite a commitment to the idea of CP and self-help, there is bewilderment as to how governments and development organisations can support it on a sufficient scale. The basic fallacy that most of these organisations made was to assume that there exist local structures within which participation takes place. According to Bwalya “even where they do exist, they are very weak” (Bwalya, 1985:183).

Recognition should also be given to the enormous amount of literature on the benefits of CP by authors like Oakley (1991), Esman and Uphoff (1984), Korten (1986), Stiefel & Wolfe (1994) etc. Most of the writings acknowledge that involvement of the people at the community level at an early stage is likely to improve design, and by giving the community a voice, better quality decision-making and programmes more closely tied to local needs will result. It ensures that full advantage is taken of local technology and knowledge deemed necessary for local development (McArthur, 1993); it motivates a sense of self-reliance (Bwalya, 1985). One underlying assumption which most of these authors share is that CP will ensure more equitable distribution of benefits and that politically or economically weaker groups will have access to project benefits and services. This latter objective, however, seems a mirage because general observations indicate that CP does not necessarily change or transform the power structure at the grassroots level that produces inequalities in distribution.

Notwithstanding this general observation, CP is revered by these writers, which raises a number of questions. According to Stone (1989), the term has clearly dominated and outlasted many other development “fads.” Yet, as with other fads, the impetuosity with which it is advocated has impeded critical examination and, in particular, the raising of questions about its cross-cultural viability. There is still no clear understanding of what constitutes meaningful and effective CP.

Moser (1983) came closer in describing the tenets of CP by distinguishing between participation as a ‘means’ and as an ‘end’. According to her, where participation is interpreted as a means, it generally becomes a form of mobilisation to get things done. This could be state directed (top-down mobilisation, sometimes enforced) to achieve development objectives, or bottom-up voluntary (community based) mobilisation to obtain a larger immediate share of

resources. The most frequent constraints of participation as a process according to Moser are operational obstacles such as inadequate delivery mechanisms and lack of social structures of local co-ordination. Where participation is identified as an end, the objective is not a fixed quantifiable development goal but a process whose outcome is meaningful participation in the development process, where the real objective is to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in a given social structure (empowerment). Here the problems are structural, that is, national and local institutions opposing each other, which most frequently limits participation. As Moser herself admitted later (Moser, 1989) in reality it is not the evaluation of participation either as a means or as an end which is important, but the identification of the process whereby participation as a means has the capacity to develop into participation as an end. This is the point of entry for the analysis of this research.

In this research, participation is not seen only as a management tool for the efficient execution of specific projects, but also as a part of a drive for more democratic residents' or households' involvement in the community's social, economic and political life. Each member of the community, from the specific context of their age, sex or activities, has a role to play and a contribution to make for everyone's common benefit. In other words, it involves households taking initiative and action that is stimulated by their own thinking and deliberations, and over which they can exert effective control. Progress will require internal and external support for the community, but the community must take charge of key decision-making on the process in a free, well-informed manner. This must be applied to each step that they take: analysis of priorities, programming of actions, follow-up, evaluation and ongoing feedback on the entire process. This means a fundamental change in building the new development model: No longer will people passively wait for the technicians or favour-pandering politicians to come around with solutions; rather, solutions are the outcome of participatory planning.

Furthermore, effective participation requires a sustained effort to build a viable organisation (Berner, 1997) capable of involving residents in the production of knowledge about their community, mobilising diverse sectors of the community to put forward their needs and aspiration. According to UNCHS (1988), CP requires a CO that has firm roots in the settlement's population, which represents the various segments of the population including minority groups, which functions as an open channel for the exchange of information and opinions between actors and beneficiaries. However, the effectiveness of participation depends on the managerial ability of the people, their leaders and their CO's.

2.1.4 Community Organisation (CO)

When left to solve their own problems, communities may organise to act spontaneously, often encountering unexpected difficulties. Nevertheless, advocacy of community interests cannot be delegated. Quiroga (1995) indicated that only the community can speak for itself, through organisation that is legitimately representative and cohesive, in order to make the community's collective wills into daily realities. According to Pieterse and

Simone (1994) CO acts as the embodiment of local aspiration and capacities while also acting as the mediator or advocate of local issues. In other words, CO is used to identify the way in which the community is organised to carry on its functions and activities rather than as some deliberate extra-community action programme that ceases once a physical object is completed.

It endeavours to represent the inhabitants of the community in their corporate relationships with the external world in general, and with the authorities whose decisions and actions affect their living conditions directly or indirectly. It must also be stated that CO are not necessarily formed by individuals in the same position with common interests, however, a form of common interest is important. Lee, argues that “ effective CO is a precondition for undertaking collective initiatives” (Lee, 1994: 164) whilst, Wils and Rijn, describe it as the “basic strategy to increase CP and mobilisation” (Wils & Rijn, 1998: 32).

However, many social scientists have questioned the ability of the most deprived groups in a society to organise or to participate even when there is no restriction on their participation. For instance, Berner observes a “close relation between the poor’s capacity to organise and their integration into, and ability to act in the urban environment” (Berner, 1997: 126). His research findings seem to confirm earlier research by Poethig (1972, 42). According to Boonyabancha et al.1988; Pornchokchai 1992; Yap 1992; Lee 1994; and Berner 1997; community under the threat of eviction needs to organise itself to be recognised and accepted as a credible negotiating partner, but few communities are able to do so without external support. Perlman (1976b) in her study of Brazilian favelas demonstrates that those “marginal” groups have to organise themselves to become an integral part of the system. Other research on neighbourhood organisations by Perlman 1976a; and Mollenkoff 1978, indicates that self-initiated, multi-functional community-development organisations are the more viable local initiators and implementers of CD. Gittel concluded that, “there seems to be little doubt that they are the more viable CO, and the most likely to expand in the future” (Gittel, 1980: 49).

However, the origin and formation of CO is still not clear. Some anthropologists have suggested that COs become more common and significant as societies advance in technology and complexity (Banton, 1957); others reject that thesis, pointing to the fact that COs are found in rural areas and non-industrialised nations.

In this research CO is referred to as voluntary association that represent all households and is independent from political or any other exclusionist groups of people in a community. The origin and its mode of formation are postulated to have positive correlation with how successful it functions.

2.1.5 Community Management (CM)

As a logical follow-up of CP, which may result in some hardware infrastructural facilities¹, there is the need to maintain and manage such facilities hence the importance of CM. CM is not only seen from the point of view of infrastructural facilities but also from the stand point of the various CO’s ability to handle, control, administer or carry on with decision

¹ Physical assets like school building, community centre, clinics etc.

making process which may not necessarily result in the provision of hardware. Such internal organisation demands proper organisational management with built-in systems of accountability; an agency that facilitates CP, and procurement and disbursement measures that support community authority. Confronting the residents with the possibility of participating in the decision-making process, the effect is to induce the people to 'risk' involvement in community affairs where before they could see no reason for doing so. This involvement is a social development that is vital to address community concerns, develop community spiritually, and embrace diversity.

Critical issues here are the system of information that is adopted in planning, monitoring and evaluation (PME). Other issues are the participative nature of PME, the role of leadership in both internal and external resource mobilisation, its networks with outside actors for example bargaining with state institutions etc. (Wils & Rijn, 1998). Additional issues that cannot be ignored are interpersonal communication networks of CL and members, conflict resolution and effective leadership. This implies that effective CM can not be pursued in an ad hoc manner. This is because to be effective, people especially, the poor must organise, and effective organisation requires resources, training and management, (Berner, 1997, 126). CM therefore goes beyond participation to empowering and equipping communities to own and control their own systems, and is the key to sustaining services for the poor (UNDP, 1990)

By involving communities in the decision- making process around a project, and giving them responsibility for the on-going management of the project, it is assumed that a sense of ownership is instilled, opportunities for wider community contribution are opened up and the likelihood of long-term success for the project is enhanced. CM is therefore an implementation strategy that links these two aspects of project development together. It involves the basic goal of responding to priority needs; to build confidence in local leaders in problem-solving skills; and organisational capacity; and to promote ownership and the care of local assets.

The major difference between CM and CD is that whereas CD is based on the active support of government, CM is built around passive support. A general observation is that the concept of CM has undergone a substantial change in the past decades, shifting from ideas of limited beneficiary participation in projects towards concepts of a more comprehensive role for communities in taking on functions previously undertaken by the state.

By far the most important facilitators in this respect are the COs that form the basic building blocks of popular action for CD. In this context, CO is defined as the associations of local people themselves with legitimacy, power and authority of leadership from the local people. It is made up of all households, the poor, the rich, minority groups etc. In principle, CM should attempt to empower all these households to build upon their institutions, identify local resources, prioritise needs, and negotiate with the powers that be on a development agenda which they will ultimately manage. However, this demands building effective and sustainable capacities at the community to deal with these predicaments. Nevertheless, it must be stressed that capacity building is primarily about money (equipment, offices, salaries etc.)

while volunteerism alone cannot sustain organisation. Mediocre COs are not expected to provide solutions to community problems, they rather tend to divide the community and worsen problems.

2.1.6 Indicators of Community Participation /Community Management

Though controversially, most households regard actual participation in terms of offering labour and material support to CO in order to have physical assets like school building and other infrastructural facilities provided. However, the reality of CP/CM as a process whereby participation as a means has the capacity to develop into participation as an end can not be assessed only by one indicator like offering labour at site or contributing material to have hardware provided. It must be seen as a continuous involvement right from the conceptual stage of the project to its implementation as well as continuous management. In this case, the following indicators (dependent variables) used in the questionnaire are considered no more than prerequisite for assessing intensive CP/CM.

1. Households' consideration of themselves as members of CO that represent the collective interests of all households. The assumption is that when households recognise themselves as members of CO, with the aim of responding together to a particular problem, logically, they are more committed to its development. This is because involvement in CO is seen as a significant means for actualising household's participation, particularly for households otherwise excluded from the process. However, the distinction between residents and actual members of CO is sometimes blur. As long as you are a resident, you are automatic member. A question arises here. Does the membership of a CO give households consent to participate in CD or it signifies acquiescence by simply conforming to the directives of leaders?
2. How often households' attend the collective meetings of the organisation? Affiliation to CO is one thing, and attending its collective meetings too is another. One of the ways to assess a household's commitment to CP/CP is the number of times the head attends meeting. The reason being that time is very precious to poor people, it will therefore take commitment for the poor to spend time attending meetings of CO.
3. Whether or not head of household participates in the planning of community activities? To avoid private goods being provided by collective action, it is imperative that households irrespective of socio-economic status participate in planning of community programmes. This is because individual households have their own interest and the likelihood that such interest will be extended to CO.
4. Whether or not spouse participates in planning activities of the community? Head of household's commitment to CO provides 'stimulus' for the spouse to also participate. In a situation where both participate, it increases the intensity to have collective activity provided with ease.
5. Whether or not many people participate in the deliberations of collective meetings of the community? CO can be hijacked by individuals or few core group of the community

members to champion their interest. In a situation where many people contribute to debate, it helps to bring all individual interests into collective interest. Negotiation and compromises are made. Nevertheless, this particular indicator is misleading, as it seems to imply that many people participating in meetings denote household is participating. This provides cause for researches to ask simple and unambiguous questions. On the other hand, it is not rejected because it provides indication of the magnitude of participation as a small participation indirectly signifies households disinterest in participation.

6. Households' recognition of the active participation of women as compared to men in community collective activities. This is because participation of women is argued to be very important for CD. According to Peterse and Simone, "the most successful community movements in the world have been driven and based on the strength and determination of women" (Peterse & Simone, 1994:102). This is based on the historic role women play in cohering and organising household relations and economics. Lee (1994) further supported the important role of women and argues that "the stereotype sexual division,...and the reality of women's triple burden means that the important role women play in CP is not recognised (Lee,1994:168).

2.2 Contextualization Of Hypotheses

This part of the conceptual framework provides an analytical and contextual framework of the four hypotheses developed in chapter one. It gives the causal relationships of the variables in each hypothesis as cited by researches and also by author's assumptions.

2.2.1 Socio- economic characteristics of households and CP/CM

In many studies of participation, one consistent finding has been the positive association of formal participation rates with certain variables that are measures of socio-economic and cultural characteristics of households'. Earlier research by Milbraith, 1965; Almond and Verba, 1963; Hausknect, 1962; and currently, by Lee, 1998, indicates that low socio-economic status as measured by income, education, and occupation has a negative correlation with rate of participation, membership in CO, and its subsequent influences on CP/CM. They made assumptions that low-class population is distinct from the larger community, have limited association with it, and prefer primary family relations. Hausknect explains that such populations feel powerless to change the institutions and processes that affect them and therefore remove themselves from active roles. In addition, he noted that, such groups have little time and or resources to partake in such outside activities, that do not directly provide livelihoods. Highlights of these researches indicates that:

1. Income is related to participation, and increased income brings high status. Low income would probably indicate longer working hours and therefore less time to participate. Lee argues that "poorer residents need to devote more time and resources to livelihood pursuits and have less opportunity to participate in community activities." (Lee, 1998:998). According to Omoka, "in terms of jurisdiction, community residents share a

common territory and language, but individuals in the lower social stratum and upper stratum are measurably distinct in each other's eyes." (Omoka, 1991: 83). He argues that activities geared to getting the means of life sustenance are typically preponderant in the life experience of the lower stratum. Matters other than those of so-called bread and butter typically tend to be of less interest to most members of this stratum.

2. Educational levels are highly significant in the extent, intensity, and pattern of participation. Participation increases with higher education. This is because organisational leadership tends to be heavily concentrated among the better educated in the community. A research by Gittel on the characteristics of CO and citizen participation indicates that "within CO, discrepancies exist between leaders and members: Leaders are generally more highly educated than members" (Gittel, 1980:111). Mutiso added, "the level of education in a community becomes an important criterion in CD because it influences the extent to which members can visualise alternatives to their present situation" (Mutiso, 1991: 125). He argued that people who have some education are more likely to be receptive to new ideas, and it is to be expected that CP will be more likely to occur in situations where members of a community have attained some level of education. Conclusion can therefore be drawn that intensive participation obviously requires communicative and human relational skills that must be learned; hence those who are better educated would be better equipped for participation.
3. Status of residence influences participation to some extent. There is a conventional belief that house owners are more active and responsive than house renters in community affairs since in most cases renters are migrant settlers, have no fixed assets, and have greater insecurity (Nelson, 1979, 250; Berner, 1997, 133). Their commitment to community collective action is therefore very little. This conventional belief is corroborated by Lee in his research in three Bangkok slum settlements, (Lee, 1998). According to Berner, when residents consider themselves as "being renters, is enough to stay away from CO" (Berner, 1997: 133). This is because renters feel discriminated against and discouraged from joining CO.

Other researches also propose cultural identity as the major influence on household's participation in CM. For instance, Olsen (1970) suggests that it is rather the feelings of identification with an ethnic community, stimulated by emphasis on identity and pride, which intensified participation among residents. Lee, (1998) supports this view also and concludes that cultural institutions are important in influencing the manifestation of community interests through people's organisations. He contended that society with a long tradition of tolerance on cultural diversity, independent organisations may thrive and even benefit from direct or indirect outside support.

Based on these current challenges and findings, further hypotheses are formulated to relate other socio-cultural characteristics of households. It is postulated in this research that socio-cultural characteristics of households like; the household size and type of family have

significant influences on CP/CM. However, researchers have not explored this. It is therefore hypothesised that:

4. In large households, the head will participate more in community activities than head of small household size. The assumption is that in LIS, where a household is large, the head tends to rely on collective or public goods² to cater for some of the household's needs. The 'breadwinner' will therefore participate intensively in order to have these goods provided by collective action. Small household heads are not enthused to participate in collective activities because they have little to gain by sheer size of their household.

5. The following hypothesis is based on the concept of reciprocity. That is, heads of extended family³ household participate higher in community activities than the head of nuclear family⁴. The assumption is that, the concept of reciprocity encourages people to see themselves as "each is one's keeper". So logically, heads of these households will transfer the idea of extended relationships into promoting collective action.

2.2.2 The structure and mode of formation of CO and its effect of CP/CM

The term "internal structure" as used in the hypothesis in chapter one refers to the internal organisation of community activities. It consists of how the CO was established to its objective and how leadership pursues this objective among others. According to Gittell (1980), the study of the structure of CD organisations provides an understanding to social interaction, and it is essential to the analysis of resident participation. A study by Pieterse and Simone, (1994) argues that the structure of CO facilitates a particular kind of mobilisation and organisation that promote local development. Ironically, current discussion and deliberations on CP place considerable stress on the communities taking control over their own destinies but often fail to highlight the structure of social differentiation and transgression among members of the community. According to Assad and Garas "CO can easily be hijacked by the more powerful individuals and families if considerable effort is not expended at the outset in creating structures of accountability and more complete participation by groups with less status and resources such as women, youth, members of minority group, and the poor" (Assad & Garas, 1994:60). Galjart for instance criticise the term target groups as used in community projects. He argues that it leads to an "erroneous assumption that members of CO forms a homogenous social groups" (Galjart 1982:5). This means that it has internal structures that their leaders and representatives can act on behalf of the group. This is supported by earlier findings by UNCHS research in CO and leadership in the community construction system in Sri Lanka which argues that "in order to undertake work effectively, a population needs to be organised and have elected and trusted leaders." (UNCHS, 1994:301). The following premises of the hypotheses are developed:

² Non-rival goods where exclusion is difficult.

³ Household set-up comprising other relatives like nephews, nieces, grand children, etc.

⁴ Household set-up comprising of only the head, spouse and children.

1. According to Bhatnager and Williams “CP/CM tends to be ineffective outside community organisational context and local organisations are crucial factors in development efforts” (Bhatnager and Williams, 1992:109). This research however, argues that it is not the organisation per se that is important but the structures it establishes. It therefore postulates that it is the democratic organisational structure that has correlation with high CP/CM. The reason is that where households see leadership as rotational, independent from political parties, consensus-seeking and sufficient information-sharing among all members etc, there is high CP because households are prepared to offer their services and resources to CD. In other words, developing collective responsibilities and a variety of roles for households’, building internal democracy, and training new and multiple leadership are prerequisite for CP& CM.
2. Leadership and membership are two most important variables in the internal structure of organisation. Committee type of leadership and voluntary membership of CO are expected to have positive correlation with high participation. This suggests that in communities where majority of households recognise the presence of CO as representative and see leadership as broad and inclusive, CP & CM will tend to be higher.
3. Concerning organisational structures for CP, OXFAM states that “credibility of an organisation depends on how effectively the membership can hold its leaders accountable; and how easily, therefore, can they be removed from office if they do not exercise their responsibilities in an acceptable way” (Oxfam, 1995:16). This suggests that household’s assessment of leaderships’ accountability and responsiveness has influence on how they participate in collective actions. And in cases where such assessment is negative, households will not participate.

Lee (1998) states that, formal structure of CO does not necessarily leads to strength and effectiveness. This is because according to his study in three slum communities in Bangkok, elected community leaders are recruited from a better-off members, because poorer residents need to devote more time and resources to livelihood pursuits and therefore have less opportunity to participate in community activities. Another implication is that outside actors tend to over rely on and be attached to this formal structure and neglect to work with the other parties in the communities. Thus, information, resources, and money become over-concentrated in the community committees. (Vorratnchaiphan, 1994). These committees are inclined to act in compliance with the implementing agency and not as a spearhead of the community people with a high degree of community spirit. It is therefore questionable whether these formally established community committee can be considered genuine communal representatives. According to Lee not only has the exploitative structure in many of these communities remained firmly entrenched with the establishment of such organisations but also, it has now become the legalised form of communal relationships.

In a rather extreme case, Peterse & Simone discredited the importance of community structure and contended that “often, as soon as apparently representative community structures are put in place, the intensity and scope of community organising declines, and thus

effective public participation.” (Peterse & Simone, 1994: 46). This is further sustained by findings of the UNCHS report on the community construction contract system in Sri Lanka: “in order to manage a settlement affairs, a community does not have to have a permanent organisation with a council consisting of a president, a secretary, a treasurer and several members who meet on regular basis”(UNCHS,1994: 30).

However, this research challenges these critical findings of Peterse & Simone, Lee, and UNCHS because without effective community structures⁵ attempts to monitor development processes are seldom effective as developers, community leaders, local elite and local authorities inevitably pursue their own interest. For instance, until structures are created to motivate and nurture corporate leadership, communities will find themselves inefficient in creating on-going social change. This is because without internal structures it is very hard to build a local consensus on matters of common concern, even despite the wish of local people to take responsibility for the future of their community. It also provides avenue for the legitimacy of CO. Furthermore, communication between community leaders (CL) and households’ turns to be difficult, as there are no formal means for including regular participation in planning. Community issues remain hidden because residents do not create and use channels to activate practical proposals. Residents begin to suspect that nothing can be achieved and adopt a fatalistic ‘wait-and-see’ attitude.

2.2.3 Sustainable CP/CM

While it is often convenient for external agencies to have ready-made, representative and accountable community structures to work with, it is important to recognise that the process of participation can create considerable disruption to the role of existing groups and their established relationships within a community. McArthur (1993) argues that without taking into account the relationships and conditions prevailing within the local community in question, it is unlikely that participation will be effective and sustainable. Effective and sustainable CP/CM are regarded as offering a better alternative to the development of low-income settlements (LIS) (Korten, 1986). However, the major concern is how to develop a CD process that is able to achieve the stability it needs to ensure continuity and not a flash in the pan that flickers and vanishes. In other words, what are the factors underlying CM that gives it longevity?

According to Cheema, and Rondinelli and Cheema, a number of conditions that seem to contribute to effective CP are: smallness of unit; strong leadership; threat to the survival of the settlement; homogeneity of the community; provision of framework by the government for CP; positive experience with past collective actions; similarities in perception of needs; information flows; training etc. (Cheema 1987:97-105; Rondinelli and Cheema, 1985:184-185). They contend that:

1. Where in the past a community has been able to safeguard common interests through collective action, residents tend to be more willing to devote their time and energy to

⁵ Elected leadership, organisation of meetings, organisational sub-committees, clear organisational goals etc.

promote community activities. It was reasoned that if people already have a tradition of forming CO at the local level to promote their own interests, they would be more likely to engage in CP/CM activities than if no such organisation existed. (Mutiso, 1991,123).

2. Communities that have strong leadership (representation and responsiveness) are more likely to be actively involved in decisions concerning the mobilisation of community resources and also their capacity to mobilise local people to put pressure from below and to negotiate with government officials. This will partly determine government decisions to provide services and facilities in their communities.
3. Creation by the government of a process of participation by community residents in programmes affecting them, with an early involvement of residents in the planning for services, based on credibility and trust between official and community, with adequate training will result in effective and sustainable CP.
4. Internally dependent organisations⁶ are less reliant on their leaders, and the leadership tends to be constantly rotating. According to Gittel, organisations in Low-Income Settlements (LIS) have strong dependence on external support and on staff and imposed leadership which contradicts their purpose and needs. Therefore for developing collective responsibility and a variety of roles for participation, building internal democracy is prerequisite. This enables leadership to be replaced for the purposes of ensuring probity and accountability and also to avoid leadership becoming the monopoly of individuals. It is therefore postulated that regular change of community leadership is correlated with effective and sustainable CP/CM. Other evidence that suggests the importance of building internal democracy in an organisation for effective CP/CM is given by Mcwilliams 1974; and Farrell, 1974. Mcwilliams pointed out that alternating leadership can attain internal democracy in CO and shared responsibility.
5. Class differentiation cannot be underestimated as a significant influence on the character and functions of COs. It is a fundamental fact for poor people that, as individuals, they lack access to power. The organisation provides a potential source of power if it pursues collective or group goals. Therefore in communities where majority of households do not recognise CO as pursuing collective goals CP/CM is not effective, hence its sustainability becomes shaky.

2.2.4 Type of settlement (Rural- Urban split) and its effect on CO, CP/CM

Most literature on the characteristics of rural and urban communities seems to suggest that the seemingly homogeneity and reciprocity of living in rural communities promote collective actions while in urban communities, ethnic heterogeneity and the need for economic survival promote individualism and therefore low household involvement in CP/CM. According to Lee, "the communal systems of exchange which are created on the principle of reciprocity and redistribution and not on market relations are, however, weakened in the urban

⁶ Organisations where leadership evolves from the community. The leadership does not require any extraordinary skills. In this case any member with little leadership qualities can become a leader.

context where neighbourhood continuity may be degraded, land and other resources are difficult to secure, social stratification is high, and constant involvement in the search for wage work destroys reciprocal and redistributive relationships. Translating the reality of urban life for the poor into active communities therefore faces many obstacles” (Lee, 1994: 163).

Furthermore, Ogu, in a study in infrastructure services in Benin City in Nigeria supported this assertion and further found out that in urban communities many migrants perceive their stay in the city as a “temporary affair” and are reluctant to contribute or participate in CD. Ogu contended that “many urban migrants have strong attachments to their rural homes and are ready to live with prevailing deteriorating conditions rather than make efforts to prevent deteriorating of the urban environment.” (Ogu, 1997: 209). The case study of community contract system in Sri Lanka also reveals that “unlike in rural areas, a simple loan provision programme for individual house builders is not enough to improve low-income housing conditions in urban areas. This is because urban poor in Sri Lanka live in settlement without formal land tenure to create sufficient security necessary for community involvement” (UNCHS, 1994: 4)

Based on these findings and premises, it is postulated that CP/CM is higher and more intensive in rural communities than urban communities. This is supported by Cheema and Rondinellis’ contentions that:

1. Where geographic and demographic unit is small, effective CP is likely to take place;
2. Where the residents in a LIS have some degree of homogeneity and harmony and share common goals and perceptions they are more likely to participate in the community activities. Heterogeneity within the community usually leads to factionalism and lack of adequate interest in the community’s affairs. According to UNCHS, “If a population is not sufficiently homogenous (ethnically, economically or otherwise), it may not have sufficient internal strength to maintain a level of organisation adequate to carry out work, handle finance and co-operate and co-ordinate.”(UNCHS, 1994:30). Hence effective CP becomes none-starter or short-lived. Narayan and Ebbe support this argument. They argued that in Africa, ethnic heterogeneity is negatively associated with growth even after controlling for such variables as political stability and a range of monetary policies. (Narayan and Ebbe 1998, 12)
3. In urban communities occupation is a major determinant of both rates and types of formal participation. This is less applicable to rural areas where there is less differentiation by occupation.

Smit, also added that “successful CD overcome the problems associated with community heterogeneity by their focus on small groups which are brought together through common interest. In this way small group work can be a successful vehicle for acceptance of a project within the wider community”(Smit, 1990:1). Stone defended this thesis and observed that “villagers’ perspectives on the process of development reflect their own social organisation and ideology which emphasise human interdependence and personal relationships so they perceive that ‘development’ will work that way” (Stone, 1989: 210).

However, the premises of the hypothesis that where geographic and demographic unit is small, effective CP is likely to take place seems to be challenged by Berner (1997) in a research in 5 cities in Metro-Manila. He suggests that “densely populated settlements foster interaction among neighbours and while these high pressure contacts can lead to conflict, they also create social capital which reflect in mutual help, protection and cohesion, voluntary organisations, some form of governance, a common lifestyle, a sense of shared history and identity” (Berner, 1997:x)⁷

Certainly, some of these findings have elapsed beyond time. But they continue to be a major guideline for development interventions. Follow-up analyses of 29 communities elucidates some of these postulations and identify the extent to which they are accepted and included in the tool kit of development actors and also into academic field.

CHAPTER THREE: SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC BACKGROUND OF RESEARCH COMMUNITIES AND HOUSEHOLDS' SAMPLE

3. Introduction

This chapter provides background information on socio-economic and demographic profile of households in the research communities. The first section analyses the socio-economic peculiarities of households while the second part draws distinction between urban and rural communities and how households in each of the two communities perceive CO and CP/CM. The communities are described individually only in those aspects in which their households' characteristics do not resemble one another; otherwise, they are described collectively. Most of the communities have CDP initiated and implemented by the people themselves and assisted financially and logistically by UNCHS. It must be pointed out, moreover, that although there are occasional significant differences between UNCHS project communities and Non-UNCHS communities with regards to some variables, such differences cannot be attributed to the presence of UNCHS programme. This is because most of the communities have not been without similar interventions by other external agencies like the Municipality, International and Local NGOs, and International Projects etc.

3.1 Socio-Economic Profile of Households

The 31 research communities provide several similar socio-economic characteristics that make them comparable though we can not assume that they are homogenous. Some of the communities have peculiar households' characteristics that make them distinct from others. Having established this, one may expect that any significant differences between them can be at least partially influence CP/CM.

⁷ Quoting from Mary Racelis' foreword

This section introduces descriptive analysis of the 5 socio-economic variables (independent variables) related to the first hypotheses. A number of socio-economic variables specified in the household questionnaire were analysed and comparisons made between communities. They include occupational and income status of household; educational level of head of household; housing status of household; family type; and household size. Synthesis tables of these variables and statistical differences using Pearson's chi-square are provided. Statistical Significance ranges from 0-9%.

3.1.1 Occupation and Income of Households

The living and working conditions of the people are not different from any other cities and rural communities in developing world. Majority of the rural dwellers are subsistence farmers while in the urban communities, though there is high unemployed labour force, majority engaged in informal income generating activities like petty trading, carpentry, usury, household-based repairing and manufacturing goods, etc. Average household income per month⁸ ranges from US\$27 of the poorest community (Asankra- Breman in Ghana), to the highest household income community US\$481 (Candelaria in Bolivia). Though there are household income differentials in the communities, one cannot use the absolute income alone to compare the standard of living between the communities in different countries. However, given the irregularity of income, general low average household incomes, and deplorable habitat indicators⁹, all the communities can be described as poor. The people's daily life evolves very much around the tasks of meeting the basic needs of food, health care, water, and clothing.

The synthesis analysis as shown in table 1 indicates significant statistical differences (Chi -square) of income between households in communities of Ghana and Uganda. For instance, while in the same country (Ghana) an average income per month of a household in Asankra-Breman is equivalent to US\$ 27, households in Akrade and Ahibenso have US\$125 and US\$89 respectively.

Table 1: Occupational and Income Status of Households (N= number of Head of Households respondents)

Description	Occupation (%)					Household Income US \$ per month	Difference Significance	
	OSF	SE	SW	SF	O		occupation	income
GHANA:								
Asankra-Breman (n=15)	7	13	0	80	0	27	.001	.043
Moseaso (n=15)	0	0	27	73	0	29		
Ahibenso (n=18)	0	0	11	89	0	89		
New Akrade (n=15) ¹⁰	13	33	40	14	0	125		
Akim Kotokuom (n=12)	0	0	33	67	0	81		
Asuboi (n=28)	11	14	4	71	0	52		
ZAMBIA:								

⁸ Local currencies in equivalent US dollars using the current official exchange rate at the time of data collection (Jan, 1997)

⁹ Habitat indicators are used in this research to connote households access to social facilities or services like potable drinking water, good housing and clean health, security, etc.,

¹⁰ Akrade, though classified as rural community in terms of demographic, it has urban socio -economic features

Linda (n=15)	0	40	40	7	13	74		
Bauleni (n=24)	4	38	46	4	8	81		
Chainda (n=15)	0	63	29	0	8	93	.128	.788
Katondo (n=15)	0	80	20	0	0	55		
Kawana (n=24)	4	92	4	0	0	83		
UGANDA:								
Kiswa (n=12)	0	38	38	0	24	152		
Nakawa (n=14)	20	40	15	13	12	77		
Kiwatule (n=15)	8	54	15	8	15	172		
Kikandwa (n=15)	7	33	7	27	26	35	.017	.027
Namigavu (n=14)	0	60	7	33	0	59		
Buyende (n=14)	7	33	7	26	27	38		
BOLIVIA:								
Candelaria (n=12)	8	67	25	0	0	481		
Hiroshima (n=12)	18	54	28	0	0	435		
Gamoneda (n=12)	0	0	0	100	0	-		
Horosas (n=12)	75	0	8	17	0	295	.000	.154
Tolomosita (n=12)	9	9	0	73	9	135		
Coimata (n=12)	0	0	54	46	0	125		
ECUADOR:								
Pisuli (n=23)	25	25	45	0	5	143		
Atucucho (n=21)	5	28	52	5	10	183		
Coop. Nacione (n=20)	21	37	26	0	16	193		
Mapasinque (n=19)	11	72	11	0	6	153	.017	.466
St. Maria Vergel (n=13)	9	55	18	9	9	109		
San Isidro (n=19)	21	5	68	5	1	168		

OSE= Owner Small Firm SE= Self-employed SW= Salary Worker SF= Subsistence Farmer O= Others

In Uganda also, households in Kiswa and Kiwatule earns four times the income of households in Kikandwa. Some of these income differentials could be attributed to the type occupation of households. It is postulated that any significant difference in household income will have correlation with variables of CP/CM. So that heads of households with high incomes are expected to partake higher in CP/CM than heads of low-income households.

3.1.2 Educational level of Households

Educational status of majority of the respondents is very low. Although there are few communities like Akrade in Ghana, Kiwatule in Uganda and Coop. Nacione in Ecuador, where more than 55% of households heads have at least secondary school education (table 2), it can generally be agreed that majority of the people have only primary school

Table 2: Educational Status of Households

Description	Illiteracy (%)	Primary (%)	Secondary and above (%)	Difference Significance
GHANA:				
Asankra-Breman	40	60	0	.000
Moseaso	29	57	14	
Ahibenso	55	33	12	
New Akrade	20	7	73	
Akim Kotokuom	60	25	15	
Asuboi	57	16	27	
ZAMBIA:				

Linda	33	40	27	
Bauleni	23	38	39	.234
Chainda & Katondo	12	72	16	
Kawana	17	83	0	
UGANDA:				
Kiswa	8	50	42	
Nakawa	14	43	43	
Kiwatule	13	30	57	
Kikandwa	20	53	27	.098
Namigavu	21	65	14	
Buyende	50	36	14	
BOLIVIA:				
Candelaria	8	50	42	
Hiroshima	8	42	50	
Gamoneda	17	83	0	.004
Horosas	0	92	8	
Tolomosita & Coimata	8	92	0	
ECUADOR:				
Pisuli & Atucuchu	4	57	39	
Coop. Nacione	6	33	61	
Mapasinque	0	61	39	.014
St. Maria Vergel	0	93	7	
San Isidro	10	85	5	

education. Moreover, illiteracy is also predominant. For instance, table 2 shows that in Akim Kotokuom and Asuboi in Ghana, and Buyende in Uganda, at least, 50% of heads of households are illiterates. Such educational characteristics of head of households do not differ statistically from the educational achievement of spouses. Differences in education seem to reflect in differences in occupation and income in some of the communities especially in Ghana.

3.1.3 Housing Status (Ownership and Renters)

Land ownership is fragmented among the communities. In the Ghanaian communities for instance, land is basically traditionally owned. Allodial title¹¹ to land is held by chiefs who serve as trustees or custodians of the land serving the interest of the entire community. Since all the communities are rural, all residents (natives and migrants) have easy access to land for building purposes. In Uganda, land ownership is a mixture of municipal authorities, private individuals and traditional or clan authorities. For example, in the urban communities of Kiswa, Kiwatule and Nakawa, land is owned by the Municipality, while in Kikandwa, most land is privately owned. In the Latin American communities, land is largely privately owned. Tenants and other migrants, however acquire land from the land-owing group who make conditional grants of land for various consideration some of which are outright purchase, lease and other forms of agreement. The land tenure system influences housing plight of residents. For instance in San Isidro and St. Maria del Virgil, more than 80% of the residents who own houses have legal title to their plot while in Pisuli and Atucuchu in the same country, about

¹¹ The right to use land

68% and 75% respectively have no title to their plot. Also at least 25% of these house owners have no users' right, enumeration card or any other basis of security in occupying the plot of land. This type of insecurity in part affect the nature and pattern of social or CO, which in turn also influences the extent to which residents, respond to their development needs.

Results of the analysis of housing status indicate that households in the communities can be divided into 2 major groups: Renters and house owners. However, there is third group of house occupants like caretakers and free occupants whose status is tied to family relationships, etc. It is postulated that house renters have little incentive to participate in CM. Although the analysis in table 3 reveals that majority of the respondents are house owners, in Akrade in Ghana and Kiswa in Uganda, about 47% and 71% of heads of households respectively are renters. Any significant differences in the indicators of CP/CM from these respondents could partially be attributed to these differences in housing status.

Table 3: Housing Status of Households

Description	Owners (%)	Renters (%)	Others (%)	Difference Significance
GHANA:				
Asankra-Breman	80	7	13	.000
Moseaso	73	13	14	
Ahibenso	83	0	17	
New Akrade	33	47	20	
Akim Kotokuom	42	0	58*	
Asuboi	76	13	11	
ZAMBIA:				
Linda, Katondo & Chainda	80	20	0	.480
Bauleni	54	46	0	
Kawana	62	33	5	
UGANDA:				
Kiswa	14	71	15	.000
Nakawa	60	33	7	
Kiwatule & Namigavu	93	7	0	
Kikandwa	69	25	6	
Buyende	100	0	0	
BOLIVIA:				
Horosas	83	8	9	.416
Candelaria & other 5 communities	100	0	0	
ECUADOR:				
Pisuli & St. Maria	86	14	0	.410
Atucucho	90	5	5	
Coop. Nacione & Mapasique	100	0	0	
San Isidro	79	5	16	

* Majority of them are free occupants (because of extended family ties)

3.1.4 Family Type (Extended and Nuclear Families)

Traditionally, all the communities comprise several families which are usually related, as well as others including migrants. One can observe a network of social relations between people based on identifiable lineage. It usually begins along the lines of families, wards, and clans. And recently, associations of people practising the same vocation or trade. This type of

indigenous lineage have great influence on the way households organise themselves to tackle collective problem. For instance, in the communities in Uganda, families are strictly obliged to provide both material and psychological support to the bereaved family. A family, which defaulted, faced very severe sanctions. In Ghana, rotating labour-sharing group¹² still persists, though this time not along only families, but friends. In Bolivia and Ecuador, families still count on relations of household reciprocity for sowing, harvesting and other tasks involving collective action.

The synthesis analysis as shown in table 4 reveals 2 main types of family lineage.

Table 4: Household Set-up (Family Type)

Description	Nuclear (%)	Extended (%)	*Others (%)	Difference Significance
GHANA:				
Asankra-Breman & Ahibenso	47	40	13	.169
Moseaso	40	33	27	
New Akrade	20	67	13	
Akima Kotokuom	8	67	25	
Asuboi	23	40	37	
ZAMBIA:				
Linda	40	47	13	.000
Bauleni	38	54	8	
Chainda	52	44	4	
Katondo	40	53	7	
Kawana	33	42	25	
UGANDA:				
Kiswa	21	50	29	.752
Nakawa	7	47	46	
Kiwatule & Buyende	33	53	14	
Kikandwa	19	50	31	
Namigavu	27	40	33	
BOLIVIA:				
Candelaria	42	33	25	.215
Hiroshima & Tolomosita	58	33	9	
Gamoneda & Coimata	83	8	9	
Horosa	75	25	0	
ECUADOR:				
Pisuli , St. Maria & Atucucho	74	4	22	.284
San Isidro	63	26	11	
Coop. Nacione	93	0	7	
Mapasique	80	5	15	

*These include household members like housemaids, labourers, family friends, and others who have no family or relative connections.

They are nuclear¹³ and extended types of families. The extended families have similar characteristics associated with neighbourhood reciprocity. Since collective activities have commonality with reciprocity in extended family relationship, it is assumed in this research that head of households with higher percentage of its members being outside the nucleus family, will participate higher in CP/CM. This is because, such people are expected to extend the idea

¹² A system whereby individuals arrange in such a way that each takes turn to provide farm labour free of charge to its neighbour.

¹³ Household made up of only the head, spouse and children.

of caring for long relationships into providing for collective actions. Table 4 indicates that extended family is the predominant type in most of the African communities while nuclear family dominate in Latin America. However, significant differences in this type of families exist in households in Zambia communities.

3.1.5 Household Size

The size of household also takes the same form as family type. The need to care for many persons in the household is assumed to render more intelligible response to community collective action. It is therefore assumed that head of households with higher household sizes will participate higher in CM. This is based on the concept of reciprocity as discussed earlier in the context of family types. Table 5 indicates that with the exception of Bolivia where household sizes are relatively homogenous, in the other communities,

Table 5: Average Household Size (N= number of Head of Households respondents)

Description	Community Average household size	Mean Average	Difference Significance
GHANA:			
Asankra-Breman	5.4	6	.000
Moseaso	6.1		
Ahibenso	7.9		
New Akrade and others	6.4		
ZAMBIA:			
Linda	5.6	5	.000
Bauleni	6.1		
Chainda & Kawana	4.9		
Katondo	5.3		
UGANDA:			
Kiswa	6.7	6	.028
Nakawa	5.4		
Kiwatule	7.1		
Kikandwa	5.1		
Namigavu & Buyende	5.6		
BOLIVIA:			
Candelaria & Coimata	5.3	5.4	.522
Hiroshima	5.7		
Gamoneda	6.0		
Horosas & Tolomosita	5.0		
ECUADOR:			
Pisuli & St. Maria	4.3	5	.081
Atucucho	5.1		
San Isidro	6.2		
Coop. Nacione & Mapasique	5.5		

Households' sizes vary significantly. For instance, in Ghana, while the average household size is 6 for all the communities, it is almost 8 in Ahibenso in the same country. In Uganda also, Kiwatule have exceptionally high household size (7.1 persons) different from the other communities.

3.2 Demographic & Cultural Characteristics of Research Communities

Demographically, 2 types of communities can be found. They are the remote rural areas and urban communities. Rural-Urban split is considered only in specific country context in the form of physical location, proximity and accessibility, occupational structure, ethnic heterogeneity of settlement, and population size. For example, in Ghana, all the communities are classified as rural because of demographic reasons (country context) although, Akrade has unique socio-economic characteristics that can be described as semi-urban. Most of the research communities are remote rural settlements. Some of them are Buyende and Namigavu in Uganda, St. Maria and San Isidro in Ecuador, and Coimata and Tolomosita in Bolivia.

Among the urban communities are the transient heterogeneous parish of Nakawa, Kiwatule and Kiswa in peri-urban fringe of Kampala, the capital city of Uganda; Candelaria and Hiroshima, in Cochabamba, a municipality in Bolivia; Atucucho and Pisuli, in Quito, the capital city of Ecuador and the former squatter settlements of Bauleni, Chainda, and Linda in Lusaka, the capital city of Zambia. It must be stated here that until recently, most of the urban settlements were described in their country as informal or squatter settlements. (UNCHS, 1998).

However, in all the communities, there are other ethnic groups. These minority groups interact and fuse together with the majority in all socio-cultural and economic activities without any clear ethnic demarcation though isolated instances could be found. For instance, the Ghanaian communities can be described as homogenous to a very large extent in the sense that they are inhabited by predominantly people of the Akan descent. The few minority groups like the Ewes in Akrade are engaged predominantly in lakes fishing while the Krobos in Kotokuom are engaged in production of local gin. The urban communities however, have some elements of ethnic heterogeneity. The free interaction of different ethnic groups augurs well for effective managing of collective projects.

The quality of housing indicates several similarities of lack or inadequate access to services like potable drinking water, sanitary conditions, drainage facilities etc., considered as vital in human settlement. Considering all these factors as constituting Habitat in totality, the difference between the urban and rural communities could be described as marginal but differentiated. Differentiated because the urban communities have higher level of services that the rural communities do not have, though the quality might not be better. This suggests that in both categories of communities, the quality of housing remains relatively poor and access to facilities is not good either. However, households in these communities have different perceptions on CP/CM. This part of the analysis covers only 3 countries where clear rural and urban communities are distinguished.

3.2.1 Perception by Rural-Urban Households on CO and CP/CM

It is assumed that the concept of neighbourhood reciprocity that is found in the social structure of rural communities originates from their positive perception on collective action.

Rural dwellers have more commitment to collective activities than urban dwellers. Table 6 indicates some similarities and differences in perceptions between rural and urban households.

Table 6: Rural-Urban Perception on Stimulating Factors of CP/CM (Responses from households)

Description	UGANDA			BOLIVIA			ECUADOR		
	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.
Initiatives by government in LIS do not work and will not be maintained afterwards, unless the people actively participate?									
Agree	83	87		4	58		42	46	
Disagree	17	13	.699	96	42	.000	58	54	.096
Only the Government is really able to improve LIS?									
Agree	21	28		91	26		74	87	
Disagree	79	72	.389	9	74	.000	26	13	.017
People in LIS can overcome problems like apathy, division and corrupt leadership only with outside assistance?									
Agree	27	56		96	100		95	94	
Disagree	73	44	.016	4	0	.188	5	6	.767
People in LIS have no capacity to improve their settlement?									
Agree	41	72		100	97		84	84	
Disagree	59	28	.003	0	3	.441	16	16	.647
A plan developed by a CO should be accepted as the basic guideline for government support?									
Agree	89	98	.081	96	93	.486	79	80	.932
Disagree	11	2		4	7		21	20	

However, it generated into striking differences between the rural-urban split in Latin American Communities and Africa communities. Plausible reason could be the level of decentralisation in these countries. In Uganda, both the urban and rural households have many similar perceptions. Overwhelming majority of the people irrespective of their settlement agree that it is not only government that is really able to improve LIS, and that initiative by government do not work and will not be maintained afterwards, unless the people actively participate. They also believe that a plan developed by CO should be accepted as the basic guideline for government support. The significant difference between the two is their perception on the capacity to improve their own settlement. While majority of urban households believe that they have the capacity to improve their own settlement and that they can overcome their own internal problems like apathy, division and corrupt leadership without necessary looking for outside assistance, overwhelming majority of rural dwellers disagree.

The analysis also indicates that, in Latin America, households share similar view about their inability to improve their settlements. This is regardless of ones place of residence. Overwhelming majority of the households believe that people LIS have no capacity to improve

their settlement, and that they can overcome their internal problems only through outside assistance. Nevertheless, they believe that if CO is able to prepare a plan, it should be accepted as the basic guideline for government support. The important difference between urban and rural dwellers, is however their perception on the role of government in LIS. In the urban communities, significant majority of households believe that initiative by government in LIS will work and be maintained afterwards, even if the people do not actively participate. This is however, disagreed by rural dwellers. Notwithstanding this, it can be concluded from the three countries that in terms of 'stimulating' variables, urban households have a clear understanding of the current concepts of CP/CM than rural dwellers. However, having positive perceptions on current concepts of CP alone is not enough to suggest that one might contribute to CP/CM.

3.2.2 Leadership Split in Rural-Urban Communities

A critical examination of the types of leadership in the two communities indicates that in relative percentages, urban dwellers consider leadership as strong and centrally controlled, while rural dwellers consider leadership as group or committee type. Though statistically, this split of leadership is prevalent only in Bolivia communities, a pattern emerges where this difference translate into how leadership is seen and described by households as shown in table 7.

Table 7: Rural-Urban Split in the Structure Community leadership.

Description	UGANDA			BOLIVIA			ECUADOR		
	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.
1. Does leadership seek consensus among all members?									
YES	69	61	.408	46	100	.000	92	93	.820
NO	31	39		54	0		8	7	
2. Does leadership changes									
Regularly	32	16		83	81		20	10	
Sometimes	43	40		9	17		0	0	
Remains the same	25	44	.220	8	2	.315	80	90	.778
3. Describe Organisational Leadership?									
Strong Central Leaders	43	36		96	35		42	28	
Group or Committee Type	41	58		4	42		44	72	
Passive Leadership	16	6	.234	0	23	.000	14	0	.677
4. How do you consider the responsiveness of leadership?									
Very Responsive	48	53		41	50		65	49	
More or Less Responsive	40	35		17	48		29	31	
Little Responsive	12	12	.863	42	2	.000	6	20	.175
5. Do you consider leadership accountable to members?									
YES	80	64		84	98		76	90	
NO	20	36	.233	16	2	.002	24	10	.125

From table 7 it could be observed that differences in how urban and rural households perceive their leadership is marginal and can hardly be used as the basis for any differences in households' participation in CM.

From the foregoing analysis, it has been demonstrated that in terms of socio-economic and demographic terms, the communities are not homogenous members of people (individual, households, families, etc.). Stratification like these has pertinence on individuals' sense of community identity and their involvement in CP/CM affairs.

CHAPTER FOUR: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION / COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT

4. Introduction

The internal problem in the communities of solidarity and cohesion vis-à-vis a differentiation affect issues related to the question of 'who' participate and 'how' (channels of representation in decision-making; local planning, monitoring and evaluation) of participation. This chapter provides an analysis of CP/CM in the research communities. It is divided into two sections. The first section describes the internal structure of COs as they pursue collective development of the communities. The second part delve into examining how sustainable are some of their CP/CM practices from households' point of view.

4.1 Structure of CO and its effects on CP/CM

All the communities have seen notable development activities taken place in recent years in partnership with external agencies. This has been in the form of housing, physical infrastructure and services, sanitation, water, etc. In the traditional approach, emphasis was placed on community labour and material contribution while excluding the communities from the decision-making process. However, there has been in these communities, some spontaneous development of indigenous instrument and procedures for the development of infrastructure without external intervention. In most instances, this form of participation or internal organisation has been spearheaded by some form of COs that could be described as flabby in their developmental activities.

For instance in the urban communities of Latin America and Zambia, COs & CM that existed tended to be more ad hoc; they are primary informal arrangements. Only when the threat of eviction becomes imminent and materialises does the COs start to function effectively. The recent formation of resident development committees is a crucial turning point in some of the communities' development process. This committee is believed to represent the interest of all households, so every household is supposed to be a member by virtue of being a resident in the community. It is the committees that co-ordinate and mobilises the residents to participate in development projects and serve as a link between the local authorities, external development organisations and communities. The committees are now responsible for

initiating local development programmes. However, households' recognition and perception about their CO's vary from community to community. This stems from how the whole organisation was established to its mode of selection of leadership and how leadership undertakes and organises collective activities. The internal structure of committees includes the chairperson, sometimes very influential in the community, the secretary, treasurer, and other executive members. The local leaders act as key opinion leaders and exert considerable influence over the 'consciousness' of residents. For example, they frequently play a major role in shaping people's perceptions. They also play important role in the community's interpretation of events, by relaying their perceived reality of situation, either in support of, or against and even sometimes personalised local issues.

To establish the internal structure of CO, the following variables were analysed: reasons for the establishment of CO; who established it; the statutes, regulatory, and legality of the organisation; how long has the CO been established; the type of leadership and whether it changes. Other variables are the mode of selection of leadership; information dissemination and consensus seeking among members; the presence of sub-committee, etc.

4.1.1 Origin and Goal establishment of CO

The origin and goal establishment of CO affect the internal structure of CO. The analysis indicates that majority of households recognise the presence of CO as representing their interest. However, there are significant differences between households with regards to the origin of CO. For instance, while overwhelming majority of households in most of the communities believe that CO was established by the settlers themselves without any influence from outside agencies, a stunning majority of households in New Akrade and Coop. Nacione however, believe that CO was established by International NGO to enable some community members to be mobilised and trained for CD. (See table 8). Also, Municipal and National Government have a greater influence in the establishment of CO in Kiswa, Buyende, etc.

Table 8: Composite index of significant differences in the origin of CO (responses from households)

Description: Who brought about the establishment of CO?	Settlers Themselves %	Residents & Outsiders %	Municipal & Government %	International NGOs %	Others *	Sig. Diff.
GHANA:						
Ahibenso	28	27	23	0	22	.000
New Akrade	29	7	0	50	14	
Other 4 Communities	100	0	0	0	0	
ZAMBIA:						
Linda	18	45	9	9	19	.000
Bauleni	30	45	0	18	7	
Chainda	0	5	8	82	5	
Kawana	5	20	0	25	50	
Zam-compound	6	24	44	6	20	
UGANDA:						
Kiswa, Buyende & Kikandwa	0	21	79	0	0	.003
Nakawa	20	7	46	0	27	
Kiwatule	40	20	13	14	13	
Namigavu	7	20	27	7	39	

For instance, while majority of households in Asankra-Breman, Moseaso, New Akra and Asuboi describe their leadership as group or committee type that is opened to everybody. About 86% of households in Ahibenso and Akim Kotokuom see their leadership as strong and centrally controlled. In Tolomosita, Coimata and Zambia-Compound majority of households perceive their leadership as passive. It is postulated that since CO embraces the interest of all households, a committee type of leadership will encourage more household participation.

On how leadership is selected among all residents, it is postulated that democratically elected leadership provides encouragement for intensive CP/CM. The analysis shows that organisational leadership is selected among members who present themselves independently. However, there are significant differences in households' opinion on how the election of leadership was pushed through. Table 12 indicate that while in Linda, Chainda and Kawana, about 73% of households believe that the election of leadership was pushed through by the whole community, in Zambia-Compound and Bauleni, it was pushed through by small core group. The Latin America communities produce homogenous responses that indicate that the whole community pushes through election.

Table 12: Composite index of significant differences in how election is organised. (responses from households)

Description: How was the election pushed through?	Whole community (%)	Small core group (%)	Sig. Diff.
GHANA:			
Akade & Asuboi	75	25	.000
Other communities	100	0	
ZAMBIA:			
Linda, Chainda and Kawana	73	27	.000
Zambia-Compound and other	34	66	
UGANDA:			
Namigavu	60	40	.089
Other communities	93	7	

Households who feel slighted therefore sit-back when their services are needed for collective action.

Democratic leadership is assumed to be rotating. In the 31 CO's, change of leadership tends to follow 3 patterns as indicated in table 13. There are significant differences between communities on the way households see change of leadership. For instance in Chainda, leadership has remained the same over years while in Candelaria and Gamoneda leadership changes frequently.

Table 13: Composite index of significant differences of how leadership changes in CO (responses from households)

Description: Does leadership changes in CO?	Regularly (%)	Only sometimes (%)	Remains the same (%)	Sig. Diff.
GHANA:				
Asankra-Breman & Moseaso	67	33	0	.000
Ahibenso other Communities	8	82	10	
ZAMBIA:				
Linda	56	33	11	.000
Bauleni, Kawana, & Zambia-Compound	40	50	10	
Chainda	28	4	68	
UGANDA:				
Kiswa	57	29	14	.038
Nakawa & Buyende	13	67	20	

Kiwatule & others	14	30	56	
BOLIVIA:				
Tolomosita	50	50	0	.047
Other Communities	93	5	2	
ECUADOR:				
Pisuli & San Isidro	45	24	31	.056
Other Communities	74	20	6	

4.1.4 Sub-Committee of CO

In most of the communities CO is often the only institution through which individuals gain leadership experience. Sub-committees offer the members opportunity to lead particular unit of the activities of CO. One such committee is women sub-organisation. Participation of women is found to be very important for community's cohesiveness. The presence of sub organisation for women is not only seen as democratic but also logically important for organisational development. However, the analysis as shown in table 14 indicates that households in some of the communities do not recognise the presence of this committee. For example in Hiroshima and Tolomosita there is no women sub- organisation

Table 14: Composite index of significant differences in Women-sub committee

Description: Do women have sub-organisation of their own?	NO	YES	Sig. Diff.
GHANA:			
Asankra-Breman & Asuboi	62	38	.062
Other Communities	25	75	
ZAMBIA:			
Bauleni & Kawana	30	70	.000
Other Communities	78	22	
UGANDA:			
Kiswa, Kiwatule & Nakawa	21	79	.001
Other communities	83	17	
BOLIVIA:			
Hiroshima & Tolomosita	100	0	.000
Other communities	8	92	
ECUADOR:			
Pisuli & St. Maria	71	29	.000
Atucuchu & others	25	75	

while in Akrade and Kotokuom, households recognise the presence of such sub-organisation. It is believed that such organisation encourages and nurtures women active involvement in community activities.

The foregoing analysis indicates communities of different organisational structures from households' perspective. Households' recognition of such differences affects their participation in community activities. However, this depends on how influential these variables have on their perception. The extent to which these variables influence their attitude determines how sustainable they will continue to offer their services.

4.2 Effective and Sustainable Community Participation /Community Management

The communities have long history of involvement in the development of collective projects. It has been traditionally practised out of necessity, and for some decades, national

development programmes have supplemented it, which, to some extent, can be effective in meeting basic needs when programmes are linked to local traditional organisations. The common form of CP in the communities has often been associated with mutual self-help. Residents in the localities have been mobilised by their local leaders to achieve a desired goal. It is through this voluntary involvement of residents that all the communities have through various ways undertaken collective measures to improve their human settlements.

In the African communities, many brands of resident involvement include local burial assistance, rotating labour-sharing group, youth organisations etc. are being practised. This form of participation doubtless served as a basis for organising contributions to community projects. Participation in communal activities is opened to all persons aged 18 years and above. The institutionalisation of CP/CM by Governments in these countries have provided the necessary legal framework through which households are expected to commit themselves to communal activities.

In the Latin America Communities, the concept of CP is deeply rooted in native cultures and ways of their life. Farmers continue ancestral traditions of making decisions, administering justice and working the land collectively. Agrarian reform following the 1952 popular revolution led to the marking-out of individual plots, but families still count on relations of neighbourly reciprocity for sowing, harvesting and other tasks. Such traditions are an integral part of each community's economic, social and spiritual life. Rural migrants take with them this collective spirit, which has always been a driving force in their popular movement. In the municipality of Cochambaba for instance neighbourhood committees strive to satisfy basic community needs, including housing and sanitation. All the communities therefore have a wealth of experience in CO and participation. However, as the world undergoes restructuring (globalisation and capitalisation), these traditional wealth of experience based on residents reciprocity becomes shaky. On the other hand, it offers local residents the opportunity to resist their long cherished practises being eroded. What is required is total commitment of households to pursue these collective actions incessantly and not when demanded.

To investigate this, the analysis focused on some variables, which are conceptually and theoretically considered to having substantial influence on the extent to which residents in a community can pursue and manage their common goal. Among them are the following: educational level of community leadership; type of training offered to leadership; mode of sanctions against individual members in default of contributing to planned community activity; accountability and relationship between members and leadership. Other variables are: information circulation within the CO; organisation of planning, monitoring and evaluation; resource mobilisation of CO; the role of external actors; community interaction with government agencies; household perception on factors considered as "stimulating" CP/CM; etc.

4.2.1 Capacity of Community Leadership

The descriptive analysis of the socio-economic background of community leaders indicates that there are no significant differences between the educational status of community leaders and community members. Only in two communities (Hiroshima and Gamoneda) are CL illiterate. It suggests that though community leadership demands some basic education, it does not necessary needs to have higher education or better education different from majority of households. What seems, as the most important prerequisite is recognition by households of leadership as credible in terms of morality. Households' information on personal records of leadership therefore seems a deciding factor here and not educational background. There are however significant income differentials between CL and community members. For instance, in all the communities in Ecuador, the monthly income of leaders is twice the income of residents. Community leadership is however, voluntary in all the communities.

In terms of their capacity to manage CO, all the community leaders have received some sort of external assistance in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. They consider such training to be very useful not only in a particular project but useful in a wider sense in the management of other communal activities. Ironically, a greater majority of them have not been able to translate some of this knowledge into practise. For instance, overwhelming majority of CL have no idea about how much money they have mobilised from government neither are they aware how much members have contributed to CD. It can therefore be concluded that in terms of leadership skill and knowledge, there is no significant difference between leaderships to influence differently CP/CM practises among households.

4.2.2 Relationship between members and leadership

Households' assessment of community leaders and CO provides a potential ground for examining the effectiveness and sustainability of CP/CM in the settlements. It is postulated that where households' responses are positive, it tends to provide grounds for higher and effective participation. For example it is assumed that CM demands that leadership seek consensus among all households. In all the communities, overwhelming majority of households believe that leadership seek consensus. However, table: 15 shows that in Candelaria about 67% of households believe that leadership do not seek consensus as compared to Gamoneda and other settlements.

Table 15: composite index of significant differences in consensus seeking (responses from households)

Description: Does Leadership Seek Consensus?	Yes (%)	No (%)	Sig. Diff.
BOLIVIA:			
Candelaria	33	67	.000
Hiroshima	58	42	
Other 4 settlements	100	0	

Furthermore, leadership relationships with community members in some of the communities can be described as not conducive for long run CP/CM. Majority of households in some of the communities describe leadership as irresponsible, unaccountable and ineffective. Such descriptions obviously discourage households' commitment to CP. Moreover,

information sharing which is supposed to be the basis for households' participation in CM is not fully shared between leadership and households. For example, while in most of the communities households receive sufficient information, table 16 shows that in Bauleni

Table 16: Composite index of significant differences in information sharing (responses from households)

Description: Do you receive good information about the programmes of CO?	Sufficient information shared (%)	Insufficient information shared (%)	Sig. Diff.
ZAMBIA:			
Bauleni & Zambia-Compound	6	94	.007
Other communities	47	53	
BOLIVIA:			
Candelaria & Hiroshima	22	78	.001
Other communities	80	20	
ECUADOR:			
Pisuli & Atucuchu	60	40	.014
Other communities	100	0	

and Zambia- Compound overwhelming 94% of households believe that leadership stifle information from members. Nevertheless, an examination of households' response towards leadership attitude reveals three different types. In Bolivia, leadership is criticised regularly while households in Ghana mostly criticise their leaders occasionally. In Ecuador, most households rarely criticise their leaders. If this type of relationship is unhealthy for intensive CP/CM, then leadership relation with government is described as unproductive.

4.2.3 Relationship between Leadership and Government Officials.

Strong and cordial relationship between LG and CL is conceptually and logically postulated to have positive correlation with CP/CM. It is the general believe and as pointed out by Cheema that provision of framework by the government for CP is one of the ways to sustain the process. In all the communities, in way one or the other, governments have supported residents' initiatives. However, the degree of support varies from community to community. In some instances, officials from LG attend communities' collective meetings, listen to the people and accept and adopt their view. Such positive response and framework are assumed to encourage an intelligible response from households to continuously participate in collective action. Among the communities that enjoy such privileges are Moseaso and Ahibenso in Ghana, and Linda and Chainda in Zambia.

The analysis also indicates that in all the communities LG officials recognise the legitimacy of CO and their leadership and is obliged to consult the leaders and their CO before it starts any development programme in the community. Nevertheless, one striking revelation is that, the responses from CL in the African Countries especially Ghana and Uganda seem to suggest more positive relationship than Latin America Countries.

Further analysis for plausible reasons was pursued on the attitude and strategy used by these leaders in dealing with LG and it officials. It reveals that almost all the leaders bargain with government 'piece-meal wise' (project by project basis). However, the difference could be found in leadership attitude to local government agencies. The leaders in Uganda and Zambia communities mostly asked for support because they believe it is in the interest of both

parties, while Ghana and Ecuador solicit for support politely because they believe they are in a dependent position. Ironically, it is only in Ghana where majority of leaders believe that the best tactics is to seek co-financing from the government and the community. The rest of the CL believe in more radical approach like actions, demonstrations, and the use of competition between candidates in election time.

4.2.4 Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation

The new trend in CP/CM indicates that CL and members cannot continue to undertake CD impulsively. Effective and sustainable CP/CM demands planning, monitoring and evaluation of implementation process of community projects and activities. However, households' analysis indicates that some of the communities have no plan or coherent programme of activities which members and leadership follow. Table: 17 shows differences in households' responses in some of the communities with regards to whether CO has plan. The rest of the communities have plan of activities that serve as development guideline for leaders and households.

Table 17: Composite index of significant differences in whether CO has plans (responses from households)

Description: Does CO have plan of activities it follows?	No	Yes	Sig. Diff.
GHANA:			
Asuboi	59	41	.000
Other Communities	0	100	
UGANDA:			
Kikandwa	85	15	.000
Other Communities	10	90	

An examination of leadership capacity indicates that most of the CLs have received some form of external assistance in project planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. They consider the training to be very useful not only for a particular project but useful in wider sense. Ironically, majority of them with the exception of communities in Ecuador believe that monitoring of projects is the responsibility of leaders. There are also differences in how evaluation is done. In the communities of Ghana and Ecuador project evaluation is through regular collective meetings while in Zambia and Uganda, CL indicates that it is done by external agencies.

On how project is maintained after completion, the communities in Ghana and Uganda uses mostly users' fee while the rest practise a combination of users' fee, raising of community funds, and individual providing labour and other material inputs. In majority of the communities, households are unanimous that when a community member fails to contribute to planned community project, the person is fined. However, communities in Zambia have no rigid sanctions. The person is either excluded, fined, publicly criticised or other form of sanctions depending on the type of activity in which the person dishonoured.

4.2.5 Stimulating Factors of Sustainable CP/CM

Though CP/CM have been practised in the communities for over decades, households' assessment on some factor considered as stimulating CP/CM leaves much to be desired. Such

perceptions by households are regarded as not conducive to ensure sustainable CP. “Stimulating” in the sense that it is assumed that households’ thoughts on these indicators provide basis on which logically, they will be committed to promoting CP/CM. And that, the more households agree on these indicators the better for sustainable CP/CM. Among some of the stimulating factors are described later in tables 18 and 19.

Overwhelming majority of households in all the communities agree that a plan developed by CBO should be accepted as the basic guideline for government support in LIS and that their CO can influence the policies and programmes of government that affect their life. However, such homogenous responses can not be found in the other three variables. There are significant differences among households on the assertion that people in LIS have no capacity to develop their settlements. Table 18 shows that majority of households in Kikandwa agree that they do not have the capacity to improve their settlement.

Table 18 Composite index of significant difference in households’ perception on their capacity to improve their settlement.

Description: People living in LIS have no capacity to improve their settlement?	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Sig. Diff.
UGANDA:			
Kikandwa	82	18	.033
Other Communities	41	59	

Communities of this nature are always caught in dependency syndrome, expecting the government to provide their needs. Also majority of households in some communities still believe that government initiatives in LIS will work and be maintained even if the people do not actively participate. Among some of the communities with this view are shown in table 19. For instance about 80% of households in Hiroshima, Gamoneda and Coimata,

Table 19: Composite index of significant difference in households’ perception of government initiatives in LIS.

Description: Government initiatives in LIS will not work unless people actively participate?	Agree (%)	Disagree (%)	Sig. Diff.
BOLIVIA:			
Hiroshima, Gamoneda & Coimata	20	80	.000
Other communities	67	33	
ECUADOR:			
Atucuchu and St. Maria	31	69	.020
Other Communities	59	41	

disagree that it is only when residents participate effectively will government initiatives work in LIS. Similar perception is shared by majority of households in Atucuchu and St. Maria.

CHAPTER FIVE: DETERMINING FACTORS OF COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION & MANAGEMENT

5. Introduction

This research began with a set of hypotheses regarding the analytical triangle of communities, CO, and CP/CM. The above case study has produced findings that allow us to examine the validity of these premises and to identify several crucial issues regarding the

dynamics of interaction between and among the three key issues in CD that require further scrutiny. The outcome put some doubts on the vision of society for CD as a community where each individual accept personal responsibility for the well being of the community and each other. The pair-wise comparison of dependent variables against the independent variables analysed earlier provides the causalities within which the 4 hypotheses are assessed. Emphasis is given to independent variables that show statistical significance, nevertheless in some instance results of this comparison are corroborated with others that show little significance.

5.1 Socio-economic characteristics of households affecting CP/CM

The outcome of this research provides critical evidence that seems to suggest that though some low socio-economic characteristics of households have correlation with low rates of participation, it also reveals that such premises be redefined to give specific context and not to be generalised. Although individuals in the lower and upper stratum are distinct in each other's eyes, members of each stratum do not see themselves as constituting a social class. This is a social reality whose consequence for CD has been demonstrated in Table 20. It shows the results of the causalities in the variable.

Table 20: Composite causalities of household socio-economic and cultural characteristics and its correlation with the elements of CP/CM.

Description	Income	Occupation	Education	Rental & Owners	Family Type	Household Size
1. Membership to CO?	++	++		+		
2. Attendance at community Meetings?	++	++		+		
3. Participation in planning of activities?	++	+		+		
4. Number of people who speak at meetings?		++				++
5. Spouse participation at meetings?						+++
6. Women participation as compared to men?		++		++		

Note: The indicator (+) is used to show that there is a correlation in the 2 variables and it is statistically significant. Those without any indicator show that statistically, the correlation is insignificant and the probability for such occurrence is highly by chance.

+ = Tendency = 5-9.9%

++ = Significant = 1-5%

+++ = Highly Significant = <1%

5.1.1 Income Differential of households and CP/CM

The analysis indicates that high-income households associate themselves with CO, attend meetings frequently and participate in deliberations more than low-income earners. It must also be stated that though the findings indicates that high incomes have positive correlation with CP/CM, it also suggests that such generalisation should be limited to instances where occupation is fairly homogeneous and where income differentials are not too wide. For instance, in communities where income differential between the very rich and the very poor is extremely wide, it is not the poor who do not participate at meetings but the

poorest of the poor. The poorest households have less than one-eighth of the average income at their disposal. These people do not count themselves as members of CO, let alone attend meetings. Also where occupation differential translate into income differential, it is not the income that determines participation but rather occupation. The analysis from the Ghanaian communities testifies to this. This is because, self-employed, salary workers, owners of small firms, participate more than farmers do. The analysis in this case also shows that the farmers, who by no means are all poor, spend much time on income and livelihood in their farms and participate less in collective community activities.

The findings by Milbraith, Almond and Verba, Hausknect and Lee that the poor have no capacity, incentive, time, resources, and income to participate in CD seem to be supported by this research but should be qualified in order to become an accepted basis of the CD paradigm. It should be related to occupation and distinguish the average poor from the very poor. The people who do not participate in community activities are rather the poorest of the poor and not the average poor. The average poor actually participate higher in the implementation of physical projects where their 'cheap' labour is mostly needed. The rich participate higher especially in planning because of recognition and sometimes prestige that goes with their roles in CP/CM. It can also be stated that getting the means of life support is not an issue that the upper stratum (the high-income households) worries about. Unlike their counterparts, (Low-income households), they have ample time and resources for social issues other than matters of 'bread and butter' and respond to CP as may seem appropriate.

5.1.2 Illiterates also participate

Educational status is one of the household characteristics which, varies greatly within and between communities. Statistically, however, all the dependent variables constituting CP/CM indicate that there is no correlation between a person's level of education and CP/CM. This indicates that many illiterates score even better than those with secondary school education in the following variables: membership to CO, attendance at meetings, and participation at planning. However, those with education speak more at community meetings than illiterates do. Speaking at meetings alone does not constitute CP/CM. The educational analysis of community leaders also suggests that the higher educated people in communities are not the leaders. And in most cases leaders' educational status is comparable to the average education of community members. The hypothesis which states that people with higher education participate more than illiterates as suggested by Gittell is not supported by this data and is therefore rejected.

5.1.3 Renters and House Owners

Effective CP/CM cannot be undertaken in an ad hoc manner. It demands long term commitment to place of residence. Landowners have more to gain from CP/CM not only because CD increases their assets value, but it also provides them the incentive to see outcome of CD as theirs and through their effort it materialised. The sense of belongings to a place of

residence and being part of the local community development is not shared by all residents. The analysis reveals that there is strong correlation between housing status of a person and CP/CM. Considering meeting attendance and participation in planning, about 75% and 85% of house owners attend collective meetings of the community and participate effectively in planning of activities respectively, while only 35% and 25% of renters attend and participate in planning. It must also be stated that in terms of a person's membership to CO, there is a weak or no correlation between house owners and rentals. This indicates that affiliation to CO is one thing and commitment to its development of the community is another. This results supports earlier posits and reaffirm findings from Lee, Berner, Nelson and Evers that renters remain at the margin of social networks in communities and hardly identify themselves with communal goals.

5.1.4 Extended and Nuclear Families

The whole concept of reciprocity as a pathfinder in offering low-income people the opportunity to pursue collective action is losing substance. The study has revealed that issue of kinship in families does not have any correlation with the elements of CP/CM. The hypothesis that extended family system will translate its reciprocity into intensive and higher involvement in CP/CM is unfounded. The analysis indicates that head of households with majority of its members being outside the nuclear family do not participate differently from heads of nuclear family. The assumption that kinship reciprocity and solidarity in families translate into collective action is not corroborated with the outcome of the analysis. Kinship relation cannot therefore be considered as one of the influencing factors in CP/CM.

5.1.5 High versus Low Household Size and CP/CM

The importance of reciprocity in CP/CM is however, shown to have correlation when it is seen in terms of household size and not the type of family. The analysis indicates that the difference in head of household responses to membership in CO, attendance at meetings and participation in planning do not vary according to the size of household. The only correlation that the size of household has with CP/CM is how each of these households' heads participate in meeting deliberations. Heads of large household sizes speak more than small household does. However, spouses in large households more often do not participate in CP/CM. They have little time to devote to collective activities. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that, heads of large households attend community meetings and become vocal in deliberations because they are better served when collective activity or project is provided than small households, who feel disincentive to contribute. This seems to confirm earlier postulation that head of large households will involve in collective action to ensure that collective goods is provided. However, the relation is very weak as compared to other households' characteristics like income and housing status.

5.2 Breaking the Rural-Urban Myth of CP/CM

The controversy surrounding CP/CM as a tool for CD both in the rural and urban areas can be appreciated better when development actors understand that there are very little differences between the perception of urban households and rural households, and that many such differences are just figment of imagination. Nevertheless, it is very imperative that development actors incorporate any slight difference into both design and evaluation of project.

5.2.1 Rural-Urban difference in CO and CP/CM

The analysis in tables 21 suggests that participation in CO and CM by rural and urban households is not distinct. Though in most cases urban dwellers score higher than rural dwellers, this has no statistical significance. For instance there is no difference between recognition of CO by urban dwellers and rural dwellers as the legitimate institution to get progress in LIS. They all believe that CO can influence government policies.

Table 21: Rural-Urban Split in CP/CM.(Responses from households)

Description	UGANDA			BOLIVIA			ECUADOR		
	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.	Urban %	Rural %	Sig. Diff.
1. Do you recognise the presence of CO as representing all households?									
YES	93	98	.285	92	80	.476	78	86	.232
NO	7	2		8	20		22	14	
2. Do you Participate in Planning Activities?									
YES	76	72	.509	no plan	100	-	60	78	.269
NO	24	28			0		40	22	
3. How often do you attend organisation's meetings?									
Always	68	47		65	81		57	54	
Now and Then	20	26	.164	9	15	.027	25	23	.943
Rarely	12	27		26	4		18	23	
4. Do you feel that CO is the best channel to get things done?									
Best Channel									
Other Channels	67	69	.526	100	90	.101	86	96	.136
	33	31		0	10		14	4	
5. Do you feel that your organisation can influence government policies and programmes?									
Yes, it can influence	73	77	.914	92	80	.207	72	65	.128
No, impossible	27	23		8	20		28	35	
6. Is CO well organised?									
Well Organised	37	56	.132	4	8	.512	46	46	.456
Needs Improvement	63	44		96	92		54	54	

Furthermore, the idea that rural dwellers will translate the characteristics of their favourable social structure into intensive CP/CM is seemingly slippery. The positive perception urban households have on current concepts of CP/CM in reality does not translate into intensive CP/CM.

The only significant difference between the two is the regularity of presence at meetings. Even here the analysis seems to suggest that urban dwellers attend meetings more regularly than rural dwellers. This could be attributed to occupational difference as majority of the rural households are subsistence farmers who need to spend more time on the field.

It can therefore be concluded from the analysis that the hypothesis that CP/CM is more intensively organised in rural communities than urban communities is unacceptable. What the research shows is that when households irrespective of size or location of residence identify common problem they can collectively organise to tackle their problem. Whether they succeed or not has very little to do with location or type of the settlement.

5.3 Internal Structure of CO and CP/CM

The results of the causalities of the internal structure or characteristics of CO and its influence on households' endeavours in CP/CM are shown in table 22. It provides thought to suggest that household's commitment to CP/CM has multi-faceted correlation with how CO is structured right from its inception to how its leadership is organised. It also indicates that diagnosing CD should be carried out with the understanding of CO. Without over-stressing this outcome, one is tempted to draw a conclusion that from households' perspective the success of CP/CM depends on the internal structure of CO more than any other elements of CD.

Table 22: Causality of the independent and dependent variables of the structure of CO and CP/CM

Description	Member-ship to CO	Attendance at Meetings	Participation in planning	Speaking at meetings	Spouse participation	Participation of Women
1. Origin of CO	++	++	++	++		+++
2. Purpose of CO	++	+++	++	++		+++
3. Long existence of CO		+	+			+++
4. CO formal or informal	++	+++	+	+++		
5. Type of Leadership	++	+++	+++	++	++	
6. Selection of leadership	++	+++	++		++	+++
7. How was election conducted		+++	+++	+++	+	
8. Change of leadership		++	+	++	+	+++
9. Sub-organisation for women	++	+	+++	+++	++	+++

5.3.1 Origin and Purpose of Establishment of CO

Differences in origin and purpose of the establishment of CO have causal relation with CP/CM. The analysis indicates that when CO is established by the people themselves with the aim of responding together to a common problem, many households are willing to affiliate to the organisation and participate in all its activities. Another striking revelation is that when CO

is established by the influence of an NGO, it has more households affiliation than when government is involve in its establishment. However, the relationship between long existence of CO and CP/CM is very weak. Though in communities where CO have existed for long time, female participation tends to be higher than male, it surprisingly has a weak relationship with other indicators of CP/CM. A plausible reason could be that such organisations become dormant. However, this does not suggest that it is defunct. Its social ties and internal structures may be instantly restored when the need arises, for instance when an external organisation enters the community. The posit that long existing CO have higher collective activities than recently established CO still remains hypothesis but what is clear is the purpose of the organisation and who establishes it. Even who establishes CO loses its potency to influence household's commitment, if CO is able to mobilise resources to tackle collective project. In this case, even politically established CO can still have households' support if it is able to pursue collective action to the satisfaction of households.

5.3.2 Formal Recognition of CO

Households' recognition of CO as legitimate representation of all households depends on how the CO is considered as formal or informal. The recognition by community members has strong correlation with the outcome of CP/CM. Table 22 indicates the various correlation's this independent variable has on the elements of CP/CM. It confirms the earlier postulation that when CO is legally recognised, households tend to associate with it and contribute higher to CP/CM. Households who consider CO as informal also believe that failure to attend its collective meetings and participate in its activities do not necessarily constitute irresponsible behaviour on their part.

5.3.3 Committee type of leadership and centrally controlled leadership

The causality table as shown in table 22 indicates that in the internal structure of CO, one of the most important factors for the promotion of CP/CM is leadership. The analysis indicates that, type of community leadership has high correlation with CP/CM. However, the posit that committee or group type of community leadership has positive correlation with high CP/CM can not be generalised as the analysis indicates that it depends on other variables. For instance, in communities where the organisation was established by the people themselves, group or committee type of leadership has more positive impact on CP/CM. (In terms of households affiliation to the organisation, attendance and participation in meetings, etc.). In contrast, if the organisation was established with outside influence (NGOs and government), strong and centrally controlled leadership is suggested to be ideal for CP/CM. Nevertheless, in both cases, only few or the same people speak at meetings when leadership is strong and centrally controlled. One cannot therefore draw the conclusion that group type of leadership increases CP/CM. The postulation still remains hypothesis for further scrutiny. However, what is clear from the analysis is that when community leadership is described as passive, CP/CM is

not anything than a speculative new gimmick, just there by name with no practical reality or substance that can be identified with.

5.3.4 Democratic leadership

Furtherance to the important role leadership play in the internal structure of CO in the promotion of CP/CM, the analysis of the causality between how leadership is selected, and the sort of people who pushed for the election indicate that there is strong correlation in these variables. The analysis indicates that when leadership is democratically or independently elected, CP/CM is very high in all the indicators. However, an intervening variable that seems very crucial is how the election was pushed through. A striking revelation is that when a few core group of community members pushed through the election, only few people speak at community meetings. The outcome of such election is divisiveness and conflict of interest between individuals and supporters. Competition between rival leaders is as much a stumbling block as internal heterogeneity of the community like tenure, income and occupation. This type of leadership is found to be associated with centrally controlled leadership. Another important variable in the democratic leadership of CO is the frequency under which leadership rotates.

The analysis further reveals that some sort of changes in leadership is a must in CP/CM. Communities where leaderships have remained unchanged for some time, households' score in CP/CM shows lower than where some form of changes have been introduced. This finding seems to corroborate earlier findings by McWilliams, Farrell and Oxfam. However, what is unclear is whether the changes should be frequent or only sometimes. The analysis indicates that in communities where leadership changes frequently, many households speak at meetings and participates in planning activities of the community, but only few people attend meetings regularly. It can therefore be concluded that democratic leadership elected by the whole community has positive correlation with high CP/CM. On the other hand, it seems apparent that when households are satisfied with its leadership and there is a high degree of cohesiveness and solidarity, members take steps to ensure that this is not disturbed. Nevertheless, it also suggests that some sort of changes in leadership is correlated with high participation but frequent changes as a result of few vocal members who attend community meetings to criticise leaders only to ensure frequent changes is undesirable and destructive.

5.3.5 Participation of Women

The presence of women sub-committee of CO was assumed to have positive influence on women's participation in community collective activities. Though, the analysis indicates a very strong correlation between the presence of women sub-committee and participation of women, it also suggests that the presence of sub-committee alone is not enough to improve women's participation unless it has external backing like NGOs. For instance in Ecuador and Bolivia where majority of spouses are mainly domestic workers, women participation turns to

be encouraging in communities where there is women sub-committee promoted by NGOs. The Ghanaian communities also show similar evidence.

5.4 Influencing factors of sustainable CP/CM

The outcome of this test (household analysis) as shown in table 23 provide a critical thoughts to re-examine the earlier indicators of what constitutes sustainable CP/CM.

Table 23: Causality of independent and dependent variables of sustainable CP/CM practises

Description	Member-ship to CO	Attendance at meeting	Participation in planning	Speaking meetings	Spouse participation	Women participation
1. Accountability of leadership				+++		++
2. Responsiveness	++					+++
3. Good information		+++		+++	+++	+++
4. Effectiveness of leadership		+++	+++		+++	+++
5. Criticisms	++		+++			+
6. Does CO have plans	++			+	++	+++
7. Knowledge of priorities		++	+	+		
8. Are priorities Right						
9. Who establishes priorities	+++			++	+++	++
10. Type of Sanctions		++	+++	+++	++	
11. Capacity of LIS			++		++	++
12. Only govt can help LIS	+	+++	++		++	++
13. Govt. initiatives in LIS						

It suggests that diagnosing sustainable CP/CM be carried out with the understanding that participation calls for good leadership, information sharing, priority setting and ranking, among others.

5.4.1 Accountable & Trustworthy Community Leadership

Accountability of leadership is one important factor that has strong correlation with the number of people who speak at community meetings. The analysis indicates that the more households see leadership as accountable the more they participate at community meetings. This seems to suggest that speaking at meetings is not only democratic right of members but also it serves to keep leadership at constant checks. Also when people speak at meetings and get involved in the planning of activities they are more committed to taking part in its implementation. This could in some ways break apathy in communities. Also household assessment indicates that accountable leadership has strong correlation with responsive leadership. And that in communities where leadership is considered responsible, more households consider themselves as members of CO. After all local organisational capacity is the ability of people to trust one another, work together in solving problems, mobilise resources and network with others to achieve agreed goals. The hypotheses and the findings by Cheema that strong leadership are more likely to increase CP/CM should be re-examined to include accountable leadership.

5.4.2 Good Information Dissemination

The hypothesis that frequency, relevance, and adequacy of information availability to each individual and households affect positively CP/CM is corroborated in this research. From the analysis in table 23 it could be observed that information sharing among all members of the community have strong correlation with attendance at meetings. This also influences the number of people who speak at meetings. The analysis indicates that in communities where majority of households feel that they get good information on what the CO is planning, they attend regular meetings and participates in deliberation. This increases households' confidence and trust in leadership.

5.4.3 Institutionalised Sanctions

The concept that membership to CO should be based on individual freewill and that individuals should not be coerced into participating in community activities is found to be idealistic and lends itself to unsustainable CP/CM practices. The analysis indicates that there are strong correlation between mode of sanctions in community, and CP/CM. In communities where there are institutionalised sanctions in the form of fine, many households attend community meetings, participate in planning and speak more at meetings. This also reflects in how leadership is held accountable. The analysis also suggests that exclusion from activity as mode of sanctions when a member fails to contribute to planned community activity is ineffective. This suggests that some mode of control is desirable to ensure that CP/CM become all-inclusive activity. This seems to follow the concept of 'the tragedy of commons and free-rider problems involved in collective goods.

5.4.4 Supportive Government Structure for CP/CM

The analysis seems to suggest that the difference between communities where leaders are represented in district council (local government administrative unit) and isolated leadership¹⁴ is not significant in influencing CP/CM. Recognition of CO by local government and attendance at community meetings by official seem to be seen as formality as in most situations community leaders admit that officials actually do what they consider best. In most cases, NGOs are better recognised by the households as the most important local institution for CD than LG. However, since this research does not provide details about local government outfit the hypothesis still remains.

5.4.5 Planning and Priority Establishment

Sustainable CP/CM demands that CO have a systematic plan of activities by which community members can easily follow not only for monitoring purposes but also to entice community members to be continuously affiliated to the organisations objectives. The analysis indicates that there is high correlation between the presence of a general plan of activities of CO and membership affiliation both in terms of household head and spouse's affiliation. It

¹⁴ Where LG does not provide little or no structure for CP/CM

suggests that people speak at meetings when they have good information about the plan of activities. Contradictory however, is the revelation from households in Bolivia that the presence of plan alone is not enough to entice membership affiliation. What seems to be the intervening variable is how priorities of the plan is established. Households are willing to become members of CO, participate in meeting deliberations only when priorities are established by collective activities.

5.4.6 Not only Government, the people have the capacity

The analysis of 'stimulating factors' of CP/CM reveals that there are two important household perceptions that should be considered if households collective activities can be pursued to its limit. These two perceptions are households' recognition that it is not only government that can really improve LIS and that the people living in LIS have some capacity to improve their own settlement. These two perceptions have positive correlation with CP/CM. The analysis shows that about 74% of household heads and spouse always attend organisations meetings when they agree that people in LIS have some capacity to improve their settlement. Furthermore, commitment to CO, attendance at meetings and participation on planning increases when households disagree that only the government is really able to improve their communities.

It can therefore be concluded that in communities where majority of households have such positive perception on what they themselves can do, there is greater likelihood that they will be committed to CP/CM with little outside assistance. After all effective CP/CM is about self-reliance in the long run. Surprisingly, however, is the outcome that whether people believe that government initiative will work with or without the people's support. The results show that, this has very little correlation with CP/CM. This implies that households believe that improvement in LIS should be a shared responsibility of the government and local people. To look to government to assume the sole responsibility for achieving this outcome would be inconsistent with the outcome itself. However, there is a limit to what the people can do. Effective CP/CM does not suggest that government should relegate all her responsibilities to the people just because the people feel they can improve themselves. Government role should therefore be complimentary to the people's effort and that is all about EG and sustainable CP/CM.

CHAPTER SIX: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION

6. Introduction

The lessons learned from analysing the various concepts and findings of earlier researchers, as well as the testing of the various variables within the hypotheses reveal several important messages that transcend regional boundaries. It provides useful analytical findings,

which require that researchers and development actors re-examine some thoughts on the elements of CD.

6.1 Major Findings

1. *Important Household Characteristics that influence CP/CM*

The analysis suggests that CP/CM is not solely the asset of the poor and that both the rich and the poor take it seriously. A critical examination of the data, however, questions the assumption that the poor have no incentive and capacity to participate in CO. At least the poorest members in community admit that provision of collective goods is one of their surviving methods. This is supposed to be enough incentive for them to participate. In terms of capacity, their cheap labour is more important for communal labour. The dilemma of the poorest of the poor as evidenced from household's analysis is how to reconcile the desire to "keep bone and flesh" together and at the same time participate in collective activities. The worthy people in communities are seen as automatic members in CO even if they do not provide their physical labour in CD. Members see them as 'bedrock' of the community's development. However, my personal experience in some of the Ghanaian communities indicates that practically, households in the higher stratum do take CP with a pinch of salt with little recognition. The common assertion by these people is that "we have risen in this status through our own efforts, as individual on our own merit, not on the basis of any collective action." This brings to question the analysis of quantitative data. But granted that households provided the correct information, it can be concluded that the poorest of the poor hardly participate in CP/CM. However, there may be other cultural and political barriers effectively preventing them from having any real stake in CD other than economic.

The results as well as a reassertion of the literature evidence that renters can not be counted on to promote CP/CM not only because they do not have security of tenure to their residents, but also on the cultural perception that they might one day move to their hometowns. Even sometimes they do not consider themselves as bona fide members of the community.

Education is not necessarily prerequisite for household's effective and intensive participation in CM. This suggests that illiterates are not impaired to participate in CD. This does not suggest that education is not important for CP/CM but the findings do not support earlier hypothesis that educated households participate higher than uneducated households do.

It can be concluded that low socio-economic characteristics like low-income, tenancy in housing status and primary occupation have correlation with low rates of participation in CM. However, what seems to influence households' participation most is a legitimate CO that is recognised by majority of households. It does not necessary have to be recognised by all households as in most cases, households recognition of CO has little correlation with how they participate in CM. This is because, description of who is a member of CO in most cases is obscure, especially where the organisation is traditionally established long ago.

2. Effective elements of the structure of CO that sway CP/CM

The origin of CO loses influence as a determining factor in households' rate of participation when it is able to transform itself into tackling collective goals. In this case a CO established through political or outside influence has little effect on households participation. The issue of past experience in CD becomes meagre too. In these circumstances, a community with a recently established CO can still mobilise households to undertake collective activities better than long established CO.

Although charismatic leader is generally viewed as more essential to CO, strong central leadership can be dysfunctional to LIS. Diversified leadership, the sharing of roles and the process of involvement are more functional in enhancing the collective goals of CO. This democratic process is more likely to support organisational maintenance over a period of time, particularly where material incentives are lacking in community leadership.

To be accepted as the representative of all residents and pursue their collective interests, a CO, particularly its leaders, must be trusted by most households in the community. After all, it is the willingness of households to follow which makes a member of the community a leader. This is one of the surest ways to encourage household's participation.

Information management between community members and leadership is a synonym of controlling decisions making, and this influences effective CP/CM. A household who does not know much about activities of CO can hardly participate effectively. Even when households are organised, their participation is severely limited often to little more than free labour in construction if information does not reach them. Poor communication of information easily generate inter-personal conflict, inter-group rivalry and, low morale and frustration among households, and these affect CP/CM. Getting accurate and good information on community activities facilitates the understanding of households on how decisions are made in their communities, and this will intend help households and CL to identify institutions and mechanism that can get opportunities and resources into their hands for development.

CO can not be representative if majority of households have no confidence in its leadership. And in most cases, this reflects the way the organisation is seen by households as being formal or informal. One accounting factor is the mode of selecting leadership. The current concept of CP/CM demands that local structures are not only necessary but also irreplaceable. This demands that traditional leadership must be separated from development oriented leadership. This brings into question the findings by Peterse and Simone, and Lee that internal structure of CO is not important for effective CP/CM.

3. Effective community leadership, the key to sustainable CP/CM

Sustainability of household's involvement in CP/CM depends to a very large extent on community leadership. The importance of leadership in directing the activities and shaping the effectiveness of CO cannot be over-stated, to the extent that leaders shape the internal agendas of organisation and invariably the key determinants of CO effectiveness. This is because type of leadership translates into a very high degree the response of households to collective action.

In this case, responsible leadership is not only seen by households in terms of ensuring the provision of physical assets, but also how trustworthy, consensus seeking and dissemination of good information reaches all households.

It is important to note that leadership patterns in a community affect the attitude and capacities of members to initiate and get involved in CD activities. The forces analysed are consequences of power (leadership structure and dynamics). Without over stressing the point, the findings do show that leadership is extremely important, perhaps more than was recognised at the beginning of this research. This research seems to agree perfectly with SCMP (UNCHS)-MLGRD, that “leadership is the single most important factor in creating successful human centred programmes, sustainable CP and lasting change in communities” (SCMP-UNCHS-MLGRD, 1998: 4).

The initial posit that strong and cordial relationship between leaders of CO, community members and LG determines the sustainability of CP/CM seems to be supported partially by the findings. The findings elucidate that sustainable CP/CM depends heavily on affable and clear relationship between community leaders and members. However, it might sound too pessimistic considering this analysis to conclude that LG have insignificant influence on long run collective action of communities. What the findings seem to support is that when members of a community are mobilised and determined to provide a collective good, the community spirit that is generated is more than enough to sustain the process than relying on LG. Having said that, it must also be noted at this juncture that lack of LG structures also limit the flow of accurate, objective information regarding resource opportunities available to the residents, and prevents effective procedures for following through once a decision is made.

4. Settlement effect of CP/CM

The rural-urban myth in CP/CM can be broken when development actors consider community as an identity, not a geographical unit. By this a group of people irrespective of their residence can undertake effective participation provided they can identify themselves within the context of common problem and not geographical identity. The analysis of this research indicates that the identification of a common problem offers a solution to the heterogeneity of people and creates its own form of homogeneity. Common interest overcomes the extent of fragmentation and factionalism.

In finding actual reasons for the outcome of this hypothesis, the research is saddled with two plausible explanations. Either urban households (communities) are increasingly faced with the task of shifting their operating base from individual unit to one of the community as a whole, or as many residents in rural communities are becoming economically and socially dependent, they are involved in structures outside the community to the extent that they feel further detached from involvement in community life.

6.2 Synthesising Best Practices of CP/CM

Achieving effective and intensive participation of households in CD is expensive. It involves both financial and human resources. The time has come to move away from experimenting to institutionalising, from testing approaches to prescribing procedures. In other words, the findings accumulated in this research suggest that the benefits from these scarce resources can be maximised if development agents and institutions make more efforts to ensure that initial structures vital for CP/CM are in place. Synthesising some of these crucial elements highlighted below into a formal methodology is considered imperative for the way forward.

- Accountable Community Leadership
- Democratic leadership but regular changes is destructive
- Formal or Legal recognition of CO
- The perception that people have the capacity to improve their living condition with minimal assistance and that it is not only government that can really improve LIS
- Institutionalised form of sanctions
- Good Information Sharing among all households
- Participation of Women is important but does not necessary depend on the establishment of women sub-committee within the CO

However, the development of this methodology will not be easy because by and large human behaviour is unpredictable.

6.3 Conclusion

The set of data presented and analysed suggests that households who to a very large extent determine the triangular relations of communities, CO, CP/CM can not be taken for granted in any programme that involves them. It would be a grievous blunder to assume that an assessment made by community leader represents the interests of the entire community. Fostering participation therefore requires that a sociological assessment of households' stratification and socio-economic structure be made. This is because, not all households express their concerns with equal forcefulness, and relatively few express them openly. Their socio-economic characteristics, thoughts and perceptions on these triangular variables can not be replaced by any effective project design. The differentiation as shown by their socio-economic status is just 'microcosm' of their general thoughts. Failure to incorporate these thoughts is twice a failure of CD programmes.

The differentiation in thoughts and perceptions also reflect the sort of internal structure necessary for CD. Given the revelation that we can not continuously accept the bloated rural-urban split of CP/CM on the basis of household reciprocity and social structure, what is important for researchers and development actors is to put more emphasis in developing coherent internal structures of CO. This is one of the most important findings to emerge from this research.

From households' point of view, the structure of CO seems to provide a credible solution to CD problem and dynamics while effective leadership is the answer to continuity of CP/CM. Until effective structures are built to create and determine local consensus, serious development of communities will be unable to move beyond inertia to creative action. The leadership has the responsibility of building the community, the task of binding individuals together regardless of their socio-economic status, ethnic or political affiliation to accomplish shared goals. And that is all about effective and sustainable CP/CM.

APPENDIX

Sample Size of interviewees in the communities.

Description	Number of Households interviewed	Number of Community Leaders interviewed
GHANA:		
Asankra-Breman	21	2
Ahibenso	12	2
Moseaso	15	2
New Akrade	15	2
Akim Kotokuom	12	2
Asuboi	28	2
ZAMBIA:		
Linda	15	2
Bauleni	24	2
Chainda	15	2
Katondo	15	2
Kawana	24	2
UGANDA:		
Kiswa	12	2
Nakawa	14	2
Kiwatule	15	2
& Buyende	14	2
Kikandwa	15	2
Namigavu	14	2
BOLIVIA:		
Candelaria	12	3
Hiroshima	12	3
Tolomosita	12	2
Gamoneda	12	2
Coimata	12	2
Horosas	12	2
ECUADOR:		
Pisuli ,	23	4
St. Maria	13	2
Atucucho	21	4
San Isidro	19	2
Coop. Nacione	20	2
Mapasique	19	2
Total 29	467	64

Appendix 2: Household Questionnaire (Head of Household) culled from Wils and Helmsing (1996: 2-14)

A: Socio-Economic Characteristics

1. What sort of **principal occupation** do you have? And your spouse?

	Head HH	Spouse
Owner Small Firm	-----	-----

Self - Employed	-----	-----
Salaried Worker	-----	-----
Non-remunerated (Family) Worker	-----	-----
Domestic Service	-----	-----
Farmer	-----	-----
Pastoralist	-----	-----
Fisherman	-----	-----

2. What was **total family income** during the last week?-----

3. How many people are there in this household, by position, age and sex?

Position	Age	Sex	Level of Education
1. Head of HH	----	----	-----
2.-----	----	----	-----
3.-----	----	----	-----
4 -----	----	----	-----

4. Is this house your **own**, is it **rented**, sub-rented, lent to you or something else?

1. Owner
2. Tenant
3. Subtenant
4. Lent / house sitting
5. Invaded
6. Down Payment
7. Others

5. If Owner: do you have a **title to the plot** on which the house is built?

1. No > ---Do you have user's right, an enumeration card or some other basis of security in occupying this plot? No--- Yes.....

2. Yes > ----How did you obtain it?

1. by your own effort
2. by the struggle of your organisation
3. by municipal initiative
4. by national government
5. by a project (specify)-----
6. ceded by traditional authority
7. another way (specify)

B: Community Participation

6. Have the households of this settlement an organisation of their own which represent all the households?

1 Yes

- 2.No
- 7.Is the community organisation only informal, or is it legally recognised?
- 1 only informal
 - 2.legally recognised
8. Has it statutes? And regulations?
1. statutes but no regulation
 2. statutes and regulations
9. When was the organisation established: already quite some time ago or recently? In what year?
1. Quite some time ago
 2. Recently
10. Who brought about the establishment of this organisation?
1. The settlers themselves
 2. Municipality
 3. National
 4. Political Party
 5. An International NGO
 6. A Local NGO
 7. Church
 8. Project (specify)
 9. Others (specify)
11. Why was the organisation established?
1. Responding together to a particular common problem (e.g. land, water)
 2. Mobilisation or training by a outside agency (e.g. NGO or Government)
 3. Political Action
 4. Growing interest of the Local Government
 5. Others (specify)
12. What people in Particular pushed for this organisation
1. Women group or women association
 2. People connected with a particular project
 3. It was the whole community: everybody
 4. Others (specify)
13. Concerning the **leadership** of your organisation, does it consist of a strong central leader, or rather of a group of people or committee, or is it a fairly passive leadership?
1. Strong central leader
 2. Group/committee
 3. Passive leadership
14. Do the leaders of the organisation change regularly, only sometimes or does leadership remain the same?
1. Change regularly

2. Change only sometimes
 3. Leadership remains the same
15. How does one become a leader in this organisation?
1. Election of independent candidates
 2. Election among candidates presented by political parties
 3. Support from political party
 4. Support from municipality
 5. Support from church
 6. Support from powerful subgroup of community
 7. Self-declared leader
 8. Traditional/hereditary
 9. Others (specify)
16. Was the election pushed by a small core group of community members, or by the whole community?
1. Small core group
 2. Whole Community
17. How often do you attend meetings? And your spouse?
- | | HEAD HH | SPOUSE |
|-----------------|---------|--------|
| 1. Always | ----- | ----- |
| 2. Now and Then | ----- | ----- |
| 3. Rarely | ----- | ----- |
18. During meetings, do only a few speak, is it always the same who speak out, do many participate?
1. Few
 2. Always the same
 3. Many participate actively
19. Do Women participate less, equally or more than the men?
1. Less
 2. Equally
 3. More
20. Do women have a sub-organisation or association of their own?
1. No
 2. Yes
21. Regarding the relationship between members and leadership, do members criticise or even oppose the leaders: only rarely, occasionally or regularly?
1. Rarely
 2. Occasionally
 3. Regularly
22. Do leaders seek a consensus among all members or not?
1. Yes
 2. No

23. Are the leaders held accountable to the membership or not?
1. Not held accountable
 2. Yes, accountable > How, in what way?
24. Do you feel that you get good information on what the CO is planning and doing or is information not shared sufficiently?
1. Good information
 2. Insufficiently shared
25. Do you consider the leadership of your organisation:
1. Highly effective (--), more or less effective(--), or little effective (--)
 2. Very responsive to the members (--), more or less(--), or little responsive(--)
 3. Independent from political parties(--), or representing party interest(--)

C: Community Management

24. Does the community organisation have a general overall **project or plan of activities**?
1. No
 2. Yes
25. Do you participate in the planning activities?
1. No
 2. Yes > How
26. Do you participate in the planning activities?
1. No
 2. Yes > How
27. Who establishes the priorities for the plan or project?
1. Leadership
 2. Collective community meeting
 3. Special Planning committee
 4. Outside agency (specify)
28. Do you know what the priorities are of the present plan or project?
1. No
 2. Yes
29. Do you feel, from the perspective of your household, that the plan's or project's priorities are the right ones?
1. Yes
 2. No
30. If a member fails to contribute to a planned community activity, what happens?
1. Gets excluded from the activity
 2. has to pay a fine
 3. Is publicly criticised
 4. Has to double the contribution next time
 5. Others (specify)

31. From the perspective of your household, do you feel that community organisation is the best channel to get things done, or are there also other channels?

1. Best channel
2. Also other channels

32. Do you feel that organisation from settlements like yours can influence the policies and programmes of the government, or is that impossible?

D. Questionnaire on household perceptions on CP/CM

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Agree
33. People living in low-income settlements don't the capacity to improve those settlements	-----	-----	-----	-----
34 A plan developed by a community-based organisation should be accepted as the basic guideline for government's support	-----	-----	-----	-----
35. Initiatives of government in Low-income settlements do not work and will not be maintained afterwards, unless the people actively participate.	-----	-----	-----	-----
36. Only the government is really able to improve low -income settlements	-----	-----	-----	-----
37. People living in low-income settlements can overcome problems like apathy, division and corrupt leadership only with outside settlements	-----	-----	-----	-----

Appendix 3: Questionnaire on Community Leadership

1. What is the office you occupy in the CO?
2. How did you come to occupy this office? Number of years----
3. What kind of principal occupation do you hold?
4. Might we ask what was the total income of your family last week?---
5. What is your level of education?
6. On whose land is the community now located?

	Now	Previous owner
1. Central Government	----	----
2. Municipality	----	----

- 3. Special Public Agency ----
- 4. Private Owners ----
- 5. Traditional (Clan) land ----
- 6. Others (specify) ----

7. What is the present land-tenure situation of the households in this community?

- 1. Legal title
- 2. Long-term lease
- 3. Informal agreement between households and private owners
- 4. Informal agreement between households and traditional owners
- 5. Individual purchase of plots
- 6. No security at all
- 7. Others (specify)

8. What percentage of affiliated households regularly attend these meetings?

- 1. Less than 20% (Few)
- 2. 21-50% (less than half)
- 3. 51-75% and more (Many)
- 4. 75% and more (Majority)

9. What is the level of Participation in these meetings?

- 1. Low, only a few speak
- 2. More or less: mostly the same
- 3. Many participate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, J.(1995) 'Community Participation and its Relationship to Community Development', *Community Development Journal*, Vol.30. No.1: 159-167.
- Almond, G and S. Verba.(1963) *The Civic Culture*. Boston: Little Brown.
- Amoka, W.K.(1991) 'Effect of Community Power on Local Development Projects-Kakamega District', in R. Mutiso and O. Chitere (eds) *Working with Rural Communities: A Participatory Action Research in Kenya*, pp 48-56. Nairobi Uni. Press.
- Assaad, M. and N. Garas (1994) 'Experiment in Community Development in a Zabbaleen Settlement', *Cairo Papers in Social Science*, Vol.16, Monograph 4, Winter 1993/94. Cairo: American Uni. Press.
- Bamberger, M. (1988) *The Role of Community Participation in Development Planning and Project management* (EDI policy Seminar Report, No.13), EDI-World Bank; WASHINGTON D.C.
- Banton, M.(1957) *West African City: A Study of the Tribal Life in Freetown*. London: Oxford Uni. Press.
- Berner, E. (1997) *Defending a Place in the City: Localities and the Struggle for Urban Land in Metro Manila*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Uni. Press.
- Bhatnager, B. and A.C.Williams (1992) 'Participatory Development and the World Bank: Potential Direction for Changes', *World Bank Discussion Papers* No 183, World Bank, Washington D.C.
- Boonyabanha, S.N., P.S. Patpui, K. Suksumake, and S. Maier, (1988) *Struggling to Stay: A case study of people Slum Klong Toey Fighting for their Home*. Bangkok: The Duang Praeep Foundation.
- Bwalya, M.C. (1985) 'The Integrated development Approach with the context of Decentralisation in Zambia', in F.G. Kiro (ed) *Challenging Rural Poverty*, pp.183-186. Trenton: Africa World Press.
- Chambers, R (1983) *Rural Development-Putting the Last First*, London: Longman.
- Cheema, S.C.(ed) (1987) *Urban Shelter and Services: Public Policies and management Approaches*. New York: Praeger.
- Dudley, E. (1993) *The Critical Villager: Beyond Community Participation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Esman, M.J./ N.T Uphoff (1998) *Local Organisations-Intermediaries in Rural Development*. Ithaca and London: Cornell Uni. Press.
- Evers, Hans-Dieter (1966) 'The Formation of a Social Class Structure: Urbanisation, Bureaucratization and Social Mobility in Thailand', in *American Sociological Review*, No.31: 480-88.
- Farrell, W. T. (1974) "Women's and Men's Liberation: Political Power Within the System and Outside the System." In M. Gittel.(1980) *Limits to Citizen participation*. London: Sage publications.

- Foster, G. M. (1982) 'Community Development and Primary Health Care: Their Conceptual Similarities'. in L. Stone 'Cultural Crossroad of Community Participation in Development' *Human Organisation*, Journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology, Vol.48, No.3 Fall, 1989: 206-212.
- Friedmann, J. and M. Salguero (1988). *The barrio economy and collective self-empowerment in Latin America: A framework and agenda for research*. in *Defending a Place in the City by Erhard Berner*, p.35 Ateneo De Manila Uni. Press.
- Galjart, B. (1987), 'Participatory Development Project: The History of a Research Project and a Summary of Results', in *Netherlands Review of Development Studies*, No.1, 1987:18.
- Gittel, M. (1980) *Limits to Citizen Participation: The decline of Community Organisations*. London: SAGE Publications, inc.
- Hausknect, M.(1962). *The Joiners: A Sociological Description of Voluntary Association Membership*. New York: Bedminster Press.
- Korten, D.C.(ed.) (1986) *Community Management-Asian Experience and Perspectives*, Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Lee S.F. (1994) 'Community -based Urban Management: Local NGOs as Catalysts in *Regional Development Dialogue*', Vol. 15, No.2, Autumn 1994: 159-173
- Lee, Y.-S. F.(1998) 'Intermediary Institutions, Community organisations, and Urban Environmental Management: The Case of Three Bangkok Slums', in *World Development Journal* Vol.26. No.6: 993-1010.
- McArthur, A.A.(1993) 'Community Partnership- A Formula for Neighbourhood Regeneration in the 1990s?', in *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 28, No.4: 305-314.
- McWilliams, N.(1974) *Contemporary Feminism, Consciousness-Raising and Changing View of the Political* in M. Gittel. *Limits to Citizen participation: The Decline of Community Organisations*. London: Sage publications.
- Milbraith, L. (1965) *Political Participation: How and Why People Get Involved with Politics*. in M. Gittel. *Limits to Citizen participation: The Decline of Community Organisations*. London: Sage publications.
- Mollenkoff, J. H., (1978) "Neighbourhood Political Development and the Politics of Urban Growth". in M. Gittel. *Limits to Citizen participation: The Decline of Community Organisations*. London: Sage publications.
- Moser, C.O.N (1989) 'Community Participation in Urban Projects in the 'third world'' *Progress in Planning* Vol.32, part2: 81.
- Moser, C.O.N.(1983) *The Problem of Evaluating Community Participation in Urban Development* in J. Abbot 'Community Participation and its Relationship to Community Development', *Community Development Journal*, Vol.30. No.1: 159-167.
- Mutiso, R.(1991) 'Spontaneous Development: Empirical Cases' in R. Mutiso & O. Chitere (eds) *Working with Rural Communities: A Participatory Action Research in Kenya*, Nairobi Uni. Press.

- Narayan, D. and K. Ebbe (1998) 'Design of Social Funds: Participation, Demand Orientation, and Local Organisational Capacity', World Bank Discussion Paper 1998: 7-45
- Neggers, J. and F. Wils, (1987) 'Self-evaluation Among NGOs': Consultation Promotion of Autonomous Development", *Noordwijkerhout*, 1987: 1-9.
- Nelson, J. M., (1979): *Access to power: Politics and the Urban Poor in Developing nations*. New York: Princeton Uni. Press.
- Oakley, P. (1991) 'Bottom-up versus Top-down: Extension at the cross-roads', *Ceres* Jan-Feb: 145
- Ogu, I. Vincent (1994) Enabling Strategies and Sustainable Infrastructure Development: Focus on Benin City, Nigeria in *Regional Development Dialogue*, Vol. 3, Winter, 1996/97.
- Olsen, M.(1970). *Social and Political Participation of Blacks*. in M. Gittel. *Limits to Citizen participation: The Decline of Community Organisations*. London: Sage publications.
- Omoka, W.K.(1991) 'Effects of Community Power on Local Development Projects-Kakamega District' in R. Mutiso and O. Chitere (eds), *Working with Rural Communities: A Participatory Action Research in Kenya*, Nairobi Uni. Press.
- Oxfam (D.Eade & S.Williams) (1995), *The Oxfam Handbook of Development and Relief* Vol.1 UK and Ireland: Oxfam Publications.
- Pelman, J (1976a) *Grassrooting the System: Social Policy*. in M. Gittel. *Limits to Citizen participation: The Decline of Community Organisations*. London: Sage publications.
- Pelman, J (1976b) *The Myth of Margination: Urban Poverty and Politics in Rio de Janeiro*. Berkeley: Uni. of California.
- Peterse, E.A, and A.M. Simone,(eds) (1994) *Governance and Development: A Critical Analysis of Community Based Organisations in the Western Cape*. Foundation for Contemporary Research.
- Poething, R. P.(1972). *Life Styles of the Urban Poor and People's Organisation*. In E.Berner *Defending a Place in the City: Localities and the Struggle for Urban Land in Metro Manila*. Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila Uni. Press.
- Pornchokchai, S.(1992) *Bangkok Slums: Review and Recommendations*. In Lee, 'Intermediary Institutions, Community Organisations, and Urban Environment: The Case of Three Bangkok Slums', *World Development*, Vol.26. No.6: 993-1010.
- Quiroga, H. (1995) 'Moving Toward change through community self-reliance', a report on the Programme Review Meeting of UNCHS Community Management Programme, Kenya: Nairobi.
- Rondinelli, D.A., and G.S. Cheema,(1985) 'Urban Services Policies in Metropolitan Area: Meeting the needs of the urban poor in Asia', in *Regional Development Dialogue*, Vol.6, No.2: pp170-190.
- Sanyal, B. (1985) 'Problem of Cost Recovery in Development Projects: Experience of The Lusaka Squatter Upgrading and Site/Service Project' in *Urban Studies*, 1987, No. 24: 285-295.

- SCMP(UNCHS)/MLGRD, 1998 *Leadership and Conflict Management*. Accra: Communication & Media For Development.
- Smit, D., (1990) 'Community Participation: Some Realities' in J. Abbot "Community Participation and its Relationship to Community Development", *Community Development Journal*, Vol.30. No.1: 159-167.
- Stiefel, M. and M. A. Wolfe (1994) *Voice for the Excluded (Popular Participation in Development, Utopian or Necessity?)*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Stone, L. (1989) 'Cultural Cross-roads of Community Participation in Development: A case from Nepal', in *Human Organisation, Journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology*, Vol.48, No.3 Fall: 206-212.
- UNCHS (HABITAT) (1994) *The Community Construction Contract System in Sri Lanka*. UNCHS: Nairobi.
- UNCHS, (Habitat) (1991) *Evaluation of Experience with Initiating Enabling Shelter Strategies*. UNCHS: Nairobi, 1991.
- UNCHS, (Habitat) (1998) *Community Management Programme* (Ghana, Uganda, Zambia, Bolivia, Ecuador). UNCHS: Nairobi.
- UNCHS, (Habitat)(1988) *Community Participation: A Trainer's Manual*. UNCHS: Nairobi.
- UNDP (1990) *Global Consultation of Safe Water and Sanitation for the 1990s, 10-14 September, 1990, New Delhi, India, Background Papers*, UNDP, New York, USA.
- Valsan, E.H., (1970) *Community development programmes and Rural Local Government: Comparative Case Studies of India and the Philippines*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Vorratnchaiphon, C.P. (1994) *Interview with Author. Office of Urban Development*, In Y.-S. F. Lee 'Intermediary Institutions, Community organisations, and Urban Environmental Management: The Case of Three Bangkok Slums', *World Development Journal* Vol.26. No.6: 993-1010.
- Wils, F. and H.V. Rijn (1998). *Literature Study on the Concept of Community Participation and Community Management*. The Hague: ISSAS
- Wils, F. and B. Helmsing (1996) *UNCHS/HABITAT's Community Development Programme: Research on the Evolution, Application and Practical Effectiveness of the CDP's Conceptual Framework* (Research Guidelines, phase 2). The Hague: ISSAS.
- Wils, F. and B. Helmsing (1998) *UNCHS/HABITAT's Community Development Programme: Research on the Evolution, Application and Practical Effectiveness of the CDP's* (Syntheses of Country Experience). The Hague: ISSAS
- Yap, K.S., ed (1992) 'Low-Income Housing in Bangkok: A Review of Some Housing Sub-Markets' in Y.-S. F. Lee 'Intermediary Institutions, Community organisations, and Urban Environmental Management: The Case of Three Bangkok Slums', *World Development Journal* Vol.26. No.6: 993-1010.