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FOREWORD

There is growing empirical evidence that social capital contributes significantly to sustainable development. Sustainability is to leave future generations as many, or more, opportunities as we ourselves have had. Growing opportunity requires an expanding stock of capital. The traditional composition of natural capital, physical or produced capital, and human capital needs to be broadened to include social capital. Social capital refers to the internal social and cultural coherence of society, the norms and values that govern interactions among people and the institutions in which they are embedded. Social capital is the glue that holds societies together and without which there can be no economic growth or human well-being. Without social capital, society at large will collapse, and today’s world presents some very sad examples of this.

The challenge of development agencies such as the World Bank is to operationalize the concept of social capital and to demonstrate how and how much it affects development outcomes. Ways need to be found to create an environment supportive of the emergence of social capital as well as to invest in it directly. These are the objectives of the Social Capital Initiative (SCI). With the help of a generous grant of the Government of Denmark, the Initiative has funded a set of twelve projects that help define and measure social capital in better ways, and lead to improved monitoring of the stock, evolution and impact of social capital. The SCI seeks to provide empirical evidence from more than a dozen countries, as a basis to design better development interventions which can both safeguard existing social capital and promote the creation of new social capital.

This working paper series reports on the progress of the SCI. It hopes to contribute to the international debate on the role of social capital as an element of sustainable development.
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INTRODUCTION

As the concept of social capital has traveled beyond its seminal application among Italian regions, and as analysts have extended it to apply to other countries and regions, new and different measurement tools have emerged. Not all studies of social capital are empirically driven, and only some among them have developed and utilized any precise measurement tools. Though intending to measure the same concept, these tools differ substantially from those developed by Putnam et al. (1993). Future researchers can either choose among the host of different measurement tools that exist today, or they can develop new ones to their own design, thereby adding to the variety that exists within this emerging sub-field.

Can some agreement not be reached about which are the best tools to apply? Will the measurement of social capital necessarily have to vary by national, regional or ethnic setting? Cannot some common method of measurement be developed that can be applied uniformly across different countries, regions and cultures of the world?

This paper addresses these questions and seeks to provide some answers based on the evidence that is available at this time. Part I of this paper reviews the measurement literature, while Part II presents a set of tools that have been developed in response to a demand for a uniform methodology.

Analyzing the terms that make up the definition of social capital provides a strong indication for considering different empirical correlates in diverse social and cultural contexts. To some extent, therefore, the different measurement concepts that exist are justified on grounds of contextual diversity. Part I of this paper identifies the main issues at stake. Diverse and often opposite views have been taken on each issue as different analysts defend their preferred measure. These theoretical and conceptual defenses provide strong support for devising locally and contextually relevant measures of social capital.

Though contextualizing the inquiry provides grounds for considering variation, however, it should not be tantamount to throwing the field open to uncountable numbers of unassociated measurement tools. The sum of categories that are useful to examine social capital will nevertheless remain fairly constant even as inquiry shifts from one context to another. In Part II of this paper we present a set of broad categories that we are finding useful for measuring social capital among populations as diverse as urban, rural and indigenous communities in Panama and rural villages and towns in Rajasthan, India. The precise selection of sub-categories varies for these two countries, but the overarching conception provides a unifying framework. We have developed this framework after studying various methodological approaches taken among different empirical studies of social capital. We invite other researchers to share their results and their measurement tools. We would also welcome the opportunity to have our emergent framework tested in other countries and by other researchers.

1 The authors would like to acknowledge the generous support of the Danish Government through the World Bank’s Social Capital Initiative in the development of this paper.
PART I. ISSUES AT STAKE IN MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL

The most common definition of social capital regards it as “features of social organization, such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit” (Putnam 1995: 67). Two sets of empirical questions emerge immediately upon examining this definition:

- What types of networks are associated most commonly with social trust and with norms that promote coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit? Do all networks need to be aggregated into a measure of social capital or only some specific types? Should the same network types be considered in all countries or will there be some variation across cultural contexts?

- Can norms and trust be assessed directly? Can these be graded in terms of their effectiveness for facilitating mutually beneficial collective action? What set of instruments will enable a researcher to undertake these tasks of identification and assessment across diverse cultural contexts?

Empirical studies of social capital differ among themselves in terms of the manner in which they have addressed these two issues. While some studies have assessed social capital solely in terms of network density, others have relied purely on a measure of trust. Yet other studies combine a measure of network density with some proxies for assessing the strength of the relevant norms.

Neither an exclusively networks-based nor an entirely norms-dependent measure suffices, however, for scaling social capital. Purely networks-based measures are too prone to the danger of including organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan and the Aryan Nation or their equivalents that exist in many other countries. Analysts who use such measures have distinguished among horizontally and vertically organized groups, heterogeneous and homogenous membership, etc. None of these analytical distinctions rules out the possibility that quite a few “wrong” or anti-social groups will find their way into the measure.

Unless one knows the activities, purposes and values that bind the members of any group, it is impossible to know in advance whether this group adds to or detracts from the sum of social capital. Of course, it is difficult to make any such prediction in advance of detailed empirical investigation. So some amount of gross categorization will have to exist, at least at the start of any study. The point being made here is that this selection of categories will need to be defended with reference to the norms that each category upholds.

Are horizontal organizations significantly more likely than vertical ones to promote cooperation and coordination for mutual benefit? Compared to organizations where members are more alike, are those with a heterogeneous membership more likely to be associated with generalized social trust? Providing any firm answer to these questions is bedeviled by the existence within the literature of studies that support opposite conclusions.²

² See Krishna 2000a for a more detailed discussion of the social capital measures presented here.
A. Horizontal and vertical organizations

In their seminal 1993 work, Putnam et al. regard horizontally organized networks to assist social capital, while vertical relationships are thought to inhibit its formation. “Intense horizontal interactions ... are an essential form of social capital... A vertical network, no matter how dense and no matter how important to its participants, cannot sustain social trust and cooperation” (Putnam et al. 1993:173-174). In his later works, Putnam suggests shortening the list to include only certain types of horizontal networks. Compared to secondary groups where members have frequent face-to-face contact, tertiary and mailing-list organizations are considered less capable of upholding or generating social capital (Putnam 1996).

Later analysts of social capital have challenged Putnam’s preference for horizontal organizations. Berman notes that “[i]t is not at all clear, how in practice one determines whether an organization is vertically or horizontally organized. The Boy Scouts, for example, are a hierarchically organized group, yet they seem to be” favorably regarded by most social capital analysts. On the other hand, “militias and other nationalist organizations,” excluded in most accounts, “do not appear to be much more vertically or hierarchically organized than other types” that get added in to social capital (Berman 1997a: 567).

Empirical investigations carried out in other countries indicate that horizontally shaped networks do not necessarily reveal the presence of higher social capital. Studying variations in economic growth for 29 countries over the three-year period of 1980 to1982, Knack and Keefer (1997: 1284) conclude that while trust and civic cooperation are associated with stronger economic performance, associational activity is unrelated to trust. “Horizontal networks – as measured by membership in groups – are unrelated to trust and civic norms...Promoting horizontal associations through encouraging the formation of and by participating in groups may be counterproductive.”

Other investigations indicate that in addition to the shape of social networks (horizontal vs. vertical) other aspects such as the composition of the membership might also matter. Stolle and Rochon (1998: 47-62) show, for instance, that not all horizontal voluntary associations are alike with respect to social capital. Studying the effects of associational membership in three countries, Sweden, Germany and the United States, they conclude that associations that are more diverse, “whose members bridge major social categories” are “more effective in fostering generalized trust and community reciprocity.” “Homogenous associations are less likely to inculcate high levels of generalized trust and reciprocity among their members.” A separate debate is waged, however, on this issue of homogeneous vs. heterogeneous organizations.

B. Heterogeneous versus homogeneous organizations

That the internal heterogeneity of groups matters both for social capital as well as for economic welfare has been independently verified by Narayan and Pritchett’s (1997) study of Tanzanian villages and also by Grootaert’s (1999) study of Indonesian villages. In each case, a household-level index of social capital – constructed by multiplying together numbers of associational memberships with internal heterogeneity of associations and their span of activities – was found to be positively and consistently related with household economic welfare. More heterogeneous associations are better in terms of social capital.

Another group of scholars derive the opposite conclusions, however, thereby confounding consensus on this issue. Drawing upon data gathered from five U.S. cities, Portney and Berry (1998: 636, 642-43) conclude that compared to social, service, self-help and issue-based organizations, it is “participation in neighborhood associations [that] is more strongly associated
with a high sense of community” and civic engagement. All else being equal, more homogenous
eighborhoods are more likely to have more effective neighborhood associations. In a separate
analysis related to understanding collective efficacy at the neighborhood level, Sampson et al.
(1997) show that among different neighborhood associations the more effective ones are less
highly stratified in terms of income and concentration of immigrants. Diversity and heterogeneity
are counterproductive in this reckoning. Homogeneous associations do better by way of social
capital.

What is a future researcher to make of these seemingly opposite views? Does each type of
group matter for some contexts more than for others? This is, in fact, the conclusion which Stolle
supports in her later work. “Groups with high diversity levels in homogenous cultures [such as
Sweden’s or Germany’s] are much more trust producing...These relations look different in
countries with more diverse populations...In the United States [with a more heterogeneous culture]
homogenous groups generate more generalized trust, and not the ones that accommodate people
from diverse backgrounds” (Stolle 1998: 28-29). Her work suggests that selecting an appropriate
network measure for social capital will depend upon the country or culture that one is studying.

A number of other issues exist that are also related to selecting appropriate network types.
Should one include only formally organized groups, as Putnam does, or should informal groups
also be considered – especially since “the socialization role of creating ‘habits of the heart’ is more
likely to be played...by informal groups” (Newton 1997: 582). Should only small face-to-face
groups be considered, or are large multi-regional and multi-national organizations also instrumental
in promoting coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Minkoff 1997, Oliver and Marwell
1988)? Are strong associational ties better than weak ones or vice versa?

These and other questions related to appropriate network types must be answered in terms
of the norms that are associated with each network type. Where a particular network type is
associated with norms of cooperation and social trust, at those times and in those situations it is
useful and valid to aggregate such network into the measurement of social capital. The norms of
social interaction that are associated with any particular network type are likely, however, to vary
from one situation to another.

Sociologists generally agree that the shape of any network – horizontal or vertical,
homogenous or heterogeneous, formal or informal – does not by itself indicate much about the
nature of human relationships within that network. Granovetter’s (1985: 487-491) is an oft-quoted
view: “Actors do not behave or decide as atoms outside a social context, nor do they adhere
slavishly to a script written for them by the particular intersection of social categories that they
happen to occupy... While social relations may indeed often be a necessary condition for trust and
trustworthiness, they are not sufficient to guarantee these and may even provide occasion and
means for malfeasance and conflict on a scale larger than in their absence.” What sorts of norms
are related to which type of networks cannot be assumed a priori but must be investigated
independently for each separate context.

What is social capital in one context can be unsocial capital in another. Organized religion
that supports humanity and peace in one context becomes a forum for armed militancy in another.
Unions that may promote coordination and cooperation with the state in a corporatist context can
wage bitter confrontation in another context.

It is hardly surprising, therefore, that analysts studying social capital in different contexts
have identified different network forms to be associated with social capital formation. What must
be recognized, however, is that the form or forms privileged by each analyst are specific to a
particular cultural domain and may have little or no value outside that domain. Horizontal vs. vertical may matter for social capital in Italy but not so much in Panama or rural north India. Heterogeneous organization may be more valuable in some countries but less so in others.

C. Importance of locally and contextually relevant measurement

As Hechter (1987) has so trenchantly argued, group solidarity is difficult to verify with reference to norms alone. Equally, network forms also do not provide any reliable indicator of the forms of human interaction occurring within the group. Network types that support cooperation and coordination in one context may promote competition and conflict in another.

The shifting variations in the definition of social capital represent efforts to contextualize an abbreviated understanding of the concept that seeks to measure it in terms of network density alone. That this practice confuses rather than clarifies the concept is illustrated by the preceding discussion. That it can be misleading and error-prone is demonstrated by another group of studies with detailed ethnographic examinations carried out among members of particular groups.

Eastis’ (1998) ethnographic examination of two otherwise similar choir groups concludes that “mere membership in one or another category of voluntary association is too crude a measure to capture empirically the complex experience of membership. Members of both choir groups could report very extensive participation yet still come away from the experience with a rather different mix of human, cultural, or social capital. Such variation owes much to the characteristics of the groups and the structure of relations between their members – not to participation per se nor to the types of groups per se.”

Following his study of groups and associations in contemporary Russia, Rose (1998) concludes that trust is not associated with all types of networks, even those that are horizontally organized or which have a heterogeneous group of members. In the Russian context of institutional involution, some (but not all) informal networks are more closely associated with trust and trustworthy behavior. “Trust,” conclude Jackman and Miller (1998: 59) after reviewing a range of empirical evidence, “is clearly not isomorphic with group membership.” The context of group membership is as important, they submit, as its density or structural form.

The upshot of this discussion about concept specification and empirical referents can be stated briefly as follows. While social capital was defined and measured originally in terms that related entirely to density of horizontally-organized social networks, subsequent investigations have resulted in complicating any such straightforward measurement. What sorts of norms are associated with which types of networks cannot be assumed in advance but it must be verified independently for each separate social context.

The cognitive elements of social capital – relating to norms, values, attitudes and beliefs – must be assessed separately and in addition to its structural elements – relating to networks, roles, rules, precedents. While cognitive elements predispose people toward mutually beneficial collective action, structural elements of social capital facilitate such action (Uphoff 2000; Krishna 2000). Both structural and cognitive dimensions matter, and they must be combined to represent the aggregate potential for mutually beneficial collective action that exists within any community.

To understand the separate importance of norms and networks, consider the following example. Someone’s house or barn burns down at night and people of the neighborhood come together the next day to help the afflicted family rebuild the structure. This kind of collective action can be found not just in villages in north India but also among diverse social groups in all
parts of the world. What is interesting to examine, however, are the factors that lead people to behave in this way.

Two alternative constructions are possible. It is possible, first, that there is a well-recognized leadership within the neighborhood. Receiving information about the unfortunate event, community leaders direct villagers to collect at the site, bringing along whatever tools and implements and building material they might possess.

Alternatively – and this is the second construction of the sequence of events – there are no clear roles for organizing such action in this community. Motivated, instead, by norms of what is appropriate behavior – that it is only right and proper and that one is expected to help any one of their community who is faced with a similar situation – people collect spontaneously and assist with the rebuilding.\(^3\)

The same cooperative outcome can come about in two different ways. In the first case, it was the structural dimensions of social capital – roles, rules, networks – that facilitated cooperation and coordinated action. In the second case, collective action is based on norms and beliefs, i.e., it has a cognitive and not a structural basis. Considering only networks results in neglecting mutually beneficial collective action that has such a cognitive basis. Considering only norms similarly underestimates social capital by ignoring its structural dimensions. Both norms and networks must be assessed, and the measure of social capital must represent the aggregate potential for mutually beneficial collective action.

Not all activities observed in any area are valid for investigating dimensions of cooperation and coordination, both structural and cognitive. Social capital exists “in the relations among persons” (Coleman 1988: S100-101), and only those activities are valid for comparing social capital that inhabitants of this area regard appropriate to carry out collectively rather than individually. The extent of social capital in any community must be verified in relation to activities that are usually carried out collectively for mutual benefit. What these activities are, however, will vary from one context to another.

Crop diseases are usually dealt with collectively in rural north India, but not crop harvesting. House building is an individual’s enterprise in Indian villages and a collective one in Somaliland. Investigators comparing social capital among Somali communities should look among networks that build houses. In rural India, however, they must look at social behavior dealing with crop disease.

Even though members of all communities within a given cultural space share similar conceptions about what are properly individual and appropriately collective activities, past practice and future expectations are likely to vary considerably from community to community. Members of some communities have acted collectively more often in the past. In the future, too, these communities’ members expect that their fellows and they will cooperate more regularly. These variations in the observance of shared collective norms and practices provide the locus for measuring social capital within any given cultural space.

\(^3\) This hypothetical example is discussed along with other real-world cases in Krishna 2000.
D. Integrating methodologies for measuring social phenomena

Increasingly, social science research, including economic research, integrates both quantitative and qualitative methods in the quest for research designs best suited for assessing complex issues and concepts. Integration of complementary methodologies is a fruitful strategy for several reasons: to confirm and corroborate results via triangulation, to elaborate or develop analysis, to provide richer detail, and to initiate new lines of thinking through attention to surprises or paradoxes (Rossman and Wilson 1984, 1991).

It is especially important to integrate complementary data collection techniques when trying to analyze a complex and innovative concept such as social capital. Qualitative methods, including observation, participant observation, life histories, in-depth interviews, and focus group research, have long been used to elucidate values, perceptions, attitudes and opinions of individuals and also groups, providing scope for in-depth examination of relationships and behaviors. These “social representations” encompass especially the cognitive aspects of social capital, and they are also useful for identifying and evaluating the nature of trust that exists in communities, and for analysis of social representations.

Coupled with results from validated survey data, presented in the form of scaled items, qualitative indicators can provide a deeper understanding of what individuals, households and communities regard as social capital. Survey data generate a broad overview of the institutional framework that exists in a particular community. Institutional mapping, focus groups and other qualitative techniques provide a more nuanced understanding of institutional characteristics. Applied together, qualitative and quantitative techniques can provide a more complete and convincing rendering of the local institutional landscape.

E. A proposed tool for cross-cultural measurement of social capital

Clearly there exists the need for a methodological tool that operationalizes the emerging concept of social capital. Such a tool would facilitate an examination of its relationship to poverty alleviation, inequality reduction, and economic growth, thereby assisting researchers, policymakers, and development practitioners in the design, implementation and evaluation of project interventions. A measure of social capital should be available for multi-sectoral, multi-disciplinary applications concerned with assessing both cognitive and structural elements of social capital in diverse communities and in different countries and cultural contexts. Instruments used to scale social

---

4 For lack of more precise terminology, “quantitative” methods here refer to random sampling for survey research, structured individual interviews for data collection and the statistical analyses generated thereby, methods that maximize ‘representativity’ and ‘generalizability’ to the larger study population. “Qualitative” methods refer to a wide range of data collection and analysis techniques whose non-random sampling criterion of ‘saturation of information’ allows for in-depth analysis of social phenomena.

5 The judicious use of histograms, pie charts, and line graphs add dynamic visual appeal to the presentation of quantitative findings. Similarly, in qualitative research, visual analysis by researchers and/or respondents provide dramatic documentation of causality links, patterns of behavior, mapping of community assets and so on. Venn diagrams, genograms, seasonality maps, and causal flow diagrams often illustrate on a single page complex interrelationships difficult to capture in pages of text (Miles and Huberman 1994; Watts and Shrader 1998). Participatory qualitative methods have the added benefit of being produced by respondents with little or no mediation by external researchers (Chambers 1997). Benefits accrue to the community research process beyond those of knowledge generation: research for project planning builds community understanding and capacity.
capital must be reasonably broad, so that they can be applied within different contexts. But breadth of application must go together with conceptual rigor and analytical precision. The things that are measured must be related conceptually to what is understood to comprise social capital, and analytically clear links must exist among the different elements that are used for measurement.

Clearly, when stepping into any cultural context for the first time, one must begin by identifying the types of activities that community members regard as appropriate for collective execution. Activities that are commonly and appropriately executed collectively must be distinguished from others that people carry out separately and individually. And the types of networks that have been constructed for undertaking the former sets of activities must be distinguished at the same time. The nature of activities and the shape of networks will vary between contexts, so it is no surprise that investigators have found different network forms to correspond with social capital in different countries and regions of the world.

Figure 1 presents the conceptual framework for the development of a measurement tool that could address the various dimensions of social capital. The cognitive dimension of social capital considered here relates to values, attitudes, norms and beliefs that influence trust, solidarity and reciprocity and which facilitate collective action among members of a community, is considered here. The structural dimension of social capital forms the other part of this broad conceptual scheme related to the composition, practices and scope of local level institutions, both formal and informal, that help to propel mutually beneficial collective action. As mentioned earlier, social capital needs to be strong in both its structural and cognitive dimensions in order for mutually beneficial collective action to be effective and cover a wide range of objectives and activities.

Social capital can be considered at different levels. At the micro level, social capital relates to attributes and propensities that facilitate mutually beneficial collective action among members of a community. At the macro or national level, however, social capital can be assessed with reference to the institutional context in which individuals and organizations operate (Olson 1982, North 1990), in terms of formal relationships and structures, such as rule of law, legal framework, openness of political regime, level of decentralization, and extent of participation in the policy formulation process (Bain and Hicks 1998). Measurement instruments presented in the following sections relate to structural and cognitive dimensions of social capital at the micro level. We leave to future researchers the task of developing suitable macro-level measures.
Can measures be constructed that are locally and contextually relevant while at the same time allowing for cross-cultural comparability? There is a clear need among development practitioners for a tool that accounts for cognitive and structural social capital, operationalizes dimensions of social capital using qualitative and quantitative measures developed concurrently and iteratively, and is valid and reliable among a wide range of community, household and institutional contexts. The design and field testing of the Social Capital Assessment Tool (SCAT) reported herein represents a first step toward the development of a uniform measure of micro-level social capital.
The tool has three key components, which may be applied separately, sequentially or simultaneously, with simultaneous application suggested as the preferred method.

- The first component of the SCAT is a *community profile* which integrates participatory qualitative methods with a community survey instrument to identify features associated with social capital in this particular cultural and institutional context. Group interviews are conducted within communities. Items in this profile include those related to community assets identification; prior experience of collective action; mechanisms available for conflict resolution; community governance and decision making patterns; and local organizations and networks.

- The second component is a *household survey* which includes 39 close-ended items that relate to the structural dimension of social capital and 21 close-ended items that relate to its cognitive dimensions. Administering this instrument among a large number of individuals or households selected through an appropriate process of random sampling facilitates the application of quantitative analyses for measuring social capital.

- The third component is an *organizational profile* designed to delineate the relationships and networks that exist among formal and informal institutions. This instrument integrates semi-structured interview data with a scoring system for assessing organizational capacity and sustainability. This component can be used as a stand-alone instrument for assessing the strengths of particular local organizations vis-à-vis some specific objective or program. It can also be incorporated into an overall assessment of local-level institutional networks in the community.

From an operational standpoint, the measurement of social capital is most relevant within the context of project development designed to improve quality of life among the poor. A key objective of this social capital assessment tool is to contribute to the understanding of how household- and community-level social capital measures interact with other development indicators to contribute to or erode economic and social development. Pertinent development indicators may come from a variety of sectors - including poverty, education, health, infrastructure, crime and violence, public sector reform, and labor - and can be incorporated at all levels of project intervention, including baseline data for initial preparation, monitoring indicators for supervision, and pre/post-indicators for evaluation.

Determining the directionality of social capital impact on development indicators is a first step in operationalizing social capital. Social capital can play a dual role in development, both influencing and being influenced by project outcomes. For example, the capacity of microcredit programs to promote high levels of trust and mutual support among their participating borrowers is one of the main characteristics of their operational success. In turn, studies have found that repayment rates for microfinance programs are higher among group-lending systems with higher levels of social capital – as is the case where borrowers have close trust networks and collective action and/or where the quality of the relationship between borrower and credit provider fosters trust created and maintained by the predictable and transparent application of the lender’s rules (van Bastelaer, 1999). Successful microfinance policy interventions may then want to both to increase levels of social capital by establishing clear and accountable institutional relations between borrower and lender, as well as prioritize the participation of poor communities with elevated levels of social capital through pre-existing social ties.
Can development projects improve levels of social capital among communities, households and/or institutions? To answer this question, social capital may be considered a dependent variable, where fostering social capital accumulation is a clear project objective. For example, water and sanitation projects that encourage the formation of water committees and employ participatory community evaluations may increase cognitive and structural social capital among participating communities (Kähkönen, 1999). Project activities that increase institutional strengthening among local level institutions, community capacity building and participation, and household participation and benefits allocation will increase levels of collective action, trust, solidarity, and a host of other dimensions of social capital.

Do preexisting levels of social capital affect project outcomes? To answer this question, social capital may be considered an independent variable, where social capital is a determinant, or at least a key input, that affects project success. In Bangladesh, for example, voluntary solid waste management programs were found to be more successful among those communities with higher levels of social capital, reciprocity being more important than trust (Pargal et al., 1999). In Indonesia, pre-existing social capital was found to be positively associated with community-based water projects for piped water systems that require more skills for operation and maintenance and more collective action for system that cross land and municipal boundaries (Isham and Kähkönen, 1999). Social capital as an input to generic project design overall decisions regarding targeting beneficiaries: i) should the project prioritize the ‘poorest of the poor’ by targeting those communities and households with the fewest social capital assets? or ii) should projects want to maximize effectiveness by targeting poor communities with mid- to higher-range social capital measures?

The social capital assessment tool is applicable at all levels of project design. In the earliest exploratory phase, an abbreviated version of the SCAT can be useful for a quick assessment of both levels of social capital and community needs and assets. In the preparation phase, the SCAT can be used to collect baseline data on norms and networks to determine where projects should be implemented and what, if any, social capital outcomes are desired. The flexibility and rapid application of the SCAT allows for the collection of monitoring data throughout the project cycle, even at brief six-month intervals, providing quantitative and qualitative supervision benchmarks. Project evaluation will benefit enormously by conducting a full SCAT upon project completion, ideally compared with data from control communities that did not participate in the project. This information can provide insight regarding project sustainability and the role of social capital in future development interventions.
PART II. DEVELOPING A TOOL TO MEASURE SOCIAL CAPITAL

The three SCAT components were developed after studying a large set of research instruments, developed by different researchers and applied in over 25 studies conducted in 15 countries worldwide. After development, these tools have been pilot tested among urban, rural and indigenous populations in Panama and in India, and these experiences have resulted in further refinement of these tools. The three SCAT tools are now available for wider application among different countries and cultural contexts.

The SCAT components – a community profile, a household survey, and an organizational profile – are intended to measure micro-level social capital at the level of communities and households; macro-level social capital measures are not included in the SCAT. Annexes B through E present the complete set of research instruments. The following discussion is intended to provide readers with an overview of each instrument and general instructions about the ways in which studies might combine these instruments for application in particular research settings.

A. Community profile

We recommend that the SCAT exercise begin with the administration of the community profile. This instrument serves three main objectives.

First, it enables the research team to familiarize itself relatively quickly with important community characteristics and issues relating to social capital, which are useful for structuring later parts of the exercise. The group interviews establish boundaries for the “community” within which the research will take place. This understanding of community boundaries will be used throughout the exercise – for selecting household members to be interviewed using the household survey, and also for identifying organizations that will be profiled using the third institutional instrument.

Second, organizing open discussion sessions in a public space enables community members to become familiar with the purposes and proposed activities of the research team. Everyone is welcome to participate at these sessions, which are publicized widely in advance. A diversity of views is represented, and the research team gets a preliminary sense of the extent of unity and cohesion and of factors that might constitute lines of division within the community.

Finally, these participatory group interviews generate a collection of community maps, diagrams, and field notes that serve as preliminary sources of information on institutions and relationships within the community. As we remarked before, it is important to have clarity on the types of activities that are appropriate within this cultural context for collective (rather than individual) execution. Community discussions are useful not only for enlisting information on these activities but also to identify the formal and informal organizations that are available to community members for implementing their collective enterprises.

There are two parts to the community profiling exercise: (a) an initial open-ended discussion with the community, which uses a participatory interview guide (Annex B) and (ii) a structured community survey questionnaire (Annex C). A standardized community questionnaire forms part of the community profiling instrument and it serves to compare responses and activities across communities. This questionnaire also inventories basic community infrastructure, providing

---

6 See Annex A for contributing researchers and studies.
an initial identification of community needs and assets. The community profile helps to identify communities’ current priorities and future project needs.

Before convening a community meeting and administering this instrument, the research team should first spend some time walking through the community to gain a sense of the location and its special characteristics. Initial contacts made at this time can serve to identify key informants, establish convenient times and venues for community meetings, and generally facilitate interactions between area residents and research team members.

Between two and eight group interviews can be conducted in each community, with a larger number of interviews required where the community is (or is likely to be) divided on gender, ethnic, economic or other grounds. Such group interviews can be conducted with the participation of as few as between 5 and 12 participants, and they may be either planned or spontaneous. Planned interviews involve the previous identification of participants and agreeing upon a time and place for the interview, for instance in someone’s home or in a public building. Spontaneous interviews take place at any given moment in a public place, taking advantage of the willingness and immediacy of community members available at that time. The composition of this group may be more fluid as participants come and go, according to their time constraints. Community leaders are often helpful for identifying other key informants and facilitating the organization of both types of interviews.

Each group interview should have a moderator and two observers. The moderator’s role is to facilitate the discussion, probe on key issues, elicit comments from all participants, and focus the discussion on the issues of interest without seeming to interrupt group dynamics. The observers’ role is to take notes on the content of the discussion and group dynamic process as well as noting down each participant’s name, age, sex, and occupation. The observers also record the substance of the discussion that accompanies the development of the community maps, Venn diagram, and institutional flowchart. The research team as a whole is responsible for having the appropriate materials ready for both planned and spontaneous interviews. The materials needed for each community interview include: a copy of the interview guide (on paper or summarized on 3 x 5 cards); pads of notepaper for recording field notes; writing pens; flip-chart paper; markers (several colors); colored paper circles of three different sizes; rolls of masking tape; scissors.

The participatory interview guide given at Annex B is used at the start of the meetings. It has six separate sections, described below.

**Defining community boundaries and identifying community assets.** The group interview begins with a mapping exercise with participating community members. Setting out large sheets of paper and providing magic markers, the facilitator asks the group to draw their community as they understand it to be. The group locates key assets, resources and landmarks. In Panama and especially in India, this mapping exercise served as an excellent starting point for starting discussions with community members, who were generally eager to speak about items such as the location of drinking water supplies, roads and school buildings, residential patterns, etc. It also opened the way to discussions of other issues.7

---

7 We found it useful to begin the SCAT community profile exercise by focusing on what communities have (in terms of assets), rather than on what they do not have (in terms of needs). It is necessary to avoid creating an impression – or to dispel the image if it already exists – that the research team has come to the community to give away some project or other tangible benefits.
Case study of community collective action. The facilitator probes on a specific instance of community collective action within the last three years. Observers recording brief oral histories recalling instances of collective action and solidarity, identifying conflict resolution mechanisms, and assessing future prospects. We found it useful to have discussions of collective action and solidarity focused around a “case study” in which the community worked collectively to resolve an issue, irrespective of positive or negative outcome. Members of the research team serve as observers and they keep detailed notes.

Community governance and decision-making. This section is concerned with identifying leaders within the community and outlining processes of leadership selection and community decision making. Facilitators probe on specific instances.

Identification of community institutions. This exercise includes the identification of both formal and informal organizations. Each organization is assessed in terms of its accessibility to different community members, involvement of different groups, and extent of exclusion. A brief history of each organization is recorded at this time, which is supplemented with more detailed inquiry conducted while using the Organizational Profiles (discussed later).

Community-institutional relationships. A simplified Venn diagram exercise forms part of this assessment. Organizations are assessed in terms of their worth for different community purposes, accessibility and importance for community well-being.

Institutional networks and organizational density. Functional relationships between pairs of organizations are mapped using a flowchart. All sorts of organizations working within the community, including local government departments, non-government organizations, community groups, and other civil society actors are considered for this purpose.

It may appear on first sight that the participatory interview guide involves research teams entering into long and complex discussions with community members. In practice, however, these interviews were usually completed within one to three hours, generating a great deal of useful information, and helping the research teams gain a clearer idea of the community and its component parts.

This exercise results in generating the following outputs:

- Community maps, indicating location of community assets and services
- Observational notes of group process and summary of issues discussed
- List of positive characteristics of community assets and services
- List of negative characteristics of community assets and services
- List of all formal and informal community institutions
- Case study of collective action in the past
- Institutional diagrams (Venn) of relative impact and accessibility
- Institutional diagrams (web) of institutional network relationships and density

---

8 Included within the technical documents we have prepared as an accompanying document is some summary information for group interview facilitators that can be written up on 3 x 5 index cards, which facilitators can use as cue cards for remembering the steps of the process. Observers should consult the entire interview guide while taking notes.
These participatory exercises, particularly the Venn diagram and the flowchart, which are colorful and have striking visual appeal, help to draw community members into the discussion. This paves the way for administering the more structured parts of the group interviews, where the community questionnaire is used as a standardized tool for comparing responses and activities across communities.

Group interviews for the purpose of community profiling may be either spontaneous or planned, though it is generally preferable to give advance information so that the largest possible number of community members can attend. Some public space can serve as an appropriate venue for the group meeting. Planned meetings involve inviting key informants (or having a key informant do the inviting) and are useful particularly when the viewpoints of a certain demographic group – such as youth, women, or laborers – are of interest. In societies where divisions based on gender or ethnicity are likely to be particularly important, it is often useful to conduct separate meetings with different sub-groups. At least two group interviews should be carried out with women and men separately. Mixed groups can also be interviewed to assess levels of consensus, but these should be in addition to separate groups.

Information collected from the community participatory interviews is compiled and coded in the following manner. Upon completion of each group interview, observers write up detailed field notes, allowing approximately a time equivalent to the length of the interview for this purpose. These detailed field notes include three levels of information. The first are “observational notes,” that is, straightforward recording of information as it occurs with no subjective commentary. At the second level are “analytical notes,” where the researcher makes judgments regarding the meaning of the information recorded. The third level relates to “methodological notes” which are assessments of the methodological implications of the techniques employed. When all group interviews for a single community are completed, the team writes up a summary assessment of the community profile, issues salient to the measurement of social capital (such as the collective activities and organizations that were identified), and also issues related to social and economic development in the community (e.g., problems related to health or to education), and other key observations. The team also writes up at least one “case study” where some community-level effort was undertaken in the last three years by community members and/or a local level organization to address a community problem. The case study describes in detail the identified problem, the community’s collective efforts for addressing the problem, and the achieved outcome, whether positive or negative. These field notes are transcribed electronically. The research team should also transfer onto 8 1/2 x 11 paper a copy of the community map(s), Venn diagrams, and the institutional flow charts.

This initial level of qualitative data ordering and coding may be followed by more in-depth analysis, beginning with a rigorous review of transcripts to begin to identify key concepts, themes and events that emerge from the interviews. Researchers should look for emerging patterns of both similarities and differences concerning informants’ common behaviors, beliefs, perceptions, attitudes and ideas. After an initial identification, researchers should develop coding categories, beginning with a preliminary list of concepts that can serve as a skeleton for a more detailed coding structure. Coding analysis involves assigning codes, representing key concepts, throughout the transcripts; coding may be done alphanumerically, with color codes, or a combination of techniques. Software packages for data coding and ordering can also facilitate this process.

The community questionnaire inventories basic community characteristics and provides an initial identification of community needs and assets. Based as it is on common collective knowledge, responses to the community questionnaire may be elicited during the participatory
group interview. However, it may be useful to schedule additional community interviews with other groups in the community specifically for the questionnaire data.

The community questionnaire (Annex C) has ten sections that are concerned, respectively, with obtaining information related to:

**General community characteristics**, including age, size and geographic boundaries, and means of reaching and making contact with the outside world.

**Principal services and the level and quality of supply**, including electricity, public lighting, potable water, public telephone service, waste disposal, mail service, public markets, and transportation. This is useful baseline information, which can be used for assessing levels of infrastructure development and also for identifying community requirements and project ideas for future use.

**Other community services**, including recreation, meeting places, and public safety and security.

**Labor migration**, including temporary out-migration in search of jobs and in-migration by outsiders. Assessing levels of migration both into and out of the community allows greater understanding of the extent to which community boundaries are fixed or flexible.

**Education** is studied in terms of the facilities that are available (primary, middle and high school, number of teachers, etc.) and how these facilities are accessed by community members (e.g., school attendance, literacy level).

**Employment opportunities**: are they available to those who need them most? Health, like education, is assessed in terms of available facilities and level of service.

**Community support needs** identifies those organizations, including grassroots groups, NGOs and government organizations, that enable community members to deal with their common problems. It serves a useful purpose, first, for assessing the extent to which common problems find common solutions within this community, and second, to inventory organizations that will be studied with the help of the Organizational Profile, discussed later in this paper.

**Environmental problems**, including forest cover, waste disposal, and prevalence of diseases in the community.

**Agriculture**, including principal crops, market activities, and problems encountered in making a decent living from agricultural activity.

The community interview questionnaire contains a wide range of questions, thus enabling the research team to gain information relatively quickly about several aspects of life in this community.\(^9\) Only a small number of items (contained within Section 8 on Community Support

---

\(^9\) Not all sectors will be equally relevant in each case, for instance, home telephone service was not significant among indigenous communities in Panama or tribal communities in India. Researchers may select which of these sectors are relevant in a particular context, and additional sectors may be added, depending upon the scope of the project and the possible uses in terms of program development.
Needs) are directly related to measuring social capital. The remaining information serves as operational sector indicators useful for subsequent impact assessment of social capital.

B. Household survey

The household survey (Annex D) is the instrument used for generating quantified indicators of social capital, measuring individual households’ stocks of and access to social capital, and aggregating these figures appropriately to generate community-level measures of social capital. Both the cognitive and structural dimensions of social capital are assessed, and they are aggregated appropriately as they are found to be related within the contexts studied. Techniques using factor analysis are generally useful for the purpose of aggregation. However, conceptual links must first be drawn from observing communities in action. Consequently, the community profile forms an essential first step for the measurement exercise, though not directly providing this measurement directly and by itself.

The household survey should be carried out among a random sample taken from the population of interest. Hence it is useful to have or to develop a list of all households in the community and then draw a random sample from this list. To preserve the integrity of the statistical techniques that will be used for analyzing the data and delivering measurements of social capital, it is essential that the exercise of drawing a random sample be undertaken carefully and systematically.

The household questionnaire consists of five sections:

**Section I. Introduction.** This section identifies the selected household, registers time and date of interview to monitor fieldwork, and lists the names of interviewer and monitor. This section is fairly standard for all surveys.

**Section II. Household characteristics.** This section assesses household characteristics and draws up a roster of household members. Socio-economic data about the household are collected in this section, and relationships among household members are also recorded.

In field tests, interviewers found it helpful if these pages were photocopied in pink (or another contrasting color) as frequent reference to this information is made throughout the interview. The contrasting color enables interviewers to easily locate this information.

**Section III. Genogram.** This section involves the participatory development of a genogram or family tree which provides an at-a-glance assessment of institutional-household relationships and concepts of community-household access to social capital. At a minimum, the genogram systematically records the respondent’s family structure for his or her current (siblings, cousins), previous (parents, uncles and aunts) and subsequent (children, nieces and nephews) generations. The genogram also depicts family and household structures, and distinguishes between family members living within and outside the research community, a potentially important link for the construction of social networks outside one’s immediate sphere. Finally, the genogram records the year of major

---

10 In India, the village was the appropriate unit of community in rural areas, and voters’ lists that enumerated all households in each village were available, so a random sample was drawn from this list. In Panama, the World Bank had completed a Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS) the previous year; a stratified sample was drawn from the LSMS sample frame.
life events such as births, deaths, marriages and dissolutions. For social capital purposes, membership in local level institutions are also recorded for each person.

Easily administered in 5 to 10 minutes, the genogram often detects household members that did not appear in survey roster, despite interviewers’ attempts to elicit complete information. It also allows for the collection of data not registered in the questionnaire, which can be subsequently coded or used alongside other qualitative data or to test hypotheses regarding family composition and kin relationships not captured in household surveys. The genogram provides a means of cross-referencing data related to community characteristics, household characteristics and structural social capital variables. It also provides a visual stimulus for respondents regarding other questions, and its participatory development helps create further rapport with respondents.

Figures 2 presents an illustrative fictitious genogram and symbols. Using the symbols shown on the lower portion of the figure, the genogram records family composition, household composition, organizational affiliation and level of involvement. The genogram presents the case of a divorced woman whose household consists of her three children and granddaughter. In a household within the same community live her mother (a remarried widow), her stepfather, her half-sister, currently separated from her husband, and niece. Another half-sister died some time ago. The respondent’s former husband resides in another community and his household consists of his common-law wife, their son, and the respondent’s nephew. The respondent’s brother lives in common-law union with two sons and a child, a girl, who is not a blood relation.

\[1\] Due to space limitations, the illustrative genogram includes neither birth, death, marriage and dissolution dates, nor institutional affiliations. Hand-drawn genograms easily incorporate these additional data.
Figure 2: Illustrative genogram and symbols

Genogram symbols

- □ = male
- □ = male informant
- □ = deceased male
- ○ = female
- ○ = female informant
- ○ = deceased female

- legal marriage
- common-law marriage
- divorced
- dissolution of union

b.19__ date of birth

d.19__ date of death

Composition of households living in the same community as the informant’s household

Composition of households living in a community different from that of the informant.
Items contained in Sections IV and V represent the survey’s key data set for assessing and comparing levels of social capital. While Section IV is primarily concerned with observing manifestations related to the structural dimension of social capital, Section V addresses its cognitive dimension. We discuss these items in some detail in the following paragraphs.

Section IV: This section has the following six sub-sections:

- **Organizational density and characteristics.** Questions in this section are intended to elicit information about the household’s membership in different types of local organizations. A typology of organizations is provided (see code box at the bottom of Question 4.1), and respondents are asked whether they or any other household member participates in the activities of any of these organizations. The quality of participation in each organization is assessed by asking whether the household member is a leader, an active member, an occasional or irregularly attending member, or if no member of the household holds any membership in the concerned organization. The relative importance of groups and organizations attended by some household member is also assessed. The internal characteristics of each organization are judged by asking a set of questions related to membership characteristics (i.e. Are members all of the same gender, kinship group, political party, etc? – or does this organization provide an example of “bridging social capital,” helping to bring together people from different subgroups and economic strata); to decision-making processes and leadership patterns; and to the opportunities provided by organization membership for learning new skills and acquiring valuable information. In short, the idea is not simply to obtain a gross measure of organizational density but also to factor in aspects related to the quality of participation and the intensity of members’ involvement.

- **Networks and mutual support organizations.** This section presents a series of hypothetical questions intended to gauge respondents’ expectations about whether community members would act in concert with one another, for instance, when faced with some common misfortune (crop failure or urban violence) or if some other issue were to arise that affected most or all of them (e.g., if the primary school had no teacher for a long time). The exact nature of the hypothetical issue can be described differently in different contexts. Asking respondents to think through these behaviorally-specific situations helps gain some ideas about peoples’ expectations related to collective action and solidarity in the future.

- **Exclusion.** Do organizational memberships and expectations about future collective action encompass all members of the community or are there significant subsections that are excluded from these enterprises? Questions in this section are intended to find out who in the community feels excluded from collective actions and what are the grounds for exclusion. Respondents are asked questions about the community generally (“Who in this community is excluded?”) and also about their own specific situation (“Are you and your family excluded?”)

- **Previous collective action.** This section supplements the sections on membership and exclusion further by asking respondents about their own and their family members’ participation in particular collective enterprises. While a previous section was related to expectations regarding future collective action, this section asks respondents about their participation in collective enterprises organized in the past. The idea is to get a
more complete picture about how the community behaves as a collective undertaking and how well the particular household is integrated with these community efforts.

- **Sector-specific participation.** This section is a continuation of the previous one, in that it asks respondents about their levels of participation in specific collective enterprises organized in the past. As such, it can readily be merged with the previous section. However, researchers may have a specific interest in a particular sector or sectors, and this section provides a space where such targeted questions can be inserted. Some illustrative questions are provided in Annex D.

- **Conflict and conflict resolution.** Where a large number of interpersonal or inter-group conflicts exist or where communities are unable to resolve such conflicts peacefully and efficiently, social capital may be adversely affected. Trust among community members might suffer, and bonds of reciprocity may be weakened. Mechanisms for conflict resolution and their effects – as assessed in terms of harmonious relationships within the community – are addressed by the questions included within this subsection.

Two observations are in order. First, not all of the questions included within Section IV are equally relevant. In any particular context, some subset of questions may be more relevant than others. In rural Rajasthan, for example, and also to an extent among rural non-indigenous and indigenous communities in Panama, the first subsection on organizational affiliations and density of membership did not prove to be very useful. Very few organizations were in existence in these areas, and a tiny minority of residents were members of these organizations. This is not to say that social capital was uniformly low in these communities. Social capital manifests itself differently in different contexts – we must stress at risk of repetition – and close observation of the local situation enables one to isolate features that reliably indicate its presence or absence in a particular situation. A relatively long list of items has been included within Sections IV and V, and researchers will need to select specific items and modify others. Utilizing three separate instruments and commencing the investigation with a close observation of community interactions enables researchers to arrive by triangulation at a short list of reliable indicators.

Our second observation concerns the manner in which the different items can be combined within a composite index of social capital. Structural and cognitive elements must be combined, and it is this combination of facilitating and predisposing factors that constitute the potential for mutually beneficial collective action that we recognize as social capital. The distinction between structural and cognitive elements is mostly of an analytical nature, however, and in practice some amount of overlap and intermixing will usually exist among these elements. The more people trust each other and the higher the extent of solidarity in the community, for instance, the more people will associate with local organizations and their expectations regarding future collective action will also be higher. Similarly, the smaller the extent of exclusion within a community, the more widespread is the network of mutual obligations and reciprocity among community members.

Structural and cognitive elements are often intertwined in this manner, and the appearance of some cognitive elements within our list of structural factors is thus not merely coincidental. Though structural and cognitive elements are often mixed together, the proportions in this mixture vary from one context to another. A measure that uses purely structural elements might be quite reliable in some context, as Putnam et al. (1993) found for the Italian case. In other contexts, such as rural India and rural Panama, predominantly cognitive elements might figure in the measurement of social capital. Structural and cognitive provide two different perspectives, or two different loci, if you will, for observing social capital in practical situations, and we retain this
We must look at social capital using both eyes, thus, and we must use our analytical apparatus to form a single sharp image.

We turn next to a discussion of the part of the household survey (Section V) that is concerned with observing cognitive elements of social capital. This is followed by a brief conceptual discussion of how the different elements can be combined to arrive at a single composite index of social capital.

Section V: of the household survey has three parts that are concerned, respectively, with solidarity, trust, reciprocity and cooperation. The questions in this section are framed in terms of different practical situations that are typically faced by community members. Do respondents expect that such situations will be dealt with through mutually beneficial collective action? What is the scope of such collective action in their estimation, i.e., how many community members will be involved, how often will they act together, and how many common situations will be covered by a collective response?

The precise practical situations to be addressed in these questions will vary from context to context. Notions regarding which activities are properly executed collectively and which others are appropriate for individuals to undertake in isolation from one another will vary depending on culture. What we have included below are some illustrative situations that we feel will apply widely, both for agrarian contexts that are likely to field the major part of rural development activity and city contexts that emerge as key factors for urban development. We encourage researchers to fine-tune these questions further in order to relate them more closely to the communities they study. Nevertheless, a wide range of practical situations is represented by the questions included within this section, and we are reasonably confident that researchers will find that at least some of these questions have value for the contexts that they study.

For instance, the following two questions were found to be consistently useful and valid in applications conducted across different parts of India and Panama (items 5.6 and 5.7), and people there could readily relate these situations to their own notions of how trust functions in their community:
5.6. Suppose someone from the village/neighborhood had to go away for a while along with their family. In whose charge would they leave (RURAL: their fields, URBAN: their house)?

-- Other family members [1]
-- Neighbor [2]
-- Anyone from the village/neighborhood [3]

5.7. Suppose a friend of yours in this village/neighborhood faced the following alternatives, which one would s/he prefer?

RURAL:
-- Own and farm 10 hectares of land entirely by themselves [1]
-- Own and farm 25 hectares of land jointly with one other person [2]

URBAN:
-- Own and use a 10 square meter patio entirely by themselves [1]
-- Own and use a 25 square meter patio that is shared with one other family [2]

The second alternative makes more land or patio available – 12.5 hectares/meters$^2$ per individual compared to 10 hectares/meters$^2$ in the first alternative – but it also involves acceptance of a situation where ownership is shared, with the attendant possibilities of disputes and mutual suspicion. More respondents selected option 2 in communities where social capital is high and people trust one another more than in other communities.

No single item serves by itself as a valid indicator of social capital, and items in Sections 4 and 5 (i.e., subsets of these items) must be combined appropriately to provide a locally-valid scale for measuring social capital. Of course such a scale will need to be defended in conceptual and analytical terms and not merely because they have been found to be handy for quantitative analyses.

Identifying suitable survey items and combining these to form an index of social capital calls for close observation of the local situation followed by statistical analysis of the collected data. First, one must ensure that items on which information is collected are indeed related to patterns of life in the communities one is studying. For instance, it is relatively useless to put questions about land sharing – even if these are couched in hypothetical terms – to persons for whom land may have relatively little value or who are not allowed to own land, such as widows. Issues of concern vary between urban and rural communities, and for many survey items we have distinguished between items to be administered in rural areas and urban areas. Second, as we have been at pains to indicate, manifestations of social capital vary by cultural context, so survey items must be selected that have relevance for the specific context that one is studying. Residents of rural Rajasthan face crop failure in two years out of every five, and they have learned to deal collectively with this common misfortune. Collective action to deal with crop failure provides a useful point for examining variations in social capital levels among Rajasthani communities. An analogous situation exists among the rural indigenous population studied in Panama, where over
the years the “starvation season”\(^\text{12}\) has increased in length and severity as crop yields decline on nutrient-poor lands. How the indigenous community responds vis-à-vis non-indigenous rural communities in terms of collective action is an area for further inquiry.

Close observation assists in identifying appropriate sites for observing social capital in action in any given context. And statistical analysis also helps to winnow the data and separate the chaff from the grain. Survey items for which the majority of respondents have indicated no response – i.e., where the recorded response is [8] ("don’t know/not sure) or [9] ("no answer") can and should be eliminated from the analysis. Similarly, instance of unvarying response, i.e., items where the responses are all fairly similar across respondents, can also be taken out of the analysis. The objective of the exercise is to scale variations in social capital across communities, and items where the response is relatively invariant are hardly helpful, except, of course, for the rare case where different communities have nearly the same level of social capital.

Eliminating non-relevant survey items on the basis of close observation and eliminating others on the ground of non-response or non-varying response will still result in a rather long list of remaining items. Factor analysis is helpful at this stage for isolating a core group of closely inter-related items. An index of social capital can be constructed by combining these items appropriately. Before including them within the index, however, the selected items must all be shown to be related to practices and activities that are collectively executed in the context that one is studying.

For instance, six questionnaire items were found useful for the purpose of constructing an index of social capital for Rajasthan: items Q4.15, Q4.17, Q4.27, Q5.3, Q5.5, and Q5.6. The first three among these six items relate to some structural components of social capital, while the last three relate to some cognitive components. Items referring to structural and cognitive components were found to be closely correlated among themselves, indicating that high scores on one of these items are likely to correspond with high scores on the others. An index of social capital was constructed by adding together household scores for each of these six items, after first re-scaling each item to give it an equal weight in the index. Other survey items will most likely be found to have relevance in contexts that are not culturally close to Rajasthan.

The household survey is relatively easy to administer. Each household questionnaire took between one and one-and-a-half hours to complete, and usually a ten percent sample of households was selected. Respondents to this questionnaire were interviewed individually in the security of their own homes, so they were under less pressure to respond in any manner that was expected of them by other members of the community. Each respondent is asked at the outset whether he or she is willing to participate in this exercise, and some respondents will always be found who will not agree to be interviewed, so the random sample must contain a reserve list of households that can be drawn upon in this situation. However, less than two percent of respondents in India and in Panama refused to be interviewed, so very few replacements were made.

Survey items come pre-coded, so data entry is a straightforward task, not requiring much sophisticated knowledge, and it can be completed relatively rapidly. It is useful to build in a five to ten percent sample verification – i.e., five to ten percent of the filled questionnaires can be cross-checked before data are entered – so that errors arising on account of lack of understanding can be detected and rectified at an early stage.

\(^{12}\) The “starvation season” or la temporada de hambruna is the period of time following the planting season and preceding the harvest season when food stores are exhausted.
C. Organizational profile

The organizational profile (Annex E) seeks to delineate the relationships and networks that exist within specific local organizations, which can be either formal or informal in nature. It assesses internal characteristics of organizations that can either promote or hinder collective action. Some of these organizations might be key participants in specific development projects, so it is helpful to assess the capacities and social bonds that exist among members. Along with the other two instruments described earlier, the organizational profile can also contribute toward the overall assessment of social capital in a community. Additionally, it serves as a useful tool for identifying and assessing local organizational support for project design, implementation and monitoring. Important local partners can be identified in this fashion and their capacities can be assessed.

The organizational profile is based on data collected in a series of semi-structured interviews with organizations’ leaders, members and also non-members. Key information sets included within the organizational profile relate to the organization’s origins and history, quality of membership (why people join, exclusion and inclusion of particular sub-groups, etc.), institutional capacity (quality of leadership, participation, organizational culture, and organizational capacity) and institutional linkages (extent and nature of exchange with other governmental and non-governmental agencies).

This closed-ended questionnaire is designed to yield information that can be compared across different organizations operating within any given community. The interviews are recorded as field notes. Subsequent to the interviews, some organizational characteristics that are amenable to quantification can be scored using the provided score sheet and a comparative index of organizational scores can be generated in this manner. \(^\text{13}\)

Between three and six organizations per community are profiled, depending on the size of the community and complexity of the development project that is being conceived. The organizations to be interviewed are identified through the community profile and/or household survey.

It helps to make prior appointments with key informants, especially with the leaders of these organizations. Individual interviews can be conducted with up to three leaders per organization. These interviews should preferably be face-to-face, but a self-administered written questionnaire can be substituted. Interviews generally last between 45 and 60 minutes. Key informants include the executive director (or functional equivalent), member(s) of the board of directors or other recognized leaders, and senior staff. One or two members of the research team can be trained to conduct these interviews. It is useful to have a two-member team, with one person acting as interviewer and the other as note-taker.

Focus group interviews are carried out separately with members and non-members, and each of these groups is comprised usually of between 5 and 12 participants. Depending on the size and diversity of the organization’s membership, anywhere from one to four focus groups can be conducted. Among non-members, an effort should be made to conduct two focus groups, one for non-members who want to be members and one for non-members with no interest in becoming a member. These interviews are generally of shorter duration, approximately 15 to 30 minutes.

\(^{13}\) See Annex F for the organizational score-sheet.
Materials needed for the organizational profile are:

- Interview guides
- Pads of lined papers
- Pencils
- One copy of organizational questionnaire per organization

Like group interviews conducted with community groups, each focus group should have a moderator and one to two observers. The moderator’s role is to facilitate the discussion, probe on key issues, elicit comments from all participants, and focus the discussion on the issues of interest. The observers’ role is to take notes on the content of the discussion and the process of group decision making. Upon completion of the focus group interview, the moderator and observers should conduct a follow-up debriefing to refine the interview notes and discuss preliminary findings.

When the series of interviews required to profile any particular organization are completed, the research team should code the completed questionnaire using all the information at hand. Interrater reliability is perhaps the greatest obstacle to accurate scoring; two or more interviewers are recommended to work together assigning numerical scores. Obtaining information separately from leaders, members and non-members enables the team to assemble an altogether more reliable assessment of the organization and its capacity.

The research team should draft a summary memo of the key characteristics of the organization, its strengths and weaknesses, and its relationship with the broader community and with other local level institutions. This summary serves as an initial analysis of the organization. More detailed transcript coding and additional interviews can be undertaken if the particular organization appears to have value as a potential partner for a future project. Repeat interviews can serve during project implementation to assess how a particular partner organization or stakeholder has changed in this time. Because a level of uniformity and rigor in the data collection process has been introduced, organizational profiles can be conducted over time to yield a broad picture of the ways in which some structural components of social capital have changed in the given community.

D. Preliminary results and lessons learned in Panama and India

Overall, the SCAT instruments were found to be valuable both for the purpose of assessing and scaling social capital and also for identifying some local organizational capacities that might be useful to investigate in the context of future development initiatives. The translated instruments were relatively easy to administer, though some changes have been made to specific items within these instruments. Some items that are particularly sensitive to social and cultural context were amended or replaced in the process of translation and pilot testing. A locally useful scale of social capital in India was constructed, and comparisons of social capital scores are presented for different categories of respondents.

The versatility of the SCAT methods allows adapting the tool to a wide variety of research and development contexts. A primary goal of the pilot tests was to apply the SCAT to as diverse a population as possible. Questions are easily understood, whether applied in English, Spanish, Ngobe, or Hindi.

Participatory methods add a positive dimension to the field work, by way of “breaking the ice” with respondents, creating and sustaining respondents’ interest, and providing didactic value to the exercise with respondents, who often stated that they, too, had learned something in the
research process. The participatory structure of the SCAT is closely linked with the needs and interests of poor households and communities. The community profile allows for clear articulation by poor communities of their priorities and assets, as well as identification of local-level institutions that they find most responsive and effective.\(^{14}\)

The integration of research methods embodied in the SCAT instruments results in findings that are highly complementary, although detailed analysis of quantitative and qualitative findings may not always coincide fully. Such discrepancies provide constructive indications of areas for further inquiry and integration. While the household survey data point the way to broader generalizations and clearly demonstrated associations, the qualitative data often elucidate possible explanations as to the complexities of these associations.

**D1. Translation and pilot testing**

The initial SCAT instruments were drafted in English and reviewed extensively by an advisory committee in Washington with extensive international experience, two Spanish speakers and one Hindi speaker. Before applying the SCAT to either field situation, the instruments were translated into the local language. The objective of this exercise is not simply to transliterate from the original English version but also to contextualize the inquiry and to situate it within the specific social context being examined. The following criteria guided this effort:

* **Simplicity.** Questions were designed to be simple for investigators to administer and easy for respondents to follow. They were worded simply and succinctly, and the range of choices provided not too extensive, so that respondents can remember and evaluate all of them before indicating their preference.

* **Objectivity.** Questions were designed to be as free of bias as possible. Leading or loaded questions were left out or reworded, for example, those for which the respondent felt under some kind of social pressure to provide the “right” response.

* **Non-repetition.** While it is useful to triangulate responses to different questions, it is necessary that respondents do not feel that they are being tested in any manner. To the extent possible, questionnaire items did not apparently repeat something that has been asked earlier.

* **Contextual relevance.** Issues raised should have relevance for the respondents, i.e., they should bear reference to their particular social context. While asking about the materials used for house construction, for example, only locally used materials were included among the indicated options and not those that are used in other countries. Contextualization is particularly important when it comes to inquiring about people’s organizational affiliations. Different types of local organizations – going by different names and performing different functions – exist among different social contexts. Before administering the SCAT instruments, it is necessary to have a fairly complete listing of these organizations, so that respondents can select from among a locally relevant set of choices. Administering the community profile first can help for this purpose.

---

\(^{14}\) Researchers’ inability to offer any immediate tangible benefits to the community may sometimes create barriers to participation among some respondents. One respondent, a female 48-year-old agricultural worker in Panama asked, “How can we convert social capital into economic capital?” and was dissatisfied when interviewers explained that the project goals were focused on research results.
Panama: The finalized pilot version of the English SCAT was translated into Spanish by the researcher, then reviewed by the technical team in Panama for Spanish accuracy and context. It was decided that, when necessary, household surveys would be interpreted into Ngobe by bilingual interviewers. The structure, ordering and wording of all instruments were again reviewed and modified following completion of the field work. These changes were incorporated into the Spanish version, then all the SCAT instruments were back-translated into English by the researcher for use in India.\textsuperscript{15}

India: A professional translator was engaged for the purpose of translating the three SCAT instruments into the local language, Hindi, and assisted in this exercise by the core project team.\textsuperscript{16} Key respondents were consulted for the purpose of drawing up a list of organizations likely to be relevant in rural and urban areas. This list of organizations was further refined during pilot testing. Only those organizations were retained in the final list that were found to exist in at least one among the three pilot locations. An umbrella category, “other,” was provided to take account of additional organizational affiliations that might be found in other locations. As it turned out, however, hardly any among the 357 respondents of the field test referred to this umbrella category.

D2. Training
Panama: Originally planned for two days, the training for the Panamanian team was expanded to four days and held in April 1999. The training focused on the definition and concepts related to social capital, a review of the study objectives, the development of qualitative and quantitative interview techniques, a review of the research instruments and their application, and field exercises for practicing the techniques involved.\textsuperscript{17} Fifteen people were recruited for the training, 14 attended all four sessions, and 12 (4 men and 8 women) were chosen as interviewers.\textsuperscript{18} One female interviewer was a member of the Ngobe-Buglé, Chiriqui’s most numerous indigenous group, whose knowledge of and acceptance within the indigenous group facilitated access to indigenous respondents and whose bilingual skills allowed interpreted interviews as necessary.

The research team was relatively highly skilled; all had secondary school education and most had some university education. Approximately one third had previous experience as interviewers in the 1997 Panama Living Standard Measurement Survey (LSMS). Two who were trained as school teachers proved excellent group interview facilitators and observers. Overall, the skill mix of the team was complementary and adequate for the wide range of data collection techniques employed.

India: Three teams were assembled to administer the field test, one for each of the three selected districts. Each field team consisted of three women and three men investigators, along with one male and one female supervisor. Members of each field team were jointly responsible for administering all three SCAT instruments, but investigators had primary responsibility for administering the household questionnaires, while supervisors were mainly responsible for the community and the organizational profiles.

A five-day training session\textsuperscript{19} was organized in Jaipur that ended three days before field testing commenced. A full set of revised instruments had been circulated ahead of time among all investigators and supervisors, so that they could study and familiarize themselves with these

\textsuperscript{15} The survey instrument included as Annex D is this version of the questionnaire.
\textsuperscript{16} See Annex G for detailed description of changes made to SCAT instruments in Rajasthani context.
\textsuperscript{17} See Annex H for a detailed lesson plan for the Panama training.
\textsuperscript{18} See Annex I for selection criteria and terms of reference for interviewers.
\textsuperscript{19} See Annex H for the lesson plan for the India training.
instruments before coming for the training session. Team members were expected to study these instruments carefully and to identify items that appeared difficult or complicated to administer. Each of the three SCAT instruments was discussed fully in this manner. Team members were provided with an opportunity for administering these instruments in practice sessions organized among both rural and urban inhabitants. Training staffs had a chance to see how the process was going and to incorporate the last set of refinements that would be possible before field testing commenced.

D3. Field administration

Panama: A first-round field application of the Social Capital Assessment Tool was conducted in 14 urban, rural and indigenous communities in Chiriquí Province, Panama. Data collection lasted 20 working days spread out over three-and-a-half weeks. The communities were chosen to provide as broad a range as possible of pertinent demographic variables for each of these regions. Household surveys were conducted with an equal distribution of male and female respondents, irrespective of household headship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of community</th>
<th>Total number of communities</th>
<th>Total number of community interviews</th>
<th>Total number of household surveys</th>
<th>Total number of organizational profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>362</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total of 362 household interviews were conducted: of these, 47.1 percent (N=170) were male respondents and 52.9 percent (N=192) were female respondents. Regarding residence, 29.0 percent (105 respondents) belonged to the three urban communities, 37.6 percent (136 respondents) belonged to the six rural communities, and 33.4 percent (121 respondents) belonged to the five indigenous communities.

Field staff was divided into four teams. Each team was comprised of a monitor, three interviewers, and a driver with a four-wheel drive vehicle. One team was assigned exclusively to the indigenous area (comarca) of the Ngobe-Buglé for the entire period of fieldwork. The research team noted that the decision to conduct research in six indigenous communities was complicated by several factors. First, the distances between communities and between households within these communities were extensive; accessible only by horse or on foot, researchers were travelling several hours just to reach a handful of houses. Second, community members, particularly men, were preparing their lands for the rainy season and were often unavailable for lengthy interviews. While this facilitated access to and participation by indigenous women, who often defer to their husbands in interview situations, male respondents were more difficult to locate in the remote areas. Finally, the annual Ngobe-Buglé meeting of all comarca leaders and members, coupled with ongoing national election activity, impeded fieldwork on several occasions. We therefore decided to reduce to five the total number of indigenous communities, and increase to 25 the total number of household interviews per community.

The other three teams were each assigned to one urban and two rural communities, accessible each day by vehicle. Teams went out to the field from approximately 10:00 a.m. until 8:00 or 10:00 p.m. For each community, teams developed a strategy for entering the community,
identifying key informants, and setting up community interviews. Over the course of two to four
days, the research teams conducted the community interviews, household surveys and
organizational interviews. Sufficient time was allotted during the process for writing up and
transcribing field notes and coordinating field activities.

As a management technique, daily meetings provided the opportunity for each team report
on their progress to date, have field supervisors provide comments on the research process and the
quality of the interview data, suggest modifications in the research methodology, as well as to
troubleshoot logistical issues. The morning meetings proved critical to overall supervision of the
field process, reinforcing data collection techniques, and maintaining uniformity and rigor in the
research process among the various teams.

The data from the community profiles are useful for project design and evaluation, as well
as analytical work on social capital and poverty reduction. The profiles can provide to a project
team an overview of key community characteristics and assets that can serve as project benchmarks
and iterative evaluations during implementation. Rapid assessment techniques allow for
preliminary data collection and analysis within three to five days of entering a community.

The household survey interviews were easily administered in all settings, and lasted from
35 to 90 minutes, depending on the number of household members and the level of household
integration with local level institutions. As the first field test in the SCAT project, the data were
collected to maximize diversity of responses at the community, household and organizational
levels. Therefore purposive sampling, rather than random sampling, was used as the sampling
criteria for both qualitative interviews and surveys. Analysis of quantitative data was limited to
assuring that questions were being answered within a predicted range of variability, eliminating
significant outliers, and triangulating qualitative and quantitative findings. The survey data
therefore are not appropriate for extensive analysis or reported results.

The genogram was also easily integrated into the survey format, adding approximately 5 to
10 minutes to the interview time in Panama. Highly skilled survey interviewers found that the
genogram assisted them in identifying household members that were omitted from the household
roster, primarily very young members and non-kin household members. After modifications were
introduced to capture additional household-, family-, and community-level data, the genogram also
provided cross-reference for community characteristics, household characteristics and structural
social capital variables often not captured in other SCAT components. The genogram is a useful
tool for establishing rapport with respondents and providing visual cues to respondents regarding
other questions. One drawback, however, is that genogram data are not easily coded into a survey
format.

A personnel issue arose which necessitated assigning the responsibility for all urban
household surveys to a single interviewer, while the research teams shifted their focus to collecting
qualitative data. This arrangement allowed fieldwork to continue at a rapid pace to meet the
deadlines established. In the rural areas, all team members participated equally in conducting in-
depth, group, and survey interviews.

The application of the organizational profiles were time consuming, primarily due to (i)
identifying institutions and organizing interviews with leaders, members and non-members and (ii)
recording the interview data and scoring institutional capacity, primarily because these activities
were done collectively by team members. This instrument would be most useful in the context of
social capital studies focused on institutional capacity and community-institution relationships.
Few formally structured local level institutions exist in rural and indigenous areas; informal groups
are common and appear to be more important to poorer communities. In urban, rural and indigenous communities, parent school committees were consistently identified as a key institutional resource. Many leaders in other areas also served on the parent school committee and community members other than parents perceived benefits. Men and women participated as well. Other formal and informal organizations interviewed included family planning affiliates, microfinance groups, formal community leaders (though often distinguished from the institutions they represent) and local “informal” or “natural born” leaders (líderes natos). Altogether 18 organizational profiles were completed.

Field supervisors continuously monitored the quality of the data collected daily. Each household survey was reviewed for accuracy, appropriate coding and whether the data were complete. Incomplete questionnaires were returned to the interviewer for recoding and, where necessary, reinterview. The challenge of transcribing the qualitative data was more formidable, as the community profiles, household surveys, and organizational profiles produced significant amounts of data. Transcriptions of expanded field notes were conducted overnight and the next day returned to the research team for revisions. Final transcriptions were archived with raw field notes and visual aides produced in the interviews for later analysis.

A final debriefing meeting was held one week following the completion of the fieldwork and was attended by all the interviewers, drivers, field monitors and supervisors. The meeting lasted four hours, and included a review of progress to date on the data collection as well as interviewers’ evaluations of the training and research process. The research team was overwhelmingly positive in its assessment of the research methods employed and data collected, and expressed appreciation for having the opportunity to acquire new skills in participatory and qualitative research methods. The group presented specific recommendations regarding the structure and content of the training workshop, the composition and terms of reference for field teams, strategies for entering communities and identifying key informants, obstacles encountered and overcome during the field work, techniques for data management and field supervision, and details of data processing.

**India:** Three locations were selected within each of three districts for administering the SCAT instruments, making a total of nine locations in all. Several different types of rural and urban locations are represented within this selection. Among rural areas, villages were selected that are located close to major roads as well as those that are more remotely situated. Different population categories were represented. Two villages and one town selected in the district of Dungarpur have majority tribal populations. With urban and rural, tribal and non-tribal, and remote and more easily accessible locations included within this sample, it should be possible to discern how well the SCAT instruments performed within each different type of settlement.

---

20 “Tribal” in India refers to groups that have been classified as “scheduled tribes” in fulfillment of a constitutional provision. There is debate about whether tribes in India are equivalent to “indigenous peoples” in other countries.
Table 2. Data sources for SCAT Rajasthan field test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of community</th>
<th>Total number of communities</th>
<th>Total number of community interviews</th>
<th>Total number of household surveys</th>
<th>Total number of organizational profiles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural non-tribal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural tribal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban non-tribal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban tribal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A representative sample of men and women were interviewed in each of these six villages and three towns. Criteria such as caste, education, and income level were considered while selecting this sample. Along with selecting men and women in equal numbers, the sample for each village included educated and uneducated persons, persons of different political persuasions, and each of the different caste groups in proportion to its share in the village population.

A total of 357 household interviews were conducted: of these, 49.9 percent (N=178) were men and 50.1 percent (N=179) were women. Of the total sample, 44.3 percent (N=158) of the respondents were illiterate with no formal education, 25.2 percent (N=90) had between one and five years’ formal education, 23.2 percent (N=83) had between five and ten years’ education, and 15.4 percent (N=55) had more than ten years’ school education, reflecting the general pattern of education among people of this area. Regarding residence, 34.2 percent (122 respondents) belonged to the three urban areas and 65.8 percent (235 respondents) belonged to the three rural areas, while 115 respondents were interviewed in the three remote villages and 118 in the three tribal locations.

The combined experiences of the three Rajasthani field teams are reported briefly below for each of the three SCAT instruments. For the community profiles, it was necessary to interview groups of men and women separately, because men and women rarely mingle in public in Rajasthan, and because it is hard to get women to speak among mixed groups. Male members of the district teams interviewed groups of men within each community, while female members spoke with the women of the community.

Each of these group sessions lasted approximately four hours. The size of these community groups ranged from a low of fifteen (in Khatoli village) to a high of 150 participants (in Asheend town). No particular difficulty was encountered while administering this instrument in any of the nine locations.

Administering the community profile was the first exercise attempted by the district teams upon entering any town or village. It served to provide the community with a useful introduction to the team’s purposes, and it also helped team members to gain general impressions about collective action and social organization in the community.

Information collected in Rajasthan using the community profile was found to be extremely sensitive to the number of participants who attended these community gatherings. Beyond contacting community leaders and other influential persons and beyond sending team members out to inform residents of different neighborhoods, district team supervisors could do little to increase the number of participants. Community interviews were organized invariably early in the morning or late at night, times which were usually found convenient by community members for attending public meetings. And the entire exercise was organized during a relatively less busy period within
the agricultural cycle, so rural residents were not especially busy with activities on the farm. Despite taking these precautions, however, the number and variety of participants varied considerably from location to location.

More organizational affiliations have been recorded where larger numbers of people attended the community meeting, and past community efforts have also been recounted in more variety and richer detail. Results recorded in the community profile for locations (such as Khatoli village) where only 15 persons attended the community meeting cannot be compared readily, thus, with those where upward of a hundred people attended (e.g., Asheend town).

Considerable interest was generated among participants, particularly while drawing village maps and constructing Venn diagrams and flowcharts. Community members participated actively in these visually appealing exercises. Venn diagrams and flowcharts were additionally useful for focusing respondents’ thoughts and for viewing (a) the importance, utility and psychological distance that people in the community experience vis-à-vis different local organizations, and (b) the nature of inter-organizational linkages. Useful information was derived about collective efforts undertaken in the past by the community and about the extents to which these actions had succeeded or failed. A list of organizations was also compiled that were active in the community and which could be studied with the help of the organizational profile.

The community profile is very useful, therefore, in providing the investigating team with a quick review of past cooperation and present organizational activity within the community being studied. These data are not useful, however, for the purpose of scaling social capital.

Administering the household questionnaire took between one-and-a-half to two-and-a-half hours among different respondents, with less time being required among more educated respondents. No particular difficulty was encountered in administering any questionnaire item, even among less educated respondents. However, in the India context, the questionnaire was found to be too long. Ideally no more than one hour should be required for this purpose, since respondents tend to lose interest if the interview drags on for too long. Some survey questions will need to be omitted in order to cut down the length of the interview.\(^{21}\)

Regarding the organizational profiles, it took the field teams between three and four hours to administer this instrument. Among the three different SCAT instruments, this one proved to be the least useful in the context of Rajasthan. Very few formal organizations are in existence in this region, especially in rural areas, and even among the few that exist, a large number have been constituted by government agencies. Nearly all of these organizations have either been set down by some government agency and not by voluntary citizen effort – and therefore may not be counted toward social capital. Many of these organizations are also very recently formed, no more than two years ago in some cases.

Organizational membership – or at least membership in formal organizations – is not very important in the context of Rajasthan. Over 60 percent (N=216 of 357) of respondents from the household survey reported that neither they nor anyone else in their family was a member of any group or organization. A further 27 percent (N=96) reported memberships in two or fewer organizations. In nearly all of these cases, the organizations mentioned are either the village panchayat (a unit of government at the village level) or the agricultural cooperative – both of which are government-established organizations. Fewer than 10 percent of respondents in any town or village reported having memberships in any organization that has been established voluntarily by citizens and which has been in existence for some considerable period of time.

\(^{21}\) See Annex K for a list of the questionnaire items found to be less useful in Rajasthan.
D4. Data analysis and preliminary results

Social capital and urban/rural residence. As indicated by findings from the community profile and the household surveys, in Panama levels of social capital were highest among the rural communities studied, decreasing among indigenous communities, and lowest within urban communities. In India, on the other hand, although social capital levels were somewhat lower among the urban communities, they were not significantly different between rural tribal and non-tribal communities.

Social capital and gender relations. Gender analysis of the preliminary household data indicates that responses from women and men within the same community generally do not differ significantly from one another, corresponding to findings from other studies (Krishna and Uphoff, 1999). Furthermore, survey data disaggregated by sex of respondent (male/female) and by residence (urban/rural/indigenous) indicate that responses vary less between men and women from the same area than among same-sex residents from different areas. However, qualitative data indicate that women and men access different types of organizations and they establish and access relationships in different ways. These findings require further analysis in terms of possibly disaggregated social capital and intrahousehold decisionmaking patterns.

Informality of institutions. In Panama, sophisticated, formal or well-established organizations were not necessarily assessed with greater levels of social capital. Newer or more informal organizations received high ratings, especially if their organizational culture promoted transparency and democracy in decision-making processes, demonstrated a clear understanding of roles and expectations, and was closer to community.

Informal rather than formal organizations are more important in the Rajasthan context, and even more so in its rural areas. Institutions such as mutual assistance groups and labor-sharing arrangements do exist within most rural communities, but these are not easily visible to an external observer. Members of such groups come together and disperse as the need arises. The only enduring evidence for the existence of these informal social networks exists in the cognitive maps that people in these villages have and which are probed to some extent with the help of items contained within the household questionnaire.

Preliminary findings from Panama on the impacts of social capital found negative as well as positive outcomes, even though so-called “perverse social capital” issues such as drug trafficking, alcoholism, corruption and violence were not initially probed during community interviews. In most urban and rural non-indigenous communities, emerging conceptualizations of social capital included negative as well as positive attributes. For example, community maps were clearly demarcated with “red zone areas” of community strife, respondents frequently and spontaneously mentioned these issues when probed on existing assets or landmarks, and communities clearly articulated the trade-offs they experienced regarding the allocation of resources when taking into account possible detrimental outcomes of social capital networks. As a by-product of encouraging locally defined assets, leadership, and organizations, some community activities and members who

---

22 This contrasts somewhat with the findings of Pena and Lindo-Fuentes (1998), who found levels based on their social capital index to be highest among indigenous populations, followed by rural populations and then urban populations. This may be explained by the fact that the SCAT pilot test included only one indigenous group, the Ngobe-Bulgé, who are arguably the most socially excluded indigenous group within the national territory. The Pena-Fuentes study included several indigenous Panamanian groups, many noted for their successful resistance strategies and high levels of organization.
promote negative behaviors were often identified as community resources and/or key informants. Gender differences were particularly apparent regarding alcohol vending establishments: although both male and female participants in community profile interviews included such establishments in mapping exercises of structural social capital, men often identified bars as a positive source of recreation while women identified them as a source of strife. Similar results have not been noted in the India data, however, perhaps reflecting either lower absolute levels of negative impacts among Rajasthanis or more openness among Panamanians to discuss these sensitive issues.

**Complementarity of methods.** For the community profiles, it is important to have a diversity of respondents to maximize the quality and depth of the information collected. Asset mapping generated keen interest and ownership among participants. The exercise also helped to identify relevant organizations that were not previously considered for organizational profiling or institutional network analysis. The diagrams and flowcharts visually depict the quality and nature of relationships between community members and local institutions. The institutional diagrams, especially when accompanied by a case study of community collective action, help to illustrate these relationships. Community profile results in each case are useful for obtaining some general impressions about collective action in each community. The process of constructing a community profile helped in each case to elicit the cooperation of the community and to familiarize it with the objectives of the research team; however, the community profile instrument is not ideally suited for the purpose of comparison and scaling.

The organizational profile methodology proved applicable to a wide range of formal and informal organizations, creating comparable information across organizations and with data from the community profile and the household questionnaire. The structured interview guides elicit detailed information for project design, implementation and evaluation which is useful later for identifying stakeholders, potential counterparts or ‘project partners’. These findings would be particularly useful for project goals focused on institutional strengthening and sector reform. The scoring index provides a standardized summary assessment of organizational characteristics useful for baseline, monitoring and evaluation activities relating to organizational capacity. The organizational profile data are less useful for comparisons and scaling among organizations or as a quantitative measure of community- or household-level social capital. These relationships would have to be explored further.

The complementary nature of the SCAT components does not necessarily imply that findings will be the same using different data collection techniques among different population samples. For example, findings from the household survey data indicate that social capital levels do not vary significantly between men and women within the same community. Yet community interviews do reveal differences in the definitions of social capital, identification of community actors and local level institutions, organizational membership and so on. These qualitative and quantitative findings are not so much contradictory as complementary, shedding light on different aspects of social capital and revealing a more nuanced description of relationships within research communities.

**Creating a scale for social capital.** As mentioned earlier, six questionnaire items were found useful for the purpose of constructing an index of social capital for Rajasthan.\(^{23}\)

---

\(^{23}\) See Annex J for the items included in the SCAT scale. Because the data for Panama were not randomly sampled, no scale was constructed for these communities.
Summary comparisons of social capital scores were made among different categories of interview respondents. These cross-tabulation results are reported in Table 3.

Table 3.
Rajasthan - Average Social Capital Scores by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>45-plus</th>
<th>Under-45</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-plus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from major roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remote location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not remote location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tribal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illiterate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## ANNEX A

**QUESTIONNAIRES AND STUDIES CONSULTED FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIAL CAPITAL ASSESSMENT TOOL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location &amp; Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Action for Solid Waste Management: Self-help in Dhaka, Bangladesh</td>
<td>Dhaka, Bangladesh</td>
<td>Task Manager: Sheoli Pargal (DECRG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio Economic Survey: Household Questionnaire</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Operations Research Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of “Russian Enterprises in the Market. “General Director”</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of “Russian Enterprises in the Market. “Supplier Relations”</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of “Russian Enterprises in the Market. “Customer Relations”</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of “Russian Enterprises in the Market. “Legal Relations”</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Social Capital in Russia</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Center for the Study of public Policy: Richard Rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft: Household Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIS/TWUWS Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft: Water Committee Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td>IRIS/TWUWS Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy and Social Capital Project</td>
<td>India, 1997</td>
<td>Utkal University, Uppsala University, Jawaharlal Nehru University &amp; Witwatersrand University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital and Poverty Survey</td>
<td>Tanzania, 1995</td>
<td>Narayan &amp; Pritchett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Capital Study: Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Canada, 1998</td>
<td>Gerry Veenstra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Local Level Institutions Study: Program Description and Prototype Questionnaires</td>
<td>Prototype, 1998</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Panama ENV Survey: Household Questionnaire</td>
<td>Panama, 1997</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Panama ENV Survey:</td>
<td>Panama, 1997</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title</td>
<td>Country/Region</td>
<td>Organization/Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 Panama ENV Survey: Anthropometric Questionnaire</td>
<td>Panama, 1997</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal Living Standards Survey: Rural Community Questionnaire</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Central Bureau of Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encuesta Condiciones de Vida: Segunda Ronda</td>
<td>Ecuador, 1995</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Values Survey</td>
<td>Worldwide</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLDSAFE Study on Intrafamily Violence</td>
<td>Philippines, Egypt, Indonesia, India, Brazil</td>
<td>Inter Clinical Epidemiologic Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAHO “Ruta Critica” study on institutional, community and individual responses to domestic violence.</td>
<td>Central America, Ecuador, Peru, and Bolivia</td>
<td>Shrader &amp; Sagot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell University Social Capital Study. Individual Questionnaire and Field Report 1.</td>
<td>Rajasthan, India</td>
<td>Krishna &amp; Uphoff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX B
COMMUNITY PROFILE AND ASSET MAPPING

OVERVIEW

Objectives: The community profile will be elicited through a series of group interviews conducted in the community during the initial days of field work. The community profile exercise has several objectives. This first is to familiarize the research team with community characteristics and issues relating to social capital for reference in later phases of data collection. Second, the group interviews will establish a consensus definition of the “community” in which the research will take place. This definition will be used throughout the community profile exercise as well as for the interviews in Part II: Household Survey and to define the catchment areas of institutions in Part III: Organizational Profile. Third, the interviews will generate a collection of community maps, diagrams, and field notes that will serve as the primary source material for the assessment of levels of social capital in the community.

Activities: Several participatory methods will be used to develop the community profile. In addition to a focus group format, the data collection will include a community mapping exercise followed by an institutional diagramming exercise. The primary data source material generated by these interviewing, mapping and diagramming exercises are:

- Community maps, indicating location of community assets and services
- Observational notes of group process and summary of issues discussed
- List of positive characteristics of community assets and services
- List of negative characteristics of community assets and services
- List of all formal and informal community institutions
- Case study of community efforts to access social capital
- Institutional diagrams (Venn) of relative impact and accessibility
- Institutional diagrams (web) of institutional network relationships and density

Structure: Between two and eight group interviews will be conducted in each community. Each group should have 5-12 participants. At least two group interviews should be carried out with women and men separately. Groups may be stratified on other sociodemographic characteristics that may be important within the community context, such as age or ethnicity. Mixed groups can also be conducted to assess levels of consensus, but these should be in addition to separate groups.

Each group will have a moderator and two observers. The moderator’s role is to facilitate the discussion, probe on key issues, elicit comments from all participants, and focus the discussion on the issues of interest without seeming to interrupt or ignore extraneous comments from participants. The observers’ role is to take notes on the content of the discussion and process of group dynamics.

Materials: Interview guide; pads of notepaper; writing pens; flip-chart paper; markers (several colors); colored paper circles of three different sizes; tape; scissors.
Community Mapping Exercise

**Community mapping:** Bring large sheets of paper and several color markers. Ask the group to draw a map of their village/neighborhood that shows the settlement pattern, sites for productive activities, and locations of various assets and services and the community. A second group may be asked to make modifications to the map developed by the first group or, if they prefer, draw their own. The map is a key referent point for the discussion and should be used throughout the interview process to stimulate discussion, identify critical issues, clarify discussion points and so on.

**Definition of community and identification of community assets**

1. How do you define this village/neighborhood?
   [Probe on geographical boundaries, place names, and other reference points. Establish consensus on the geopolitical definition of “community” for later use in the household survey.]

2. Where is/are the...
   ...primary school? Secondary school? Child care centers? Other schools?
   ...health services (both formal and informal)?
   ...sources of water?
   ...waste and garbage disposal?
   ...sources of electric lighting?
   ...public telephones?
   ...main streets/roads?
   ...principle means of transportation?
   ...markets, shops and other commercial establishments?
   ...churches (houses of worship)?
   ...cultural and recreational areas? (Where do you spend your free time?)
   ...areas that are less safe?
   RURAL: ...irrigation systems?

3. How many years has this village/neighborhood been in existence? Has the village/neighborhood grown, gotten smaller or stayed the same in the last five years? Who are the people most likely to come in to or leave the community?

   *(In the case of significant in- or out-migration, have the group draw a second map showing patterns of migration, new settlement and expansion of community boundaries and land use.)*

**Collective action, solidarity, conflict resolution, and sustainability of efforts**

**Screening**

People from the same village/neighborhood often get together to address a particular issue that faces the community, to fix a problem or to improve the quality of life or something similar. Which of the following issues has your village/neighborhood tried to address in the last three years?
Probe re: education, health, public services, roads and transportation, markets, credit, recreational and cultural resources, security, child care, irrigation, agricultural services. Conduct interview based on group response.

1. Do you think that everyone in this village/neighborhood has equal access to ____________________________?
   (name of service or benefit)

   Is this also true for the poorest members of the community?

2. Have there been any efforts by the community to improve the quality of the ___(service or benefit)_______ or overcome a problem? Can you describe one instance in detail? (Refer to this case study for specifics of the following questions) Were there community groups that played an important role? What kinds of responses did you get from the local government? From other organizations? From the rest of the community? What kinds of obstacles did you have to deal with? What was the outcome of the effort?

   (Probe for locus of leadership, resources tapped, sources of resistance, who benefited or suffered from the outcome, what kind of follow-up occurred as a result of the effort, and what mechanisms were employed to assure sustainability of the effort.)

3. Has this village/neighborhood ever attempted to make improvements but failed? Why do you think it failed? What would you have done differently to make the effort more successful?

   (Probe for constraints on collective action, identify the roles of government, community organizations and secondary institutions in influencing outcomes, and discuss the relationship between the community, representative organizations, local government, and other civil society actors.)
Community governance and decision making

1. Who are the main leaders in this community?  
   (Probe formal and informal leadership.)

2. How do they become leaders? How are new leaders selected?

3. How are decisions made within this community? What is the role of the community leaders? How are community members involved?  
   (Probe on role of traditional leaders, informal leaders, elites.)

Identification of community institutions

What are the groups, organizations or associations that function in this village/neighborhood?

List of organizations: Have the group list all the organizations, formal and informal, that exist in the community. Make sure all different types of organizations are included (agriculture, credit, religious, recreational, health, education, etc.) and that the list is as complete as possible. Have the group go through the list and identify which institutions are most important in meeting the community’s needs. Make sure the list is written with plenty of space between each item.

1. Which groups play the most active role in helping improve the wellbeing of community members?

2. How did this group or organization get started (government initiated; through government donations; NGO donations; grassroots initiative; etc)?

3. How are the leaders selected (election; appointment; inheritance)? How stable is the leadership (frequent or sudden changes, normal progressive change, or never changes)? Is leadership generally harmonious or conflictive?

4. How are decisions made within these groups or organizations?

Community-institutional relationship

Venn diagram: Cut out (ahead of time) paper circles of three different sizes and lay them out. Ask the group to place the largest circles next to the most important organizations, the middle-sized circles next to the less important organizations, and the smallest circles next to the least important organizations. Write the name of the organization in each circle. Observers should record the group’s reasoning as to why organizations are categorized as more or less important.

Draw a relatively large square in the center of the flip-chart paper. Tell the group that this square represents themselves. Have the group place the organization-labeled circles in or around the square at the center. The closer they are to the center square, the more accessible the particular organization is to the community. Let the group discuss among themselves and facilitate as necessary. Record the resulting diagram and reasoning behind the group’s discussion on each organization.
1. Of the organizations on this list, which are most important? Which are least important? Which are of medium importance?

2. Of the organizations on this list, which ones are most accessible to the community? Which are least accessible? Which are somewhat accessible?

**Institutional networks and organizational density**

**Flowchart diagram:** Have ready a sheet of flip-chart sized paper and markers. Facilitate a discussion among the group regarding the relationships among the identified organizations, community leaders, and the community. Probe on local government institutions, non-governmental organizations, base organizations and other civil society actors. Ask the group to draw each actor and, using arrows or other appropriate symbols, indicate the relationship among them. Probe links among all organizations.

1. Which organizations work together? How do they work together (hierarchically, collaboratively)?
2. Are there any organizations that work against each other (compete or have some sort of conflict)? Which ones and why?
3. Some groups may share the same members and some groups have different members. Which organizations have the same or similar membership?
4. Are there organizations that share resources?
## ANNEX C
### COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE

### Section 1. Community Characteristics

1. How many years has the community been in existence?
   - More Than 20………………………………………[ ] 1
   - Between 10 and 20………………………………[ ] 2
   - Less than 10………………………………………[ ] 3

2. In the past 5 years the housing situation in this community has: (take into account availability, services and physical conditions)
   - Improved………………………………………[ ] 1
   - Deteriorated……………………………………[ ] 2
   - Remained the same…………………………….[ ] 3

3. In the past 5 years the number of inhabitants in this community has:
   - Increased……………………………………...[ ] 1
   - Decreased……………………………………….[ ] 2
   - Remained the same…………………………….[ ] 3

4. What are the two principal reasons for the increase, decrease, or lack of change?
   - 1.
   - 2.

5. What are the two principal economic activities in the community
   - 1.
   - 2.

6. In the past 5 years the living conditions and quality of life of the inhabitants of the community have (take into account job availability, security, environmental conditions, etc.):
   - Improved……………………………………….[ ] 1
   - Worsened……………………………………….[ ] 2
   - Remained the same…………………………….[ ] 3

7. What are the 2 principal reasons that the living conditions in the community have improved, worsened, or remained the same during the past 5 years?
   - 1.
   - 2.

8. What is the principal route that inhabitants use to reach this community, both in summer and in winter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paved road</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel road</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse or donkey trail</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River or sea</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plane</td>
<td>[ ] 6</td>
<td>[ ] 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath</td>
<td>[ ] 7</td>
<td>[ ] 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>[ ] 8</td>
<td>[ ] 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. In the past 5 years the roads leading to this community have:
   - Improved……………………………………….[ ] 1
   - Worsened……………………………………….[ ] 2
   - Remained the same…………………………….[ ] 3

### Section 2. Principal Services

#### A. Electricity

1. Do the homes in this community have electricity?
   - Yes……………………………………...[ ]
   - No……………………………………….[ ]

2. In what year was electrical service installed?
   - Year ………………. Less than one year = 00 (skip the following question)
3. In the past 5 years, the electrical service within the individual homes in this community has:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Condition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained the same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Currently, the quality of electrical service within the individual homes in this community is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Quality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How consistent is the electrical service in the homes in this community, both during the summer and winter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consistency Type</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only at night</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only some days</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular (specify)</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What are the two principal problems with the electrical service within the homes of this community?

1. ..............................................................................
2. ..............................................................................

7. What part of the community has household electrical service?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Coverage</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The entire community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than half</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In the homes without electricity, what do they use for lighting? In column J, rate the importance of each on a scale of 1-6, with 1 being the most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lighting Source</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Torches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerosene lamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas or butane lamps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battery operated lighting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Does this community have public street lights?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. In what year was public lighting installed in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Less than one year = 00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. In the last 5 years this service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Condition</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has improved</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has worsened</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has remained the same</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Currently, the public street lighting service is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Quality</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. How often does the community have public street lighting?

- Permanently………………………………………[ ] 1
- Most nights……………………………………...[ ] 2
- Irregular (specify) ……………………………...[ ] 3

14. What are the 2 principal problems with the public street lighting service in this community?

1. ………………………………………………………………...
2. ………………………………………………………………

15. The public lighting service in this community covers:

- All of the community……………………………………...[ ] 1
- Over half of the community………………………………...[ ] 2
- Half of the community……………………………………….[ ] 3
- Less than half of the community……………………………..[ ] 4

16. In this community, do individual homes receive potable water service?

- Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]
- No………………………………………………………….[ ]

17. Who provides this service?

- The state………………………………………………...[ ] 1
- The municipality…………………………………………...[ ] 2
- The community…………………………………………….[ ] 3

18. In what year was potable water service initiated in the individual homes?

Year ……………… Less than one year = 00 (skip the following question)

19. In the past five years, the potable water service in this community has:

- Improved……………………………………………...[ ] 1
- Worsened……………………………………………….[ ] 2
- Remained the same……………………………………….[ ] 3

20. What is the quality of the potable water service in this community?

- Very good………………………………………………...[ ] 1
- Good……………………………………………………….[ ] 2
- Normal……………………………………………………..[ ] 3
- Poor…………………………………………………………...[ ] 4
- Very poor……………………………………………………[ ] 5

21. How frequently is the potable water service available to the individual homes in this community, in both summer and winter?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Winter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>………..</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only at night</td>
<td>………..</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only during the day</td>
<td>………..</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irregular (specify)</td>
<td>………..</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. What are the two principal problems with the potable water service?

1. ………………………………………………………………
2. ………………………………………………………………

23. The potable water service in this community reaches:

- All of the community……………………………………...[ ] 1
- Half of the community……………………………………….[ ] 2
- Less than half of the community……………………………..[ ] 3
24. The homes that do not have potable water service, where do the residents obtain drinking water? What is the quality of this water? Rate the following sources in order of importance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public tap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River/Spring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality Code:
- Very high quality….1
- High quality……..2
- Normal………………3
- Low quality………..4
- Very low quality…..5

Rating: Rate in numerical order (1-4), with 1 being the most important.

25. Do the homes in this community have telephone service?

Yes……………………………………………………….[   ]
No……………………………………………………….[   ] (skip to 32)

26. In what year was telephone service installed?

Year ………………… Less than one year = 00 (skip the following question)

27. In the past five years, the telephone service in this community has:

Has improved………………………………………………..[   ] 1
Has worsened………………………………………………..[   ] 2
Has remained the same…………………………………………[   ] 3

28. Currently, the quality of phone service is:

Very good……………………………………………………….[   ] 1
Good…………………………………………………………..[   ] 2
Normal…………………………………………………………..[   ] 3
Bad……………………………………………………………..[   ] 4
Very Bad………………………………………………………..[   ] 5

29. How consistently is telephone service available to the homes in this community

Permanently………………………………………………….[   ] 1
Only at night……………………………………………...….[   ] 2
Only during the day………………………………………….[   ] 3
Only certain hours………………………………………….[   ] 4
Irregularly (specify) ………………………………………....[   ] 5

30. What are the two principal problems with the telephone service?

1. …………………………………………………………………………..
2. …………………………………………………………………………..

31. Home telephone service is available to:

The entire community……………………………………….[   ] 1
Over half of the community………………………………….[   ] 2
Half of the community……………………………………….[   ] 3
Less than half of the community…………………………….[   ] 4

32. Does this community have public telephone service (PT)?

Yes……………………………………………………….[   ]
No……………………………………………………….[   ]

32a. What is the distance from this community, to the nearest public telephone?

Distance……………………… Number of phones……………..
33. This community has:

| Sufficient number of public telephones | 1 |
| Insufficient number of public telephones | 2 |
| Very few public telephones | 3 |

34. In what year was public telephone service installed?

Year ………………… Less than one year = 00 (skip the following question)

35. In the past 5 years, the public telephone service in this community has:

| Improved | 1 |
| Worsened | 2 |
| Remained the same | 3 |

36. Currently, the public telephone service in this community is:

| Very good | 1 |
| Good | 2 |
| Normal | 3 |
| Poor | 4 |
| Very poor | 5 |

37. The public telephone service in this community is:

| Permanent | 1 |
| Irregular | 2 |
| Occasional | 3 |

38. What are the two principal problems with the public telephone service in this community?

1. 
2. 

39. Are the homes in this community connected to a public sewage system?

| Yes | 
| No |

40. In what year was public sewage system installed in this community?

Year ………………… Less than one year = 00 (skip the following question)

41. In the past 5 years, the sewage system in this community has:

| Improved | 1 |
| Worsened | 2 |
| Remained the same | 3 |

42. What are the two principal problems with the sewage system in this community?

1. 
2. 

43. The sewage system covers:

| The entire community | 1 |
| Over half of the community | 2 |
| Half of the community | 3 |
| Less than half of the community | 4 |
44. What other sewage and waste water systems are used in this community? In column J, rate each in importance from 1-5 (with 1 being the most important):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latrine/Outhouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Septic tanks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty lots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers, springs or ocean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Do the streets of this community have sewers and drains to handle excess water and prevent flooding when it rains?

Yes: [ ]
No:  [   ]

46. Does this community have (by truck or cart) a garbage collection service?

Yes:  [ ]
No:  [   ]

47. In the past 5 years, the garbage collection service in this community has:

Improved: [ ] 1
Worsened: [ ] 2
Remained the same: [ ] 3

48. The frequency of garbage collection in this community is:

Permanent: [ ] 1
Irregular: [ ] 2
Occasional: [ ] 3

49. The garbage collection service in this community serves:

The entire community: [ ] 1
Over half of the community: [ ] 2
Half of the community: [ ] 3
Less than half of the community: [ ] 4

50. In the homes that do not receive garbage collection service, what do they do with their solid wastes? In column J, rate the importance of each method on a scale of 1-5 (with 1 being the most important):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burn it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw it on other lots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw it somewhere on own lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throw it in a river, bay or ocean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bury it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay someone to haul it away</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. Does this community have a post office?

Yes: [ ]
No:  [   ]

51a. If not, what is the distance from this community to the nearest post office?

Distance:  [   ]

52. In the past 5 years, the postal service in this community has:

Improved: [ ] 1
Worsened: [ ] 2
Remained the same: [ ] 3
53. What are the two principal problems with the postal service in this community?

1. .................................................................
2. .................................................................

58. Where do the majority of the inhabitants of this community regularly buy their foodstuffs?

1. .................................................................
2. .................................................................

I. Public Market

54. Does this community have a public market?

Yes.................................................................[  ]
No.................................................................[  ]

54a. If not, how far is the community from the nearest public market

Distance........................................ (Skip to number 58)

59. Does this community have an open market for durable goods?

Yes.................................................................[  ]
No.................................................................[  ]

(If no, skip to question 64)

60. How often does this market operate?

Every day.................................................................[  ] 1
Some days of the week..................................................[  ] 2
One day per week.........................................................[  ] 3
Other (specify)............................................................[  ] 4

61. How many inhabitants of the community utilize this market?

The entire community..................................................[  ] 1
Over half of the community..........................................[  ] 2
Half of the community...............................................[  ] 3
Less than half of the community...................................[  ] 4

62. In the past 5 years, the quality and service at this market has:

Improved..........................................................[  ] 1
Worsened............................................................[  ] 2
Remained the same...............................................[  ] 3
63. What are the two principal problems with this market?

1. .................................................................
2. .................................................................

64. Does this community have a public transportation system?

Yes......................................................................[ ] 1
No.......................................................................[ ] 2
(If no, skip to question 69)

65. In the past 5 years, the quality of the public transportation in this community:

Has improved.................................................[ ] 1
Has worsened...................................................[ ] 2
Has remained the same.................................[ ] 3

66. How frequently is public transportation available to the inhabitants of this community?

Every day...........................................................[ ] 1
Some days of the week......................................[ ] 2
One day per week.............................................[ ] 3
Other (specify)..................................................[ ] 4

68. Public transportation is used by:

The entire community...........................................[ ] 1
Over half of the community...................................[ ] 2
Half of the community........................................[ ] 3
Less than half of the community........................[ ] 4

69. How far must the members of the community travel to access public transportation?

Distance.........................................................

70. What other types of transportation do the inhabitants of this community use to get around? Rate each mode of transportation in order of importance in column J, with 1 being the most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/boat.................................[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plane............................................[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse.............................................[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot................................................[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal car, or friend’s car............[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify).................................[ ] 1 [ ] 2 [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3. Other Community Services

A. Recreation

1. Does this community have public parks and/or green areas?

Yes.................................................................[ ]
No.................................................................[ ]
2. What are the two principal changes needed to improve the parks and green areas in this community?

1. ………………………………………………………………………
2. ………………………………………………………………………

8. What are the two principal changes that could be made to improve the quality of the children’s play areas in this community?

1. ………………………………………………………………………
2. ………………………………………………………………………

9. Does this community have sports fields and recreational areas?

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]
No…………………………………………………….…………[ ]

7. In the past 5 years, the sports fields and recreational areas have:

Improved……………………………………………………………………[ ] 1
Worsened…………………………………………………………………..[ ] 2
Remained the same………………………………………………………[ ] 3

B. Municipal Hall

9. Does this community have a town or municipal hall?

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]
No…………………………………………………….…………[ ]

10. In the past 5 years, the quality of this building has:

Improved……………………………………………………………………[ ] 1
Worsened…………………………………………………………………..[ ] 2
Remained the same………………………………………………………[ ] 3

11. This building is used:

Permanently……………………………………………………..…………[ ] 1
Seasonally……………………………………………………………...[ ] 2
Sporadically……………………………………………………………[ ] 3

9. Does the community have children’s play areas?

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]
No…………………………………………………….…………[ ]

10. In the past 5 years, the quality of these children’s play areas has:

Improved……………………………………………………………………[ ] 1
Worsened…………………………………………………………………..[ ] 2
Remained the same………………………………………………………[ ] 3

12. What are the two principal changes needed to improve this building?

1. ………………………………………………………………………
2. ………………………………………………………………………
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. What buildings do the inhabitants of this community use most frequently for meetings and gatherings?</td>
<td>Personal homes…………………………………………………….[   ] 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homes of political leaders……………………………………………….[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Churches or religious buildings…………………………………………….[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health center/School/Government building………………………………….[   ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (specify)…………………………………………………………………….[   ] 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Does this community have a security or police force?</td>
<td>Yes……………………………………………………………………………….[   ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No…………………………………………………………………………………….[   ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a. This service is provided by:</td>
<td>The police…………………………………….[   ] 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The community…………………………………………………………………….[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A private company..………………………….[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. In the past 5 years, this security service has:</td>
<td>Improved……………………………………………………………………….[   ] 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Worsened…………………………………………………………………………….[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remained the same………………………………………………………………[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What are the two principal problems with this security service?</td>
<td>1.…………………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.…………………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The security service is:</td>
<td>Permanent……………………………………………………………………..[   ] 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only at night………………………………………………………………. [   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sporadic (specify)…………………………………………………………….[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. This security service benefits:</td>
<td>The entire community………………………………………………………………....[   ] 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Over half of the community……………………………………………………….[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Half of the community…………………………………………………………….[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less than half of the community…………………………………………..[   ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More men than women…………………………………………………………….[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal numbers………………………………………………………………..[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Where do they go to work primarily?</td>
<td>To cities in this province……………………………………………………….[   ] 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To cities in other provinces………………………………………………….[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To cities in other countries………………………………………………….[   ] 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To rural areas in this province…………………………………………….[   ] 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To rural areas in other provinces………………………………………….[   ] 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To rural areas in other countries………………………………………….[   ] 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Section 5. Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does this community have at least one public primary school?</td>
<td>Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No……………………………………………………….[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How far from the community is the nearest public primary school?</td>
<td>Distance………………………….. Number of schools…………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do some of the children from the community attend this (nearest) school?</td>
<td>Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No……………………………………………………….[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How many public primary schools are there in:</td>
<td>This community:…………………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A nearby community…………………………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Are the number of public primary schools in this community sufficient to serve the number of school age children in the community?</td>
<td>Yes……………………………………………………….[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No……………………………………………………….[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. What is the physical condition of the public primary schools in this community?</td>
<td>Very good……………………………………………………….[ ] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Good……………………………………………………….[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal……………………………………………………….[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Poor……………………………………………………….[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very poor……………………………………………………….[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Is the number of teachers in this (these) school(s) sufficient for the number of students?

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………….….[ ] 2

8. On average, how many days a week do the students who attend school receive classes?

Number of days………………………………………

9. The primary school(s) offer:

All grades in separate classrooms……………………[ ] 1
All grades in one classroom……………………………[ ] 2
Between 1 and 2 grades per classroom…………………[ ] 3
Between 3 and 4 grades per classroom…………………[ ] 4

10. The amount of ( ____ ) in these public primary schools is sufficient for the number of students:

For each item, ask questions 9 & 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Classrooms | Very good……[ ] 1
 | Good……….[ ] 2
 | Normal…….[ ] 3
 | Poor……….[ ] 4
 | Very Poor……[ ] 5 |
| Desks and chairs | Yes, sufficient……[ ] 1
 | No, not sufficient……[ ] 2
 | There are none……[ ] 3
| Blackboards | Yes, sufficient……[ ] 1
 | No, not sufficient……[ ] 2
 | There are none……[ ] 3
| Bathrooms | Yes, sufficient……[ ] 1
 | No, not sufficient……[ ] 2
 | There are none……[ ] 3

11. The primary school(s) have potable water:

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………….….[ ] 2

12. The public primary school(s) have electricity:

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………….….[ ] 2

13. The public primary school(s) have green areas and/or recreation areas:

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………….….[ ] 2

14. The public primary school(s) have green areas and/or recreation areas:

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………….….[ ] 2

14a. If yes, are these areas sufficient?

Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………….….[ ] 2

15. What percentage of the school-age children attend public primary schools?

All of them attend………………………………………[ ] 1
The majority attend………………………………………[ ] 2
About half attend………………………………………[ ] 3
Few attend………………………………………………[ ] 4
Very few/almost none attend………………………….[ ] 5
16. What are the two principal reasons that students from this community do not attend public primary school?

1. .................................................................
2. .................................................................

17. During the past year, who was responsible for maintenance and upkeep of the public primary school(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The municipality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Are there any private primary schools in the community?

Yes [ ]  
No [ ]

What percentage of students attend ………. %

19a. How far from the community is the nearest secondary or high school?

Distance…………………..

20. What is the highest grade offered at the secondary or high school level?

Grade ……………………

21. What percentage of school-age children do not attend secondary or high school?

All of them attend………………………………………..[ ] 1
The majority attend………………………………………..[ ] 2
About half attend………………………………………..[ ] 3
Few attend……………………………………………. [ ] 4
Very few/almost none attend…………………………..[ ] 5

22. What percentage of school-age children do not attend secondary or high school?

23. What are the two principal reasons that these children do not attend secondary or high school?

1. …………………………………………………………………………..
2. …………………………………………………………………………..

24. Does the community have a high school or secondary school?

Yes…………………………………………………………[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………………………[ ] 2

25. Is there an adult literacy campaign or program in the community?

Yes………………………………………………………..[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………………………..[ ] 2

26. Is this literacy program public or private?

Public [ ]
Private [ ]

27. Are there job training programs in this community?

Yes………………………………………………………..[ ] 1
No…………………………………………………………………..[ ] 2
28. Are these training programs public or private?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public</th>
<th>[ ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are the two principal illnesses or diseases affecting the adult men in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 6. Employment

1. In the past 5 years, the employment opportunities for the members of this community have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved</th>
<th>[ ] 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worsened</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remained the same</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What are the two principal causes for the change, or lack of change, in the employment opportunities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What are the two principal illnesses or diseases affecting the adult women in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Does the community have a health clinic or hospital?

Yes | [ ] 1  (Skip to question 5)
No  | [ ] 2

4a. How far is the nearest health clinic or hospital to this community?

Distance …………………………………

3. In this community, which segment of the population faces the greatest difficulty in finding employment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young men</th>
<th>[ ] 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young women</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult men</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult women</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All the same</td>
<td>[ ] 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 7. Health

1. What are the 3 principal illnesses or diseases that affect the children under 6 years of age in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
<td>………………………………………………………………………...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Does the health clinic or hospital regularly have sufficient:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic medicines</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment and instruments</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beds for patients</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambulances</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For each item, answer 7, 8 &amp; 9</th>
<th>Does the clinic offer or have enough ( ___ )</th>
<th>The service provided by ( ___ ) is:</th>
<th>The service provided by ( ___ ) is:</th>
<th>11. Is the service offered public or private?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public...........................................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Private..........................................</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. In addition to any public health clinic or hospital, does the community have any of the following private health services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses/Nurses aids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obstetricians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holistic, homeopathic or natural healers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 8. Community Support Needs**

1. Is there any committee or community organization dedicated to addressing the needs and problems of the community?

Yes..........................................................[ ] 1 (Skip to 2)
No.............................................................[ ] 2

1a. In the last three years has the community organized to address a need or problem?

Yes.................................................................[ ] 1
No.................................................................[ ] 2 (Skip to 4)

1b. What sector has the community organized for? (List up to 3)

1c. Was the initiative successful or unsuccessful?

Yes.................................................................[ ] 1
No.................................................................[ ] 2
2. Which of the following organizations exist in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community council or board</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous organization</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives (agricultural, crafts, etc.)</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic clubs</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health committee</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents committee</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What persons or institutions help or support these community organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The government</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The politicians</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The church</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The school/teachers</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The community</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Which of the following problems exist in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robberies</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol abuse</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family violence</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostitution</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td>![ ] 1</td>
<td>![ ] 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What are the two principal problems or needs that community members feel must be addressed and/or solved?

1. ..............................................................
2. ..............................................................

6. Is there any government institution or organization that supports any specific assistance programs in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No……………………………………………………….[ ] 2 (skip to 8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Please give the name of the government institution, the name of the program and the program’s importance to the community.

a) Institution.............................................
Program.....................................................
Importance..................................................

8. Is there any non-governmental organization (NGO) that supports any specific assistance programs in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes……………………………………………………….[ ] 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No……………………………………………………….[ ] 2 (skip to 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please give the name of the non-governmental institution, the name of the program and the program’s importance to the community.

a) Institution.............................................
Program.....................................................
Importance..................................................

b) Institution.............................................
Program.....................................................
Importance..................................................
10. During the past 5 years, have the members of the community participated in voluntary work programs or construction projects aimed at improving conditions in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>(skip to 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. List the two most important public works projects or actions undertaken by the members of the community in the past 5 years:

1. 
2. 

12. What types of projects do you think the members of the community can undertake to improve conditions here?

……………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………..

13. To what extent do the members of the community participate in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) In solving problems with the local school</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>There is no school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) In solving problems at the health clinic</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent</th>
<th>There is no health clinic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) In community organization</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) In the problems of access roads to the community</th>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) In solving problems of roads and highways:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) In solving problems of potable water and garbage collection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large extent</th>
<th>Small extent</th>
<th>No extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What members of the community participate most in solving the problems in the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men &amp; Women in equal numbers</th>
<th>Neither participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b) Youth and adolescents</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Adults and young people in equal numbers</th>
<th>Neither participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Workers</th>
<th>Unemployed or non-workers</th>
<th>Workers and non-workers in equal numbers</th>
<th>Neither participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
<td>[ ] 3</td>
<td>[ ] 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 9. Environmental Problems

1. In the past 5 years, has the community experienced cases of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dengue</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaria</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leishmaniasis</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meningitis</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
<td>[ ] 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Does this community have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Garbage dumps that pollute or contaminate rivers, streams or wells</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junk yards or scrap heaps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing water/stagnant pools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouses that dump their waste in public places</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics who dump waste oil near rivers or wells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contaminating industries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumber industry, clear cutting or forest burns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Where do the inhabitants of this community generally sell their livestock and produce. In column J, list the top three in order of importance, with 1 being the most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public market or community farmers market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nearby market or fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To middlemen or outside buyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local stores and shops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only self-consumption/no outside sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In the past 5 years, has there been any reforestation project undertaken in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What problems do the members of this community face in getting their products to market and earning a fare profit? Of those mentioned, rate the three most important in column J, in order of importance, with 1 being the most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only self-consumption/no outside sales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In the past 5 years, has there been any reforestation project undertaken in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In the past 5 years, has there been any reforestation project undertaken in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Do the agricultural workers/producers in this community receive technical assistance?

Yes……………………………………………………….[   ] 1
No……………………………………………………….[   ] 2

5. Who provides this technical assistance? Is the institution public or private?

1. ………………………………………………………………………………………..
2. ………………………………………………………………………………………..

6. Does the community have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehouses…………..</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silos………………….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouses…….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Does this community have any type of agricultural cooperative?

Yes……………………………………………………….[   ] 1
No……………………………………………………….[   ] 2

8. Does this community have any institution or person (either in the community or nearby) that provides credit and loans to agricultural producers?

Yes……………………………………………………….[   ] 1
No……………………………………………………….[   ] 2

9. What persons or institutions provide credit or loans to agricultural producers in this community? In column J, rate the importance of each on a scale of one to ten, with 1 being the most important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>J</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Banks………………….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural/Development Banks.</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Banks………………….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Credit Unions or Cooperatives</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private individuals………….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export businesses……………</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing businesses…………….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer associations………..</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouses, or middlemen…..</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (specify)……………….</td>
<td>[   ] 1</td>
<td>[   ] 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Do the agricultural producers of this community receive loans or credits from individuals or institutions in other cities or regions?

Yes……………………………………………………….[   ] 1
No……………………………………………………….[   ] 2

11. What percentage of the agricultural producers in this community use loans or credits to support their activities?

……………………………………………….

12. What are the three principal problems facing the agricultural producers of this community in terms of receiving loans and credits?

1 ………………………………………………………………………….
2 ………………………………………………………………………….
3 ………………………………………………………………………….
13. In the past 5 years, the harvests/yields have:

| Increased                                      | [ ] 1 |
| Decreased                                      | [ ] 2 |
| Remained the same                             | [ ] 3 |

14. In the past 5 years, the sales of agricultural/livestock products in this community have:

| Increased                                      | [ ] 1 |
| Decreased                                      | [ ] 2 |
| Remained the same                             | [ ] 3 |

**Observations**

……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
……………………………………………………………………………………..
ANNEX D
HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

Length of interview

Time initiated: _______________
Time terminated: _____________

I. Community characteristics

*For identification of selected household:*

1.1. Province/State

1.2. District

1.3. Subdistrict

1.4. Town/village

1.5 Area: Urban
          Rural non-indigenous
          Indigenous
          Difficult access

1.6 Location: Unit
              Number

1.7 Address of selected household: Community
                                    Street
                                    House number
                                    Other details

Interviewer: _____________________________  Supervisor: __________________________
II. Household characteristics

2.1. In this dwelling are there people or groups of people who share food preparation and consumption together or separately?

[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No (Go to 2.3) [2]

2.2. How many groups of people in this dwelling share expenses, together or separately?

[__/__]

2.3. Type of house (OBSERVATION ONLY)

[ ] Individual house [1]
[ ] Open roof and patio [2]
[ ] Apartment [3]
[ ] Room within a larger house [4]
[ ] Other [8]

2.4. What construction material is used for the MAJORITY of the exterior WALLS of the house or building?

[ ] Cinderblock/brick/stone/concrete/cement [1]
[ ] Fiberglass [2]
[ ] Wood [3]
[ ] Adobe/wattle and daub [4]
[ ] Cane/straw/sticks [5]
[ ] Retazos [6]
[ ] No walls [7]
[ ] Other [8]

2.5. What is the construction material of MOST of the ROOF of this house?

[ ] Concrete/cement [1]
[ ] Tiles [2]
[ ] Fibra [3]
[ ] Metal (zinc, aluminum, etc.) [4]
[ ] Wood [5]
[ ] Straw or thatch [6]
[ ] Retazos [7]
[ ] Other [8]

2.6. What is the construction material of MOST of the FLOOR of this house?

[ ] Concrete/cement [1]
[ ] Tiles, brick, granite [2]
[ ] Wood [3]
[ ] Vinyl [4]
[ ] Earth, sand [5]
[ ] Cane [6]
[ ] Other [8]

2.7. How many ROOMS are used by this household for sleeping ONLY?

[__/__]

2.8. What type of SANITARY SERVICES does this household use?
2.9. What is the PRIMARY source of WATER for this household?

[ ] Public water system (Ministry) [1]
[ ] Public water system (local gov’t) [2]
[ ] Private well [3]
[ ] Public well (Ministry) [4]
[ ] Open tap or faucet [5]
[ ] River or stream [6]
[ ] Other [8]

2.10. How does this household dispose of MOST of its GARBAGE?

[ ] Public garbage service (Ministry) [1]
[ ] Private garbage service [2]
[ ] Throw in vacant lots [3]
[ ] Throw in inside patio [4]
[ ] Throw in river, stream, ocean [5]
[ ] Burn and/or bury [6]
[ ] Other [8]

2.11. What type of LIGHTING does this household use?

[ ] Electricity (public source) [1]
[ ] Electricity (private source) [2]
[ ] Electricity (combination public and private) [3]
[ ] Only kerosene, gas, candles [4]
[ ] Other source [8]

2.12. This home is

[ ] Owned and completely paid for [1]
[ ] Owned with a mortgage [2]
[ ] Loaned [3]
[ ] Given in exchange for services [4]
[ ] Squatter [5]
[ ] Rented [6]
[ ] Other [8]
NOTE:  
- The household is defined as all the people living in this dwelling and sharing food preparation and consumption.  
- List all the people in the household first and then ask questions 2 to 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Marriage or Relationship</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Currently employed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private sector</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow(der)</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fisherman</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow(der)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widow(der)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Never married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code box for Question 2**

- Head: 01 Grandchild: 08 Cousin: 15  
- Wife/husband: 02 Grandparent: 09 Other relative: 16  
- Son/daughter: 03 Father-in-law/mother-in-law: 10 Children from another family: 17  
- Father/mother: 04 Son-in-law/daughter-in-law: 11 Other relative: 18  
- Sister/brother: 05 Sister-in-law/brother-in-law: 12 Renter: 19  
- Stepson/stepdaughter: 06 Nephew/niece: 13 Other non-relative: 20  
- Stepfather/stepmother: 07 Uncle/aunt: 14

**Code box for Question 7**

- Farmer: 1 Private sector:  
- Fisherman: 2 Unskilled: 6  
- Trade: 3 Skilled: 7  
- Manufacturing: Public sector:  
- Artisan: 4 Unskilled: 8  
- Industrial: 5 Skilled: 9  
- Other: 10
III. Genogram

(Using symbols below, record here family composition, household composition, organizational affiliation and level of involvement.)

---

Genogram symbols

- □ = male  □ = male informant  □ = deceased male
- ○ = female  ○ = female informant  ○ = deceased female

- = legal marriage  b.19__ date of birth
  common-law marriage
  divorced
  dissolution of union

- ≠

Composition of households living in the same community as the informant’s household

Composition of households living in a community different from that of the informant.
IV. Structural social capital

**READ**: Now I would like to ask you some questions about work you or members of your household might do in this village/neighborhood.

**Organizational density and characteristics**

4.1 Are you or is someone in your household a member of any groups, organizations or associations?

(**PROBE**: Who in the household belongs to which group? Are there any other groups or informal associations that you or someone in your household belongs to? *Code below and record on genogram.*)

[If “No”, skip to 4.15]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H/h member (use roster code)</th>
<th>Name of organization</th>
<th>Type of organization (use codes below)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1] Farmers'/fisherman’s group
[3] Cooperative
[4] Women’s group
[5] Credit/finance group (formal)
[6] Political group
[7] Youth group
[8] Religious group
[9] Cultural association
[10] Neighborhood/village association
[12] School committee
[13] Health committee
[14] Water/waste
[15] Sports group
[16] Civic group (i.e. Rotarians)
[17] NGO
[18] Professional association
[19] Trade union
[98] Other
4.2 Are you/household member a leader in the group? Do you consider yourself/household member to be active in the group, such as by attending meetings or volunteering your time in other ways, or are you relatively inactive?  

(Record responses on genogram.)  
(Record h/h member with highest level of participation; in case of the same level of participation, record h/h member with longest participation in group.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code h/h member</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Not active</th>
<th>Not member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a] Farmers’ group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] Traders’ association/business group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c] Cooperative</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d] Women’s group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e] Credit/finance group (formal)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f] Political group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g] Youth group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h] Religious group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[i] Cultural association</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j] Neighborhood/village association</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[k] Parent group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[l] School committee</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[m] Health committee</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[n] Water/waste</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[o] Sports group</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3. Which of these groups is the most important to your household?  

(List up to three by name and code type of organization.)

Group 1: _________________________________   [__/__]

Group 2: _________________________________   [__/__]

Group 3: _________________________________   [__/__]

READ: Now I’m going to ask you some questions about the groups’ members.
### 4.4. Overall, are the same people members of different groups or is there little overlap in membership?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little overlap</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Some overlap</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Much overlap</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.5. Are they mostly of the same extended family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.6. Are they mostly of the same religion?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7. Are members mostly of the same gender?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.8. Are members mostly of the same political viewpoint or belong to the same political party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.9. Do members mostly have the same occupation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.10. Are members mostly from the same age group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.11. Do members mostly have the same level of education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.12 When there is a decision to be made in the group, how does this usually come about?  

**Code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The leader decides and informs the other group members.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The leader asks group members what they think and then decides.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The group members hold a discussion and decide together.</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.13. Overall how effective is the group’s leadership?

**Code:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not effective at all</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.14. Do you think that by belonging to this group you have acquired new skills or learned something valuable?

*Code:*

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Group 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
<td>Group 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Group 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Networks and mutual support organizations**

*READ: Now I am going to ask you some questions about your village/neighborhood. By village/neighborhood, I mean ___________________________. (insert here consensus definition derived from community interview.)*

4.15. If the primary school of this village/neighborhood went without a teacher for a long time, say six months or more, which people in this village/neighborhood do you think would get together to take some action about it? *(Code all that apply.)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No one in the village/neighborhood get together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Local/municipal government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Village/neighborhood association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parents of school children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The entire village/neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (describe):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.16 Who would take the initiative (act as leader)? *(Code one, using codes from the categories in the previous item.)*

4.17. If there were a problem that affected the entire village/neighborhood, for instance (RURAL: “crop disease” URBAN: “violence”), who do you think would work together to deal with the situation? *(Code all that apply.)*

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Each person.household would deal with the problem individually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighbors among themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Local government/municipal political leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>All community leaders acting together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The entire village/neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (describe):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Don’t know/not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.18. Who would take the initiative (act as leader)?

(Code one, using codes from the categories in the previous item.)

Exclusion

4.19. There are often differences that exist between people living in the same village/neighborhood. To what extent do differences such as the following tend to divide people in your village/neighborhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Differences in education</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in wealth/material possessions</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in landholdings</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in social status</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between men and women</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences between younger and older generations</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between old inhabitants and new settlers</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in political party affiliations</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in religious beliefs</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differences in ethnic background</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other differences</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.20. Do these differences cause problems? If so, how are these problems generally handled? (Record first two mentioned.)

[ ] There are no difference (Q4.19 all coded “1”) [00]
[ ] Differences do not cause problems [01]
[ ] People work it out between themselves [02]
[ ] Family/household members intervene [03]
[ ] Neighbors intervene [04]
[ ] Community leaders mediate [05]
[ ] Religious leaders mediate [06]
[ ] Judicial leaders mediate [07]
[ ] Violence [08]
[ ] Other: [97]

[ ] Don’t know/Not sure [98]
[ ] No answer [99]
4.21. In your view, are there members of your village/neighborhood who are excluded from or do not have equal access to any of these services?

4.22. How many (what percentage) do not have access to these services?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Members excluded?</th>
<th>Percentage excluded?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education/schools</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services/clinics</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance/mortgage</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water distribution</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation services</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural extension</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training/employment</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit/finance</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice/conflict resolution</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.23. Why do you think are the main reasons that not all people benefit from these services?
(Record first three mentioned.)

[01] Income level /___/___/
[02] Occupation /___/___/
[03] Social status (class; caste) /___/___/
[04] Age /___/___/
[05] Gender /___/___/
[06] Race/ethnicity /___/___/
[07] Language /___/___/
[08] Religious beliefs /___/___/
[09] Family relations /___/___/
[10] Political affiliation /___/___/
[12] Distance to facilities/services /___/___/
[13] Not everyone needs these services /___/___/
[14] Some people prefer to go elsewhere to obtain these services /___/___/
[15] Lack of information/lack of knowledge that service exists /___/___/
[97] Other ____________________________ /___/___/
[98] Don’t know/not sure /___/___/
[99] No answer /___/___/

4.24. Are there any services from which you or members of your household are excluded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education/schools</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services/clinics</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road maintenance</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing assistance</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water distribution</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation services</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural extension</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job training/employment</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit/finance</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice/conflict resolution</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[8]</td>
<td>[9]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Collective action

4.25. In the past year how often have members of this village/neighborhood gotten together and jointly petitioned government officials or political leaders with village development as their goal?

[ ] Never (Go to 4.28.) [1]
[ ] Once [2]
[ ] A couple of times [3]
[ ] Frequently [4]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.26 Was this action/Were any of these actions successful?

[ ] Yes, all were successful [01]
[ ] Some were successful and other not [02]
[ ] No, none were successful [03]

4.27. How often in the past year have you joined together with others in the village/neighborhood to address a common issue?

[ ] Never [1]
[ ] Once [2]
[ ] A couple of times [3]
[ ] Frequently [4]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.28. In the last three years have you personally done any of the following things:

(a) Voted in the elections [1] [2] [8]
(b) Actively participated in an association [1] [2] [8]
(c) Made a personal contact with an influential person. [1] [2] [8]
(d) Made newspapers, radio and TV interested in a problem. [1] [2] [8]
(e) Actively participated in an information campaign. [1] [2] [8]
(f) Actively participated in an election campaign. [1] [2] [8]
(g) Taken part in a protest march or demonstration. [1] [2] [8]
(h) Contacted your elected representative. [1] [2] [8]
(i) Taken part in a sit-in or disruption of government meetings/offices. [1] [2] [8]
(j) Talked with other people in your area about a problem. [1] [2] [8]
(k) Notified the court or police about a problem. [1] [2] [8]
(l) Made a donation of money or in-kind. [1] [2] [8]
(m) Volunteered for a charitable organization. [1] [2] [8]
4.29. Have you been approached by someone personally during the last three years who asked you to do any of the following:

- (a) Voted in the elections
- (b) Actively participated in an association
- (c) Made a personal contact with an influential person.
- (d) Made newspapers, radio and TV interested in a problem.
- (e) Actively participated in an information campaign.
- (f) Actively participated in an election campaign.
- (g) Taken part in a protest march or demonstration.
- (h) Contacted your elected representative.
- (i) Taken part in a sit-in or disruption of government meetings/offices.
- (j) Talked with other people in your area about a problem.
- (k) Notified the court or police about a problem.
- (l) Made a donation of money or in-kind.
- (m) Volunteered for a charitable organization.

4.30. If some decision related to a development project were to be taken in this village/neighborhood, then do you think the entire village/neighborhood would be called for this purpose or would the community leaders make the decision themselves?

- [ ] The community leaders would decide
- [ ] The whole village/neighborhood would be called
- [ ] Don’t know/not sure
- [ ] No answer

4.31. Overall, how would you rate the spirit of participation in this village/neighborhood?

- [ ] Very low
- [ ] Low
- [ ] Average
- [ ] High
- [ ] Very high

4.32. How much influence do you think people like yourself can have in making this village/neighborhood a better place to live?

- [ ] A lot
- [ ] Some
- [ ] Not very much
- [ ] None
- [ ] Don’t know/not sure
Conflict resolution

4.33. In your opinion, is this village/neighborhood generally peaceful or conflictive?

[ ] Peaceful [1]
[ ] Confictive [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.34. Compared with other villages/neighborhoods, is there more or less conflict in this village/neighborhood?

[ ] More [1]
[ ] The same [2]
[ ] Less [3]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.35. Do people in this village/neighborhood contribute time and money toward common development goals?

[ ] They contribute some or a lot [1]
[ ] They contribute very little or nothing [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.36. Compared with other villages/neighborhoods, to what extent do people of this village/neighborhood contribute time and money toward common development goals?

[ ] They contribute less that other villages/neighborhoods. [1]
[ ] They contribute about the same as other villages/neighborhoods. [2]
[ ] They contribute more that other villages/neighborhoods. [3]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.37. Are the relationships among people in this village/neighborhood generally harmonious or disagreeable?

[ ] Harmonious [1]
[ ] Disagreeable [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]
4.38. Compared with other villages/neighborhoods, are the relationships among people in this village/neighborhood more harmonious, the same or less harmonious than other villages/neighborhoods?

[ ] More harmonious [1]
[ ] The same [2]
[ ] Less harmonious [3]
[ ] Don't know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

4.39. Suppose two people in this village/neighborhood had a fairly serious dispute with each other. Who do you think would help resolve the dispute?

[ ] No one; people work it out between themselves [01]
[ ] Family/household members [02]
[ ] Neighbors [03]
[ ] Community leaders [04]
[ ] Religious leaders [05]
[ ] Judicial leaders [06]
[ ] Other: [07]

[ ] Don’t know/Not sure [98]
[ ] No answer [99]
V. Cognitive social capital

Solidarity

5.1. Suppose someone in the village/neighborhood had something unfortunate happen to them, such as a father’s sudden death. Who do you think they could turn to for help in this situation? (Record first three mentioned.)

[01] No one would help (Go to 5.2)
[02] Family
[03] Neighbors
[04] Friends
[05] Religious leader or group
[06] Community leader
[07] Business leader
[08] Police
[09] Family court judge
[10] Patron/employer/benefactor
[12] Mutual support group to which s/he belongs
   (PROBE: Name of organization description of other group members; common characteristics (economic class, job, sex, residence)?)
[13] Assistance organization to which s/he does not belong
[97] Other
[98] Don’t know/not sure
[99] No answer
5.2. Suppose your neighbor suffered an economic loss, say (RURAL: “crop failure”; URBAN “job loss”). In that situation, who do you think would assist him/her financially? (Record first three mentioned.)

[01] No one would help (Go to 5.2) /__/_/
[02] Family /__/_/
[03] Neighbors /__/_/
[04] Friends /__/_/
[05] Religious leader or group /__/_/
[06] Community leader /__/_/
[07] Business leader /__/_/
[08] Police /__/_/
[09] Family court judge /__/_/
[10] Patron/employer/benefactor /__/_/
[12] Mutual support group to which s/he belongs (PROBE: Name of organization description of other group members; common characteristics (economic class, job, sex, residence)?)

[13] Assistance organization to which s/he does not belong /__/_/
[97] Other /__/_/
[98] Don’t know/not sure /__/_/
[99] No answer /__/_/

Trust

5.3. Do you think that in this village/neighborhood people generally trust one another in matters of lending and borrowing?

[ ] Do trust [1]
[ ] Do not trust [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

5.4. Do you think over the last few years this level of trust has gotten better, gotten worse, or stayed about the same?

[ ] Better [1]
[ ] The same [2]
[ ] Worse [3]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]
5.5. Compared with other villages/neighborhoods, how much do people of this village/neighborhood trust each other in matters of lending and borrowing?

[ ] Less than other villages/neighborhoods [1]
[ ] The same as other villages/neighborhoods [2]
[ ] More than other villages/neighborhoods [3]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

5.6. Suppose someone from the village/neighborhood had to go away for a while along with their family. In whose charge could they leave (RURAL: “their fields” URBAN: “their house”)? (Code all that apply.)

[ ] Other family member [1]
[ ] Neighbor [2]
[ ] Anyone from the village/neighborhood for this purpose [3]
[ ] Other (describe): [4]

[ ] No one [5]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

5.7. Suppose a friend of yours in this village/neighborhood faced the following alternatives, which one would s/he prefer most?

RURAL:

[ ] Own and farm 10 hectares of land entirely by themselves [1]
[ ] Own and farm 25 hectares of land jointly with one other person [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

URBAN:

[ ] Own a patio 10 m² alone [1]
[ ] Own a patio 25 m² that is shared with one other family [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]
5.8. If you suddenly had to go away for a day or two, who could you count on to take care of your children? (Code all that apply.)

[ ] Other family member
[ ] Neighbor
[ ] Anyone from the village/neighborhood for this purpose
[ ] Other (describe):
[ ] Don’t have children
[ ] Don’t know/not sure
[ ] No answer

Reciprocity and cooperation

5.9. People here look out mainly for the welfare of their own families and they are not much concerned with village/neighborhood welfare. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

[ ] Strongly agree
[ ] Agree
[ ] Disagree
[ ] Strongly disagree
[ ] Don’t know/not sure
[ ] No answer

5.10. If a community project does not directly benefit your neighbor but has benefits for others in the village/neighborhood, then do you think your neighbor would contribute time for this project?

[ ] Will not contribute time
[ ] Will contribute time
[ ] Don’t know/not sure
[ ] No answer

5.11. If a community project does not directly benefit your neighbor but has benefits for others in the village/neighborhood, then do you think your neighbor would contribute money for this project?

[ ] Will not contribute money
[ ] Will contribute money
[ ] Don’t know/not sure
[ ] No answer
5.12. Please tell me whether *in general* you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[a] Most people in this village/neighborhood are basically honest and can be trusted.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[b] People are always interested only in their own welfare</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[c] Members in this village/neighborhood are always more trustworthy than others.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[d] In this village/neighborhood one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[e] If I have a problem there is always someone to help you.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[f] I do not pay attention to the opinions of others in the village/neighborhood.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[g] Most people in this village/neighborhood are willing to help if you need it.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[h] This village/neighborhood has prospered in the last five years.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[i] I feel accepted as a member of this village/neighborhood.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[j] RURAL: If you lose a pig or a goat, someone in the village would help look for it or would return it to you. URBAN: If you drop your purse or wallet in the neighborhood, someone will see it and return it to you.</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX E
ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE INTERVIEW GUIDES

OVERVIEW

Objectives: The overall objective of the institutional profile is to delineate the relationships and networks that exist among formal and informal institutions that operate in the community, as a measure of structural social capital. Specifically, the profile will assess the organizations’ origins and development (in terms of historical and community context, longevity and sustainability), quality of membership (in terms of why people join, exclusivity and inclusively of the organization), institutional capacity (in terms of the quality of leadership, participation, organizational culture and organizational capacity) and institutional linkages.

Activities: Between three and six institutions per community will be profiled. The organizations to be interviewed will be identified through the community interviews and/or household survey as key organizations or those that are identified as having the most impact or influence on community development.

Structure: For each organization profiled, interviews will be carried out with its leadership, members and non-members. Individual interviews will be conducted with up to three leaders per organization. The interviews should preferably be face-to-face, but a self-administered written questionnaire may be substituted. Focus group interviews will be carried out with members and non-members where each group will ideally have between 5 and 12 participants. Depending on the size and diversity of the groups membership, anywhere from one to four focus groups will be conducted. Of the non-members, effort should be made to conduct two focus groups, one for non-members who want to be members and one for non-members with no interest in becoming a member.

Each focus group will have a moderator and two observers. The moderator’s role is to facilitate the discussion, probe on key issues, elicit comments from all participants, and focus the discussion on the issues of interest without seeming to interrupt or ignore extraneous comments from participants. The observers’ role is to take notes on the content of the discussion and process of group dynamics. Upon completion of the focus group interview, the moderator and observers will conduct a follow-up debriefing to refine the interview notes and discuss preliminary findings.

Materials: Interview guide; pads of notepaper.
ORGANIZATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

1. District
2. Community
3. Name of organization
4. Type of organization
5. Membership
LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW GUIDE

A. Origins and Development

1. How was your organization created? Who was most responsible in its creation (e.g. government mandate, community decision, suggestion of outside NGO)?
2. What kinds of activities has it been involved in?
3. In what ways has the organization changed its structures and purpose? What is the main purpose of your organization today?
4. As the organization developed, what sort of help has it received from outside? Has it received advice and/or funding or other support from the government? What about from non-government sources? How did you get this support? Who initiated it? How was the support given? What benefits and limitations has the organization derived from this support?

B. Membership

1. Can you tell us about the people involved in your organization? How do they become involved? Are all people in the community involved? If not, why are some members of the community not involved?
2. Why do people join or are willing to serve (as officers/leaders/board members) in the organization? Is it hard to convince people to continue being active in the organization? What kinds of requests/demands do they make on the leadership and organization?
3. Those who are active members in this organization, are they also members of other organizations in the community/region? Do people tend to be members of just one organization or join many simultaneously? Can you explain why?

C. Institutional Capacity

1. How would you characterize the quality of leadership of this organization, terms of …
   • …stability?
   • …number of leaders/availability?
   • …diversity/heterogeneity of leadership?
   • …quality and skills of leaders?
   • …relationship of leaders to staff and to the community?
2. How would you characterize the quality of participation of this organization, terms of …
   • …attendance at meetings, both internal to the organization and externally with other organizations?
   • …participation in decision making within the organization?
   • …dissemination of relevant information prior to the decision?
   • …informal opportunities to discuss the decision?
   • …consultation processes with base organizations or with the community?
   • …broad debate, including opposition positions and honesty?
   • …dissemination of the results of the decision making process?
   • …the number of women, young people, poor people who work in the organization? Who occupy positions of responsibility in the organization?
• …whether there are groups within the community that feel excluded from the organization? What groups are they?
• …the level of participation of more prosperous families (elites) in the organization?
• …whether elites are sympathetic, supportive, interfering, adversarial, or negative influences?

3. How would you characterize the organizational culture of this organization, terms of ...
• …the existence and level of knowledge of the procedures and policies?
• …whether the procedures and policies are carried out? Whether there are problems with non-attendance in meetings, absenteeism, shirking, theft of property or supplies?
• …conflict resolution mechanisms, both within the community and within the organization?
• …the nature of conflicts between the organization and community members?

4. How would you characterize the organizational capacity of this organization, terms of ...
• …carrying out specialized activities of the principle sub-projects (i.e. credit, commercialization)?
• …supervising and contracting consultants?
• …preparing financial reports for bank, donors, and government?
• …reacting to changing circumstances (i.e. price fluctuations, change in government)?
• …developing specific plans for the future (instead of reacting to opportunities as they present themselves)?
• …reflecting on and learning from previous experiences?

D. Institutional Linkages

1. How would you characterize your organization’s relationship with other community organizations? When do you feel the need to establish collaborations/links with them?
2. Do you have links with organizations outside the village/neighborhood? With which ones? What is the nature of those links?
3. Do you feel sufficiently informed about other organizations’ programs and activities? What are your sources of information?
4. Have you attempted to organize or work with other organizations to achieve a mutually beneficial goal? (Describe activities.) Is this a common strategy among organizations in this village/neighborhood? (Probe as to reasons why or why not.)
5. Could you describe your relationship with the government? Have you had experience in trying to get government assistance? What was your experience? Which level of government do you find most cooperative (local, district, national)? Has the government made particular requests on your organization?
6. Is your organization linked to any government program? Which government program(s) is your organization involved with? Why those particular programs? What sort of role does your organization play in the program? Are there certain characteristics of these programs which make it easier for your organization to work with?
7. Do you feel sufficiently informed about government programs and activities? What are your sources of information?

8. Have you attempted to give inputs to the government? What were the circumstances? What have been the results? What kinds of challenges did you have to deal with? (Probe for any role in planning, operation and maintenance of government sponsored services.)

9. Has your organization been invited to participate in any of the various government development planning processes? What do you think about these planning mechanisms?

10. In general, how do you assess your organization’s actual influence on government decision making at the district level?
MEMBERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

A. Organizational History and Structure

1. How did this group start?
2. Who have been the leaders of this group? Who are the leaders now? How and why does the leadership change over time? What are their qualities of leadership?
3. How did you decide to join this group? What kinds of benefits do you get by being a member of this group?
4. How are the leaders of this organization selected? How are decisions made? To what extent do you feel the organization represents your concerns to the outside world and to the government?
5. Why are some people not members of this organization?
6. How do you feel this organization complements, replaces or competes with government institutions’ activities in the community?
7. How do you feel this organization complements, replaces or competes with non-governmental institutions’ activities in the community?
8. What would you do to make this organization more effective?

B. Institutional Capacity

1. How would you characterize the quality of leadership of this organization, in terms of …
   - …stability?
   - …number of leaders/availability?
   - …diversity/heterogeneity of leadership?
   - …quality and skills of leaders?
   - …relationship of leaders to staff and to the community?

2. How would you characterize the quality of participation of this organization, in terms of …
   - …attendance at meetings, both internal to the organization and externally with other organizations?
   - …participation in decision making within the organization?
   - …dissemination of relevant information prior to the decision?
   - …informal opportunities to discuss the decision?
   - …consultation processes with base organizations or with the community?
   - …broad debate, including opposition positions and honesty?
   - …dissemination of the results of the decision making process?
   - …the number of women, young people, poor people who work in the organization? Who occupy positions of responsibility in the organization?
   - …whether there are groups within the community that feel excluded from the organization? What groups are they?
   - …the level of participation of more prosperous families (elites) in the organization?
   - …whether elites are sympathetic, supportive, interfering, adversarial, or negative influences?
3. How would you characterize the **organizational culture** of this organization, in terms of …
   - …the existence and level of knowledge of the procedures and policies?
   - …whether the procedures and policies are carried out? Whether there are problems with non-attendance in meetings, absenteeism, shirking, theft of property or supplies?
   - …conflict resolution mechanisms, both within the community and within the organization?
   - …the nature of conflicts between the organization and community members?

4. How would you characterize the **organizational capacity** of this organization, in terms of …
   - …carrying out specialized activities of the principle sub-projects (i.e. credit, commercialization)?
   - …supervising and contracting consultants?
   - …preparing financial reports for bank, donors, and government?
   - …reacting to changing circumstances (i.e. price fluctuations, change in government)?
   - …developing specific plans for the future (instead of reacting to opportunities as they present themselves)?
   - …reflecting on and learning from previous experiences?
NON-MEMBERS INTERVIEW GUIDE

Group #1: Non-members who want to be members

1. In your opinion, do the benefits of this particular organization spread beyond its members?
2. Why are some people not members of this organization? Why are you not a member of this organization?
3. How far do you think this organization complements or competes with other community organizations?
4. What is your view about how the organization deals with government? (For example, does kinship, party affiliation play a role in determining the relationship)?
5. What is your view about how the organization deals with other organizations that work in the village/neighborhood

Group #2: Non-members who do not want to be members

1. In your opinion, do the benefits of this particular organization spread beyond its members?
2. Why are some people not members of this organization? Why are you not a member of this organization?
3. How far do you think this organization complements or competes with other community organizations?
4. What is your view about how the organization deals with government? (For example, does kinship, party affiliation play a role in determining the relationship)?
5. What is your view about how the organization deals with other organizations that work in the village/neighborhood
ANNEX F
ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE SCORESHEET

I. Leadership

Rotation

1.1. Does the organization’s leadership change regularly?
[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No [0]

1.2. Is the amount of time the leaders remain in their position sufficient for acquiring experience and learning leadership functions?
[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No [0]

1.3. Is there the possibility of reelecting successful leaders?
[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No [0]

Density/Availability

1.4. How many people within the organization have acquired the capability and qualities to be effective leaders?
[ ] No one possesses these qualities [0]
[ ] Few (1 to 3) [1]
[ ] Some (4 to 6) [2]
[ ] Many (more than 6) [3]

1.5. How many are put forward for leadership tasks?
[ ] Only a few are ready to be leaders. [1]
[ ] The group of candidates is limited but adequate. [2]
[ ] There is never a lack of candidates (candidates who are prepared, enthused, and available to assume a leadership role). [3]
1.6. How amenable are former leaders to continued participation in the organization?

- [ ] There are no previous leaders; the organization is new. [0]
- [ ] Almost no participation by former leaders. [1]
- [ ] Some participation by former leaders. [2]
- [ ] Active participation by former leaders. [3]

Diversity/Heterogeneity

1.7. Do the leaders tend to come from a few certain groups or families and are always the same, or do the leaders represent a wider circle among the community?

- [ ] From few groups [1]
- [ ] From various groups within the community [2]
- [ ] From almost all the groups within the community [3]

1.8. What percentage of those that occupy leadership positions within the organization are women?

- [ ] <10% [0]
- [ ] Between 10% and 25% [1]
- [ ] Between 24% and 50% [2]
- [ ] More than 50% [3]

Leadership quality and skills

In general, how would you characterize the quality of leadership in this organization in terms of …

- 1.9. …education/training? [3] [2] [1] [0]
- 1.10. …dynamism/vision? [3] [2] [1] [0]
- 1.11. …professionalism/skills? [3] [2] [1] [0]
- 1.12. …honesty/transparency? [3] [2] [1] [0]

Relationship between leadership and staff

1.13. How would you characterize the relationship between the executive director and the management and technical staff?

- [ ] Harmonious; without major problems [3]
- [ ] Coexisting; with occasional rivalries [2]
- [ ] Conflictive; with many problems [1]
- [ ] Dysfunctional; there is no communication or coordination [0]
1.14. What level of acceptance and legitimacy does the leadership have, especially among grassroots organizations whose communities are underrepresented?

[ ] The leaders are openly accepted and everyone recognizes their legitimacy to represent their interests. [3]
[ ] The leaders are accepted by the majority of the community; the majority recognize their legitimacy. [2]
[ ] The leaders are accepted by a minority of the community members; leaders have little legitimacy. [1]
[ ] The leaders are not accepted and do not have legitimacy within the community. [0]

II. Participation

Levels of participation in important meetings

2.1. Should the frequency with which the organization meets with __________ be greater, less, or remain the same (adequate)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Meeting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresses</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assemblies</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directories</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation in decisionmaking

2.2. What have been the two most important decisions taken recently?

Decision # 1:

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

Decision # 2:

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

2.3. Thinking about these decisions, what was the decisionmaking process?

2.4. In comparison with other decisions, was this response more, less or the same as these
decisions?

(Code Decision # 1 first, then continue with Decision # 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Prior dissemination of information</th>
<th>Opportunity for informal discussion</th>
<th>Consultation with grassroots</th>
<th>Widespread debate, opposing opinions and frank discussion</th>
<th>Dissemination of results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision # 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision # 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusivity

2.5. In the last three meetings, what has been the level of participation of women, of youth, and of the poorest and most isolated communities?

2.6. In comparison with other meetings, was this level of participation more, less, or the same?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Little/none</th>
<th>Comparison with previous meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
<td>[0]</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.7. To what degree does the organization truly represent its communities/members?

[ ] Highly representative [3]  
[ ] Somewhat representative [2]  
[ ] Slightly representative [1]  
[ ] Not representative at all [0]

2.8. What percentage of the population in this community feels included as beneficiaries of the organization or feels its interests are represented by the organization?

[ ] <25% [0]  
[ ] Entre 25% y 50% [1]  
[ ] Entre 51% y 75% [2]  
[ ] Más que el 75% [3]

Participation by elites

2.9. To what degree to the more prosperous families in the community (those with land, businesses, or profession) attend meetings, hold positions or participate in activities of the organization?

[ ] Active [2]  
[ ] Moderate [1]  
[ ] Little/none [0]

2.10. What is the relationship of the more prosperous families toward the organization itself?

[ ] Sympathizers/supporters [3]  
[ ] They could be a resource, but currently are an interfering element. [2]  
[ ] They could be a resource, but currently are indifferent. [1]  
[ ] Adversarial/negative element. [0]
III. Organizational culture

Rules, norms, and fulfillment thereof

3.1. How many members know the procedures, norms and tasks of the organization?

- [ ] The majority of members know the procedures, etc [2]
- [ ] Some members know about them [1]
- [ ] Few members know about them [0]

3.2. How willing is the organization to confront problems with its members (if they were to happen) such as laziness, not attending meetings, avoiding work, or stealing property belonging to the organization?

- [ ] The organization is very willing to confront damaging behavior. [2]
- [ ] The organization is sometimes willing to confront damaging behavior on the part of its members. [1]
- [ ] The organization has little capacity to confront damaging behavior. [0]

3.3. For serious cases, do guidelines or rules exist to sanction, fine or expel the transgressor?

- [ ] Yes [1]
- [ ] No [0]
IV. Organizational capacity and sustainability

Specific capacities

What is the organization’s capacity to…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Deficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>…carry out specialized tasks for its principle subprojects (i.e. credit, training, commercialization)?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>…supervise and contract specialized consultants or staff?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>…prepare financial reports for banking institutions, donors, or government?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>…respond in a timely fashion to changes that affect the organization (i.e. price fluctuations, change of government)?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>…develop specific plans for the future (instead of reacting to external offers or opportunities as they present themselves)?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>…reflect upon and learn from experience (build an institutional memory)?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>…resolve problems or conflicts with other organizations or social actors?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>…resolve problems or conflicts within the organization?</td>
<td>[3]</td>
<td>[2]</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Formulation of demands

4.9. Does the organization have clearly defined processes for identifying the common needs and priorities of its members?

[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No [0]

4.10. In the last three years, have there been petitions or other expressions of demand formally presented by the communities?

[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No [0]

4.11. Have there been other ways for grassroots members to express their demands?

[ ] Yes [1]
[ ] No (End) [0]

4.12. In what way has the organization addressed these demands?

[ ] Tries to process them one by one [0]
[ ] Tries to identify common elements [1]
[ ] Promotes demands of common interest [2]
Annex G: Translation to Hindi and Pilot Testing in Rajasthan

PART I: COMMUNITY PROFILE

1. It was found useful during pilot testing to administer this profile to two different groups within each community consisting, respectively, of men and women. Social rules make it difficult for women to participate and speak out where men are present in large numbers. To elicit women’s opinions, it is usually necessary to consult a separate group constituted solely or primarily by women.

2. For the map of the community to be drawn up for question A2, additional features have been considered, including temples and public meeting places, that are important aspects of social and community life, especially among villages in India.

3. A question relating to relative exclusion has been added at the start of section B. The first question in this section inquires about whether services and benefits provided within the community are equally accessible by all residents. This question has been inserted here to serve as a baseline for comparing perceptions about exclusion that are reported by individual households (question numbers 4.22 and 4.24 in the household questionnaire). The numbering of questions has not been changed, however, and it remains the same as that used in the original SCAT instrument, enabling comparisons to be made between the Rajasthan data and other data collected from other regions and countries.

4. Question numbers 4 to 8 have been added to part D. It was thought that inquiring about motivations and expected length of association would help to elicit the nature and strength of sanctions against free riding. Question numbers 4 to 6 have been inserted to serve this purpose. Additionally, questions 7 and 8 inquire about the extent and quality of participation within each group.

5. A standard set of symbols have been provided within part E of the questionnaire (relating to flowchart construction) so that all investigation teams use the same set to indicate organizations that have particular types of mutual relationships. The use of a standard set of symbols was expected to facilitate data analysis.

PART II: HOUSEHOLD QUESTIONNAIRE

1. The order of questions remains exactly as in the original SCAT questionnaire, enabling direct comparisons to be made between responses received in Rajasthan, India, and in other parts of the world.
The wordings of a few questions have had to be changed to reflect the changed cultural and institutional context of rural north India. The following questions fall within this category:

Q2.4 – Q2.6  (options have been changed to reflect the different construction materials commonly used in this part of the world)

Q4.1  (items in the code box have been changed to reflect the different sorts of local organizations that exist in rural Rajasthan)
Q4.2  (change in language to include informal as well as formal organizations)
Q4.6  (substitution of “religion” by “caste”)
Q4.15/Q4.17 (changed coding scheme that reflects differences in the local context)
Q4.19  (addition of caste and tribe as potential causes of social differences)
Q4.22  (very different wording used to get at the extent of relative exclusion)
Q4.24  (“exclusion” measured in terms of relative access to services and benefits)
Q5.1  (different options provided to reflect different sets of local organizations and leaders)
Q5.8  (insertion of caste as another option among alternative mutual assistance networks)
Q5.12  (deletion of “pig or goat” and using “wallet” for both rural and urban areas)

Part 3 of this questionnaire has been omitted, i.e., a genogram has not been constructed. Constructing a genogram proved to be too difficult and time-consuming for the investigators who were hired for this survey in Rajasthan. To minimize the social distance between interviewers and interviewees, investigators were hired who themselves live mostly in the rural areas, who dress like villagers do, and who speak dialects common among rural folk. It proved hard to find such people who also had a level of education high enough to understand and construct genograms with little difficulty. Not much has been lost as a result of this omission, especially insofar as scaling and comparing levels of social capital is concerned.

The coding scheme will need to be reversed for a few questions, e.g., Q5.3 and Q5.4, so that more of the desired forms of behavior are allocated higher scores. These changes in coding will need to be made at the time of data entry.

Although only one question – that relating to the genogram – has been deleted from the original SCAT questionnaire, the total number of questions in the Hindi version is 70, as against 119 in the original version. This difference has arisen on account of counting only entire questions (and not sub-parts to questions) for the Hindi version.
## ANNEX H
### LESSON PLANS FOR TRAINING OF FIELD WORKERS, PANAMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Handouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>• Introduction to the workshop</td>
<td>Lecture: Review the workshop objectives, agenda, expectations</td>
<td>Handouts: pens, pads, notebooks, agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>• Introduction of the workshop participants</td>
<td>Group dynamic: “Alliterative names” as an ice breaker: name, where from, previous research or field experience; name and alliterative adjective written on paper</td>
<td>8x11 paper; magic markers masking tape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45&quot;</td>
<td>• Introduction to the SCAT study</td>
<td>Lecture: What is social capital? Overview; definitions; relation to other types of capital; relationship to economic development What is the SCAT study? Objective; conceptual framework; structure of the tools; what the study is not. Who will participate? Criteria for selection of interviewers; review of terms of reference.</td>
<td>Handouts: memos on social capital, SCAT study, terms of reference for interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Part I: Community profile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15&quot;</td>
<td>• Overview presentation</td>
<td>Lecture: Objectives; structure; activities; materials.</td>
<td>Handouts: Community profile interview guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>• Qualitative participatory methodologies: In-depth interview techniques with groups</td>
<td>Group discussion: How to conduct a group interview; entering the community; role of the research team (facilitator and observers); using the interview guide; importance of transcripts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>• Qualitative participatory methodologies: Community asset mapping</td>
<td>Group discussion: How to facilitate a participatory mapping of community assets; identification of the community’s asset portfolio; the art of listening.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30&quot;</td>
<td>• Qualitative participatory methodologies: Venn diagrams</td>
<td>Group discussion: How to facilitate a participatory Venn diagram; community assessment of the relative importance and accessibility of associations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20”</td>
<td>Qualitative participatory methodologies: Flowchart diagrams of organization networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10”</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Part I: Community profile (cont.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90”</td>
<td>Review of the community interview guide, by sections:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Definition of the community and identification of community assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Collective action, solidarity, conflict resolution, sustainability of efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Community leadership and decisionmaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Identification of local level institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Relationship between the community and local level institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Institutional networks and organizational density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>Reintegration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Part I: Community profile (cont.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 90” | • Application of the community interview guide | **Role play:**  
The objective of this exercise is to practice interview skills and evaluate participants’ capabilities for conducting the community interviews. Assign the roles of facilitator, observers, and informants. Have the “research team” and the “community members” take ten minutes to clarify their roles, strategies, responsibilities, etc. | Will need enough space to recreate a community interview plus all relevant materials (“research team” is responsible) |
| 30” | • Conclusion of the exercise | **Group discussion:**  
Comments regarding the role play; observations on the roles of facilitator, observer, participants; constructive criticism regarding ways to improve interview techniques, eliciting information, managing group dynamics. |
| 17:00 | Finish | |
| | • Homework assignments | **Reading:**  
- Community interview guide  
- Household interview  
- Organizational interview guide  
- Memoranda describing the SCAT study  
- Terms of reference for interviewers  
**Writing:**  
- For all participants, draft in their own words an introduction to the study, appropriate for presentation to informantes; should include references to the study objectives, the meaning of social capital, the use of participatory methods, and guarantee of confidentiality.  
- For those who played the role of observer, draft the expanded field notes.  
**Practice:**  
- Explain to someone not involved with the study the concept of social capital and its importance in the economic development of the community. | Handout copies of all research instruments, support memoranda, and tors. |

**Day 2**

| 8:00 | Review of previous day’s work and homework assignments; questions and clarifications | **Group discussion:**  
Ask participants to recite their written explanations of the study and to make comments regarding accuracy of contents, style of delivery, clarity of language, etc. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00</td>
<td>Part II: Household survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:15</td>
<td>Overview</td>
<td>Lecture: Objectives, sampling and interview techniques, structure, materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50</td>
<td>Review the first three sections of the</td>
<td>Group discussion: Review the “why” of each question, its application and coding. For the genogram, show symbols used and draw a sample genogram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>household questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Community characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Household characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Genogram</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>Application of the household questionnaire</td>
<td>Role play: In pairs, apply the first three sections of the questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:15</td>
<td>Review of the exercise</td>
<td>Group discussion: In front of the class, have a third person describe a genogram from one of the interviews; question and answer about interview techniques and coding; emphasize research objectives and relationship to social capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Part II: Household survey (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45</td>
<td>Review Section 4. Structural social capital</td>
<td>Group discussion: Review the “why” of each question, its application and coding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Application of Section 4. Structural social</td>
<td>Role play: With the same partner, continue applying the household questionnaire through Section 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Review of the exercise</td>
<td>Group discussion: Q&amp;A; emphasize pilot research objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:15</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Part II: Household survey (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>Review of previous day’s work and homework</td>
<td>Group discussion: Have participants describe their experience with applying the questionnaire; discuss interview techniques, presentation and informed consent, areas of difficulty encountered and ways to solved them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assignments; questions and clarifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Review of previous day’s work and homework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>assignments; questions and clarifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Part II: Household survey (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60”</td>
<td>• Review Section 5. Cognitive social capital</td>
<td>Group discussion: Review the “why” of each question, its application and coding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60”</td>
<td>• Application of Section 5. Cognitive social capital</td>
<td>Role play: With the same partner, continue applying the household questionnaire through Section 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15”</td>
<td>• Review of the exercise; conclusion of the presentation on the household survey</td>
<td>Group discussion: Q&amp;A; emphasize pilot research objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15”</td>
<td>Reintegration</td>
<td>Group dynamic: “When I think about ‘social capital’ I think of _____”; use “The Floor” ball and quickly pass it around. Gauge whether participants are integrating social capital concepts; stimulate group; also ask someone ahead of time to write down the responses for use in tomorrow’s dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:45</td>
<td>Review of Part I: Community Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120”</td>
<td>• Application of the community interview guide</td>
<td>Role play: Practice interview skills and evaluate participants’ capabilities for conducting the community interviews. Assign the roles of facilitator, observers, and informants. The “research team” and the “community members” should take ten minutes to clarify their roles, strategies, responsibilities, etc. Choose a setting (i.e. urban, rural, indigenous) different from first community interview role play; all participants should have played an “observer” role at least once.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:45</td>
<td>• Conclusion of the exercise</td>
<td>Group discussion: Comments regarding the role play; observations on the roles of facilitator, observer, participants; constructive criticism regarding ways to improve interview techniques, eliciting information, managing group dynamics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>End</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homework assignment</td>
<td>Read:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Part III: Organizational profile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The “observers” from the community interview role play should write up their field notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Review of previous day's work and homework assignments; questions and clarifications</td>
<td>Group discussion: Have participants describe their experience drafting field notes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45</td>
<td>Part III: Organizational Profile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30”</td>
<td>Lecture: Objectives, sampling and interview techniques, structure, materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90”</td>
<td>Group discussion: Review the “why” of each question, its application and technique for drafting field notes. Review coding sheet that is filled in following interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>Group dynamic: “Entre mis piernas tengo__________________.” Prior to exercise, write down words or phrases associated with ‘social capital’. Have participants draw at random and balance paper paper between knees. Each one says out loud, “I have _______ between my legs,” reading what is written on the paper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00</td>
<td>Part III: Organizational profile (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120”</td>
<td>Field exercise: Arrange previously with a local organization to conduct an individual interview with leaders and a group interview with members. Select an interviewer; all other participants are observers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>Part III: Organizational profile (cont.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45”</td>
<td>Group discussion: Review the details of the interview: technique, informed consent, findings. As a group, apply the closed coding form; Q&amp;A; emphasize objectives and relationship to social capital.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Session</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td><strong>Group discussion:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Final selection of interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- How field work will be managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Teams (one supervisor, three interviewers, one driver with vehicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Assignment of communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Hand out materials (maps, instruments, paper, markers, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Letters of introduction; identification cards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>End of training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The five-day training session in India was organized in the following manner:

**Day 1**

a.m.  Overview of SCAT Instruments and Discussion of Objectives and Methodology  
(Methodology for drawing samples of households in each test location was also discussed at this time.)  
p.m.  Discussion of Household Questionnaire in Small-Group Session  
(Supervisors led their field teams, assisted by training staff, in item-by-item discussions of this questionnaire. Each team identified items that were difficult to understand or that were likely to confuse respondents in the field.)

**Day 2**

a.m.  Discussion of Household Questionnaire in Full-Group Session  
(Specific items identified by each district team were discussed among the full group, followed by simulations and role-playing exercises. Some further refinements were made among a small number of items in this questionnaire.)  
p.m.  Discussion of Community Profile in Full-Group Session  
(Discussion of each item in this instrument, with special attention being given to Venn diagrams and flowcharts, corresponding to items D and E1 of this profile. Sample Venn diagrams and flowcharts were constructed by each district team. Simulation and role-playing.)

**Day 3**

a.m.  Practice Administration of Household Questionnaires among Farmers  
(A group of farmers, equal in number to the field investigators, were persuaded to come to the training center from a nearby village. Each field investigator was assigned one farmer to interview using the household questionnaire. Supervisors and training staffs assisted with this exercise, observing the process, and noting difficulties faced by investigators. They also recorded times taken for individual interviews and instances of loss of interest among respondents. This exercise, which lasted approximately two-and-a-half hours, was followed by further discussions and clarifications about this instrument.)  
p.m.  Practice Administration of Community Profile among Farmers  
(Supervisors assisted by the investigators on their teams interviewed the same group of farmers, this time using the community profile. Teams discussed their experiences in full-group session.)

**Day 4**

a.m.  Full-Group Discussion of Organizational Profile, Simulation and Role Playing  
p.m.  Practice Administration of Organizational Profile in Urban Neighborhoods  
(District teams went into urban neighborhoods located near the training center for this purpose. Teams discussed their experiences in full-group session.)

**Day 5**

a.m.  Practice Administration of Household Questionnaire and Community Profile among Urban Neighborhoods  
(The teams returned to the same neighborhoods for administering these instruments.)  
p.m.  Final round of discussions on all three instruments and final amendments and revisions.
ANNEX I
SELECTION CRITERIA AND TERMS OF REFERENCE
FOR INTERVIEWERS, PANAMA

Terms of reference

Interviewer

Responsibilities

The objective of the study is to pilot test the research instruments that are part of the Social Capital Assessment Tool (SCAT). Interviewers selected will have the following responsibilities:

- Be completely familiar with the content and application of the various data collection methods including the community profile, the household questionnaire and the organizational profile.
- Be able to answer any questions regarding the study, its objectives, and fieldwork activities.
- Select key informants to be interviewed according to the indicated sampling techniques.
- Obtain informed consent from all interview subjects prior to their participation in the study.
- Conduct interviews, whether group interviews, individual in-depth interviews, or individual surveys, using the indicated data collection instruments.
- Provide in timely fashion the primary source materials generated during the interviews, whether expanded observation notes, appropriately coded survey questionnaires, or other results of the qualitative interviews.
- Debrief field supervisors about the research process and the application of the piloted instruments, in order to refine and improve their contents and application. Inform field supervisors in a timely manner regarding the research process and the handling of piloted instruments, in order to refine and improve their application.

Skills

The interviewer will have certain qualities and skills to be able to undertake the diverse activities associated with the fieldwork. These include:

- Completed secondary school education, preferably with some university-level studies in one of the social sciences.
- Previous experience conducting household surveys.
• Previous experience conducting focus group interviews and/or using participatory research techniques.

• Demonstrated ability to document, in detail and precision, the main issues brought out in individual and group open-ended interviews.

• Ability to work in teams, coupled with demonstrated self-motivation.

• Availability to work six days a week, including Saturdays and Sundays, with long working hours.

• Availability to work in distant areas, in difficult terrain, under challenging conditions.

**Selection criteria**

The final selection of the research team will be made at the conclusion of a four-day training workshop. The workshop will present the study objectives, and the contents, research justification and application of the research instruments, as well as practice applying the instruments. The team of field supervisors will select 12 people for the position of interviewer. The selection criteria include demonstrated ability in the above-mentioned areas as well as:

• Team members’ diversity in terms of sex, ethnicity and social class that appropriately reflect the diversity of the research population; and

• Team members with complementary skill mix regarding techniques for conducting qualitative individual and group interviews, conducting household surveys, drafting expanded field notes, transcribing field notes and data management, and the application of participatory research methods.
**Annex J**

**SCAT Scaling Items**

*Annex J. Six Questionnaire Items Used for Constructing a Scale for Measuring Social Capital*

4.15 If the primary school of this village/neighborhood went without a teacher for a long time, say six months or more, which people in this village/neighborhood do you think would get together to take some action about it?

- [ ] No one in the village/neighborhood get together  [1]
- [ ] Local/municipal government  [2]
- [ ] Village/neighborhood association  [3]
- [ ] Parents of school children  [4]
- [ ] The entire village/neighborhood  [5]
- [ ] Other (describe):  [6]
- [ ] Don’t know/not sure  [8]
- [ ] No answer  [9]

4.17 If there were a problem that affected the entire village/neighborhood, for instance (RURAL: “crop disease” URBAN: “violence”), who do you think would work together to deal with the situation?

- [ ] Each person/household would deal with the problem individually  [1]
- [ ] Neighbors among themselves  [2]
- [ ] Local government/municipal political leaders  [3]
- [ ] All community leaders acting together  [4]
- [ ] The entire village/neighborhood  [5]
- [ ] Other (describe):  [6]
- [ ] Don’t know/not sure  [8]
- [ ] No answer  [9]

4.27 How often in the past year have you joined together with others in the village/neighborhood to address a common issue?

- [ ] Never  [1]
- [ ] Once  [2]
- [ ] A couple of times  [3]
- [ ] Frequently  [4]
- [ ] Don’t know/not sure  [8]
- [ ] No answer  [9]
5.3 Do you think that in this village/neighborhood people generally trust one another in matters of lending and borrowing?

[ ] Do trust [1]
[ ] Do not trust [2]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

5.5 Compared with other villages/neighborhoods, how much do people of this village/neighborhood trust each other?

[ ] Less than other villages/neighborhoods [1]
[ ] The same as other villages/neighborhoods [2]
[ ] More than other villages/neighborhoods [3]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]

5.6 Suppose someone from the village/neighborhood had to go away for a while along with their family. In whose charge could they leave their fields?

[ ] Other family member [1]
[ ] Neighbor [2]
[ ] Anyone from the village/neighborhood for this purpose [3]
[ ] Other (describe): [4]
[ ] Don’t know/not sure [8]
[ ] No answer [9]
ANNEX K
LESS USEFUL SURVEY ITEMS

Hard-to-Administer Survey Items

FOR REASONS RECORDED AGAINST EACH OF THEM, THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE FOUND TO BE HARD TO ADMINISTER OR NOT VERY USEFUL FOR THE PURPOSES OF SCALING SOCIAL CAPITAL AND ASSESSING ORGANIZATIONAL CAPACITIES IN THE CONTEXT OF RAJASTHAN.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q4.20</td>
<td>Too many options – eight – are provided to this question. It is also not clear how the different responses compare in relation to one another. Suggest: remove this question, since its intent is probed as well or better by other survey questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.22 and Q4.24</td>
<td>Both these questions are intended to assess extent of exclusion from services and program benefits. Respondents tended to get bored with this repetition, and as many as 73 (out of 357) did not respond to the later question. Since assessing exclusion is not the main purpose of this exercise, only one among these two questions should be retained within the questionnaire. Suggest: retain 4.24 and drop 4.22.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.23</td>
<td>The respondent is asked to evaluate among 15 different choices. It is hard for any respondent to remember all 15 options, far less compare among them (missing values are 50 or more). Suggest: cut the list down to at most 10 items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.26</td>
<td>This question asks about the degree of “success” achieved by collective action taken in the past. It is hardly clear what “success” implies, so the question tends to confuse respondents. 110 respondents did not record any response to this question. Suggest: drop this question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4.33 and Q4.34, Q4.35 and Q4.36, Q4.37 and Q4.38</td>
<td>These pairs of questions are repetitious. 4.34 repeats the question asked in 4.33, albeit with a slightly different wording; 4.35 repeats 4.36; and 4.37 repeats 4.38. Alert respondents are prone to spot this repetition and indicate their resentment by refusing to respond – 50 and more respondents did not respond to the second question of each pair. Suggest: drop one of the questions among each of these pairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5.1 and Q5.2</td>
<td>Each of these questions provides 13 options to the respondents to evaluate. Suggest: cut down the set of options to no more than 10. Question 5.1, which asks respondents to consider the death of someone’s father, should be dropped or reworded. As many as 123 respondents in Rajasthan refused to consider such a situation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>