Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management


# Influence of Social Capital on Performance of Social Amenities Projects in Rural Areas of Tanzania: A Case of Water Projects in Puge Division, Tabora

**Alex Fredrick Nduwayo & Dr. Angelina Sabina Mulwa**

**ISSN: 2616-8464**

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 4||Issue 4||Page 17-40||October||2020|*
*Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464*

# Influence of Social Capital on Performance of Social Amenities Projects in Rural Areas of Tanzania: A Case of Water Projects in Puge Division, Tabora

**[1*]Alex Fredrick Nduwayo & [2]Dr. Angelina Sabina Mulwa**

**[1*]Post Graduate Student, University of Nairobi**

**[2]Senior Lecturer, School of Open and Distance Learning,**

**University of Nairobi**

**Email of the Corresponding Author: nduayo@gmail.com**

***How to cite this article*: Nduwayo, A., F., & Mulwa, A., S. (2020). Influence of Social Capital on Performance of Social Amenities Projects in Rural Areas of Tanzania: A Case of Water Projects in Puge Division, Tabora.** ***Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management,* 4(4), 17-40**

# Abstract

The development of rural areas is measured on various indicators and various parameters. Social amenities are some of those indicators that rural development can be measured. Social capital is linked to the development of rural areas. However, its role in the development of social amenities is still a paradox that this study intended to divulge. In light of this, the study sought to evaluate the impact of social capital on the performance of social amenities projects in Puge Division of Tabora in Tanzania. In this case, only the water project was considered. The study was guided by three objectives namely: evaluating the way structural social capital influences performance of social amenities projects of Puge Division in Tabora, assessing the degree to which relational social capital influence the performance of social amenities projects of Puge Division in Tabora and evaluating the influence of cognitive social capital on the performance of social amenities projects of Puge Division in Tabora. To effectively pursue this study, a descriptive research design was used. This enabled the collection of data through administering of the interviews and questionnaires. The validity of the research instruments was met by involving the experts in evaluation of the data collection instruments. The research project supervisor and panelists were involved in the scrutiny of the data collection instruments. The questionnaires had a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.985 signifying that the instrument was reliable. The data was collected from a sample of 145 participants who included 133 Community members to which questionnaires were administered and an interview was conducted 1 District Water Engineer, 5 Water Committee Members, 3 Ward Executive Officers and 3 Village Executive Officers. Descriptive statistics basically frequencies were used to analyze quantitative data whereas thematic analysis was utilized to analyze the qualitative data. It was found that the level of performance of social amenities projects including the water projects in Puge Division was not satisfactory. The results indicated that some of the aspects of structural social capital were reported to influence the performance of social amenities projects positively and some do not. Moreover, it was established that relational social capital had a positive influence on the performance of

social amenities project and lastly a negative influence of cognitive social capital on performance of social amenities projects was also reported. Specifically, more than 83.3 per cent of the participants indicated that they do not meet their obligations in making the water projects extremely well. Also, the results revealed that most of the aspects examined in the three forms of structural social had a positive influence on the performance of social amenities projects. The study recommended that there should be collective and practical measures including but not limited to policy reform and local community building to create awareness on the aspects of social capital and their significant influence on the performance of social amenities projects which are meant to improve their livelihoods. This may increase the level of involvement of the members of communities in all processes involved in the development of water projects and other amenities projects.

**Keywords**: *Performance, social amenities, Water Projects, social capital, Puge division, Tabora, Tanzania*

### 1.1 Statement of the Problem

A well-established capital is in a position to stir the rural development if utilized by the stakeholders, including the government, NGOs, among others. This includes the use of a participatory approach in spearheading development plan in rural areas. However even these participatory approaches which put into consideration the social capital is not utilized to the maximum. We have a lot of challenges which in our communities which needs social concern like education, health and water problem. For example, at Puge, the number of wards have a water problem. The government and other stakeholders have made a lot of intervention in funding water projects through Government funds, Water Aid, World Bank and other stakeholders. Still, the water seems not well functioning or sustainable (Catholic Archdiocese of Tabora, 2018). This study sought to examine how social capital can influence social amenities projects in rural areas.

The failure of participatory rural development strategies to achieve expected results is something to ponder about. But also, the failure of some of the established social amenities to bring the intended results suggest that there is a breakdown somewhere (Water project report, 2018), especially when social capital is considered to be a process for creating and mobilizing social networks within organizations to provide access to other resources in social capital's cycle. This suggests that inadequate knowledge of dynamics involved in rural social capital formation. It also suggests lack of such knowledge is hampers the acknowledgement of social capital as a vital ingredient in development (Bourguignon & Chiappori, 1992; Bowles, 1999; Grootaert, 2000; Fukuyama, 2001; Murphy, 2002; Barr, 2003; Miguel and Kremer, 2003), enters the rural economic development function.

Community development has not been successful enough as a result of not putting this network into proper use (Woolcock, 2001). he decisions concerning the communities' development plan in Tanzania and Tabora do not consider social capital, enabling and encouraging mutual advantageous social cooperation. The government community development agenda has not been successful as decisions are from the top with involving the local people's participation at the ground. There are rural development programs that have been set up, but they have not brought the intended impacts. There are rural development programs which have been set up, but they have not brought the intended impacts.

Social amenities projects which help us to access services such as sanitation, housing, school, health and drainage among other services are crucial for our well-being because they contribute to improving the quality of life. These projects are not well implemented and sustainable. Despite the huge investments, most of social amenities projects fail to reach the target set. Water project in Puge division is having challenges. This study, therefore, intended to fill this knowledge gap.

### 1.2 Objectives of the Study

This study was guided by the following objectives:

i. To establish the way structural social capital influences the performance of social amenities projects of Puge division in Tabora.
ii. To review the extent to which relational social capital influence the performance of social amenities projects of Puge division in Tabora.
iii. To evaluate the influence of cognitive social capital on the performance of social amenities projects of Puge division in Tabora.

## 2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Performance of Social Amenities Projects

It is unanimously agreed that access to basic amenities contributes significantly to improving the quality of life (Kumar, 2014). The prosperity of any community and its general wellbeing has always been measures on how its social amenities are developed and the accessibility of these amenities to the community members. But also, how these social amenities are developed will depend on their performance during their implementation and the eventual utilization by the community members. It is agreed upon that lack of basic infrastructure impacts negatively the lives of people who live in such areas (Manggat, Zain and Jamaluddin, 2018). This is about the fact that such basic infrastructures are believed to improve the quality of lives. As a result, the role that social workers play in developing communities is critical in improving the quality of their lives. Manggat, Zain, and Jamaluddin (2018) believe that the concept of development and its application to development needs to be understood. This would be critical in enabling those involved in planning processes to take active measures to provide relevant facilities so that the lives of other people can be improved.

In the process of understanding the way social capital is linked to the performance of social amenities projects, it is imperative to understand social capital by its function. Alan (2006) asserts that social capital is not a single entity, but it is a productive aspect that simplifies the process of attaining goals that might not be attainable. The successfulness of many projects will greatly depend on the coordinated actions among players of a certain community.

Today, social infrastructural development and the performance of social amenities has become one of the much-debated topics among scholars because in different countries development in infrastructure has been identified as a parameter that measures the ability of each country to compete globally (Opawole, Jagboo, Bababola & Babatunde, 2012). We cannot compete globally if our amenities projects like water are not performing in the case in Puge Divison. This is concerning the fact that access to essential commodities is primarily related to improving public members' well-being. In Nigeria for example, the development of basic infrastructural facilities (social amenities) in rural areas is perceived as a factor that accelerates development in those areas, which promotes national development (Ale, Abisuwa, Olagunagba and Ijarotimi, 2011). The importance of infrastructure for rural areas has also been discussed by Adeyoye, Yusuf, Balogun & Carim-sanni, (2011). Therefore, the

lack of amenities in rural areas might be seen as a factor that undermines the quality of life in those areas and national development. But all these will have been achieved if the projects or amenities in question have performed following the intended set purpose. In the successful implementation and performance of rural projects, Michelini (2013) considers social capital to be a resource that is critical in rural development particularly in projects that involve civil societies and joint participation. Although Michelini was concerned with water irrigation projects, he demonstrates the way social capital is important in enhancing the success of such projects. He claimed that they needed to be developed without the support of other factors that create cohesive communities, which are neglected in other forms of capital, which could apply to the case of water project of Puge Division. Considering social capital as a resource started with Piselli, (2003), who asserts that social capital should be viewed as a resource for collective action even though its interest for development lies within structures of relationship that develop among people. As a result, communal wealth in terms of social capital depends largely on the degree of involvement of those people and the range of networks among them. Researchers argue that the performance of social amenities requires involvement and participatory framework if such development is to take place in any country or in any community. Ghafoor (2000), for instance, views the infrastructural investment as an investment that can contribute the increase of economic growth so long as there is a readiness among various players were the infrastructure is to be situation who include the beneficiaries. Then those who believe in the power of social capital to stir social agenda would consider it as a form of investment for the performance and development of social amenities projects.

According to Manggat (2018), social infrastructure development is none other than a mechanism that increases the living quality of a society. Gary, Steven and Marcouiller (2005) in their publication titled Amenities and Rural Development, might not have been talking about social capital concerning the performance and development of amenities, but the way they formulated their arguments, the role of social capital is clearly portrayed therein. They assert that several amenities are provided by a combination of economic agents, in rural areas of Eastern Europe and Asia. Sometimes all of these agents without exception must commit themselves if the amenity is to be successfully conserved. They offer an example of rural Japan with the physical amenities, and state that the landscape made up of rice-growing terraces in Japan, known as tanada, could not be sustained without the commitment of all the owners because the water flows from one terrace to another and if anyone terrace is not properly maintained all those downstream of it are under threat. In puge Division, we have several water projects, but some are not functioning, is it because of a lack of commitment? A collective initiative was mandatory to be put in place. It's this collective initiative and commitment of the members of the society and stakeholders that form the basis of collective action that is to be measured on the parameters of social capital.

### 2.2 Structural Social Capital and Performance of Social Amenities Projects

The structural dimensions in social capital are elements that provide opportunities for the realization of productive ends within social cycles (Social Capital Research and Training Network, 2018). With regard to the group and organization level, the fundamental dimension of social capital includes four elements, which define networks' structural characteristics such as; frequency, institutional networks, redundancy, size, diversity, density, centrality and links. The third ones include associations within members, trust and institutional links. At an individual level, these dimensions might include structures of social networks in form of size,

density, centrality ties with other people and degree of trust with them. This may extend to the number of networks, social connection with other people, volumes of social resources, participation in social groups and bridging ties with other people (Social Capital Research and Training Network, 2018).

With such attributes of structural social capital Allan (2006) contends that social capital (in respect to the attributes of structural dimension) is commonly noticed when it is not in local communities. Normally, when social networks are few, people lack trust with each other, they are less effective, they do not share norms, they are even not committed to communal issues, and they lack unity and even promote underdevelopment. This result in high crime rates, poor health standards, mutual suspicion and physical environment degrades. In recognition of social capital, (in respect to the attributes of structural dimension) we can improve the way we look at communities and the way they operate. This might be critical in promoting development in communities and devising interventions that can help build and rebuild social capital. This shows that not even the development of social amenities will be feasible if the attributes of structural social capital are not enhanced.

Concerning the development of social amenities, one point to understand is that within communities, there exists people, governments and institutions that form a system alongside each other (Allan, 2006). As a result, social capital plays a major role in promoting development across all sectors, and local infrastructural facilities (in this case – social amenities). For example, according to Allan (2006), social capital when evaluated from structural attributes can reduce costs because there would be no need for written agreements and contracts. This may go-ahead to increase bargaining power within communities. In this case, if the transaction cost is related to social amenities, then their establishment will be met with ease.

**2.3 Relational Social Capital and Performance of Social Amenities Projects**

The relational dimension of social capital is concerned about the attributes of social links between people; hence, it is majorly defined in terms of trustworthiness and trust (Social Capital Research and Training Network, 2018). At the Group and Organization Level Relational dimension of social capital includes; social ties and links among people either at the family level or at workplaces, ties with external stakeholders be they political leaders or official from government and different types of trust are they interpersonal or otherwise. On the other hand, at an individual level, Relational dimension of social capital includes; the levels of association with other people, social networks and social cohesion among other levels of association with other people.

Although Georg (2007), was not concerned with the development of social amenities projects, his study on the development of rural areas as induced by social capital can give many highlights on relational social capital about the development of rural infrastructural facilities and structures. He gives an analysis of two regions. That is, region A and region B. Region A is a rural area that is marginalized because the level of economic development is little with excessive overgrazing and high levels of brain drain. However, in this region, there is a high level of social capital in terms of strong norms, mutual trust and association among members of the community. In contrast, Region B consists of a community that is not marginalized as such because it is less remote and is a bit developed economically. Despite this, its level of social cohesion among members of the community is relatively lower than that of Region A. Because of the level of development in Region B the majority of the people in that region can commute outside of the community. As a result, they do not have time to

involve in communal activities. While this might appear to be again to Region B, the region might be at risk of under-developing its agricultural activities or even deforesting in favour of industrialization.

According to Ploch (1976), community development refers to the active participation of the community in the programs that are planned for them in the effort to increase the community's quality of life. On the other hand, Twelvetrees (2008) defined community work (particularly in community development) as the process of assisting people to improve their own community through collective and autonomous efforts. This is a real picture of being a social worker as envisioned by Manggat, et al. (2018) for the community members who have the urge to effect changes and developmental agenda upon their community. Earlier we have seen that relational social capital is related to levels of trustworthiness, trust, sanctions, expectations, identification, identity, obligations and norms and Putnam (1993) one of the greatest advocators of this field of study holds that networks of civic engagement like associations at the neighborhood level, sports clubs, choral societies, mass-based parties and cooperatives represent horizontal interactions that can promote reciprocity, cooperation at the society level, and trust.

## 3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. The target population was drawn from 501 people, in the following categories: 465 rural community dwellers specifically who were close to project water sources and schemes or rather beneficiaries of the water projects in their area, 25 members of the Water Project Committees, Government officials such as 1 District Water Engineer, 5 Village Executive Officers (VEO) and 5 Ward Executive Officers (WEO). The sample size was 133 respondents

## 4. 0. RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 4.1 Performance of Social Amenities Projects

The researcher sought to examine the extent to which social amenities projects were performing in Puge area of Tabora region of Tanzania. Therefore, this section analyzed, presented and interpreted the findings based on the performance of social amenities projects basically the water projects. The results are summarized in Table 1.

**Table 1: Performance of Social Amenities Projects**

*Stratford Peer Reviewed Journals and Book Publishing*
*Journal of Entrepreneurship & Project Management*
*Volume 4||Issue 4||Page 17-40||October||2020|*
*Email: info@stratfordjournals.org ISSN: 2616-8464*

| Items Measured | SA | | A | | N | | D | | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| I feel obliged to participate and volunteer time in our water project. | 6 | 4.8 | 11 | 8.7 | 6 | 4.8 | 65 | 51.6 | 38 | 30.2 |
| We plan and make decisions regarding the water project together with our leaders. | 15 | 11.9 | 7 | 5.6 | 2 | 1.6 | 32 | 25.4 | 70 | 55.6 |
| I am not aware of what is going on about the water project. | 49 | 38.9 | 53 | 42.1 | 8 | 6.3 | 12 | 9.5 | 4 | 3.2 |
| Our water project is performing well to all beneficiaries. | 13 | 10.3 | 10 | 7.9 | 6 | 4.8 | 66 | 52.4 | 31 | 24.6 |
| Our water project has created a strong relationship among the beneficiaries. | 15 | 11.9 | 12 | 9.5 | 7 | 5.6 | 60 | 47.6 | 32 | 25.4 |
| Members consistently contribute money for water project sustainability. | 12 | 9.5 | 4 | 3.2 | 1 | 0.8 | 51 | 40.5 | 58 | 46.0 |
| The water project was not completed. | 56 | 44.4 | 36 | 28.6 | 6 | 4.8 | 24 | 19.0 | 4 | 3.2 |
| The time taken to complete the social amenities projects was not equal to the planned one. | 53 | 42.1 | 49 | 38.9 | 3 | 2.4 | 18 | 14.3 | 3 | 2.4 |
| The number of people served by the water project is not the same as a planned one. | 73 | 57.9 | 32 | 25.4 | 2 | 1.6 | 15 | 11.9 | 4 | 3.2 |
| I am not satisfied with the performance of the water project. | 63 | 50.0 | 42 | 33.3 | 4 | 3.2 | 10 | 7.9 | 7 | 5.6 |
| We cannot afford the maintenance of the water project. | 49 | 39.2 | 39 | 31.2 | 7 | 5.6 | 25 | 20.0 | 5 | 4.0 |

The results presented in from Table 1 reveals that very few participants at 4.8 per cent and 8.7 per cent strongly agreed and agreed on the statement that they feel obliged to engage and volunteer time in the water project respectively. Apart from that majority at 51.6 per cent disagreed with statement whereas 30.2% of them strongly disagreed with it. This implies that the community members do not feel obliged and responsible to participate in their water projects. Based on this finding, it may be stated that the sustainability of social amenities projects such as those dealing with water is in a poor state. On the extent to which they are involved by their leaders in decision making concerning the water projects. Concerning this statement, the majority of the participants at 25.4% and 55.6% disagreed and strongly disagreed with such statement respectively while minority at 11.9 per cent and 5.6 per cent strongly agreed and agreed with the statement respectively. This can be conducted that the community members are left behind in the process of planning and decision making on water projects. That is why the results indicate that majority of the respondents at 38.9 per cent and 42.1 per cent indicated that they were not aware of what was going on concerning the water project. This may pose difficulties both in the implementation and evaluation processes about social amenities projects and hence they may perform poorly in improving the livelihood of the people in the study area. The extent to which social amenities projects are performing to all beneficiaries. Based on this item, the majority of the respondents at 52.4% and 24.6% strongly disagreed and disagreed with the statement whereas very few supported the item. Based on this peculiar finding, it can be explained that there is the poor performance of social

amenities projects in Puge area of Tabora in Tanzania. Table 1 further shows that about 11.9 per cent and 7.9 per cent of the participants support the statement that their water projects have created an effective relationship among them while the majority at 47.6 per cent and 25.5 per cent disagreed and strongly disagreed with the item respectively. This implies that the water projects as social amenities projects have instilled poor and unhealthy relationship among the beneficiaries perhaps due to poor services provided by such projects to some of the beneficiaries.

The findings in Table 1 show that on one hand very few at 9.5 per cent of respondents strongly agreed that they contribute a financial resource for the projects and 3.2% agreed with the statement. Conversely, the majority of the participants at 40.5 per cent and 46.0% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement respectively. Based on this finding, it can be stated that the development, performance and sustainability of social amenities projects do not depend on beneficiaries' financial contributions. Concerning a statement that the water project as one of the social amenities projects was not completed, majority of the respondents at 44.4% and 28.6% strongly agreed and agreed that the water project in their area of jurisdiction was not completed while few of them at 19.0% and 3.2% disagreed and strongly disagreed with such statement respectively. Based on the response given by the majority, the water projects are initiated but not completed. Meaning that community members may not be getting the targeted services they desire.

The results further inform that 42.1% and 38.9% of the participants strongly agreed with the item that time taken to complete water projects is not same as the planned one while 38.9 per cent agreed. Likewise, very few at 14.3% and 2.4% of the participants disagreed and strongly disagreed with such statement respectively. This means that water projects are initiated but completed in time than the planned one. The results based on the performance of social amenities projects further reveal that majority of the participants at 57.9 per cent and 25.4 per cent strongly agreed and agreed respectively with the statement that the number of beneficiaries served by the water projects was not the same as the targeted one while 11.9% and 3.2% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement respectively.

A combination of those who strongly agreed and those who agreed with the statement indicates that the social amenities projects basically the water projects provide water service to the number of people that were not targeted. This may be the reasons for the majority of the participants at 50.0 per cent and 33.3 per cent to strongly agree and agree with the statement that they were dissatisfied with the performance of the water project while few at 7.9% and 5.6% disagree and strongly disagree with the statement respectively. This shows that the majority of the beneficiaries are dissatisfied with the performance of the water projects while very few people are satisfied.

The findings in Table 1 also show that 39.2% and 31.2% of the respondents strongly agreed and agreed with the statement that they cannot afford the maintenance of the water project while only 20.0% and 4.0% disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement respectively. Meaning that, if people cannot afford the maintenance costs, the likelihood that most of the materials become used off may be high and therefore, the water projects eventually decline.

Besides, the interview also was conducted to find in-depth information on the existence and performance of water projects as among the many forms of social amenities projects. One of the interviewees said,

> *"The water project has been implemented since 2012 and performs well". He added that "Community members were not involved during the initial stages but later were consulted for meetings for effective implementation of the water project. Currently, people are involved in forming water committees and by-laws." (2019)*

Another interviewee explained,

> *"The water project began very well and we thank very much the Water Aid Organization for their help" (2019).*

He paused and continued,

> *"Currently there are challenges as among the 9 water boreholes only 5 are effective in providing water to the community while the rest have declined due to lack of maintenance and water has dried up". (2019)*

Additionally, the third interviewee narrated,

> *"The community is involved to a large extent in the water projects due to high water demand in my area. However, the project is not working due to high running costs emanating from the use of diesel generators as a source of power" (2019)*

Besides that, another interviewee reported that the water project has declined due to high running costs.

**4. 2 Structural Social Capital and Performance of Social Amenities Projects**

This was the first objective that guided the study. It examined the influence of structural social capital on the performance of social amenities projects especially the water projects implemented in Puge area of Tabora region. The results for this objective are presented in Table 2

**Table 2: Structural Social Capital and Social Amenities Projects**

| Items Measured | SA | | A | | N | | D | | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| We have a strong relationship in the water project. | 13 | 10.3 | 6 | 4.8 | 1 | 0.8 | 73 | 57.9 | 33 | 26.2 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| My community has a strong bonding and linking ties. | 14 | 11.1 | 20 | 15.9 | 3 | 2.4 | 28 | 22.2 | 61 | 48.4 |
| My community is structured with membership and institutional links. | 11 | 8.7 | 10 | 7.9 | 2 | 1.6 | 21 | 16.7 | 82 | 65.1 |
| We trust each other. | 12 | 9.5 | 18 | 14.3 | 3 | 2.4 | 37 | 29.4 | 56 | 44.4 |
| We have a sense of belongings to our water project. | 9 | 7.1 | 25 | 19.8 | 3 | 2.4 | 53 | 42.1 | 36 | 28.6 |
| We do not have bylaws governing your water project. | 7 | 5.6 | 20 | 15.9 | 3 | 2.4 | 39 | 31.0 | 57 | 45.2 |
| We know the budget of the water project. | 72 | 57.1 | 33 | 26.2 | 3 | 2.4 | 16 | 12.7 | 2 | 1.6 |
| We do not have a committee to monitor and evaluate the water project. | 8 | 6.3 | 17 | 13.5 | 7 | 5.6 | 54 | 42.9 | 40 | 31.7 |

As depicted in Table 2 some of the aspects of structural social capital on the performance of water projects as one of the social amenities project was unrealized because most of the participants disagreed with them. For example, 57.9% and 26.2% of them disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement that they have a strong relationship in the water projects. Only 10.3% and 4.8% strongly agreed and agreed with the statement respectively whereas very few (0.8 per cent) were undecided. The majority of the participants at 22.2 per cent and 48.4 per cent disagreed and strongly disagreed respectively with the statement that their community has a strong bonding and linking ties towards the water projects implemented in their areas. In other words, the community has poor bonding and linking ties concerning water projects. Thus, these social amenities projects cannot perform effectively.

Apart from that, a sum of the percentages of participants who strongly agreed and agreed as well as a sum of those who disagreed and strongly disagreed with the statement, "The community is structured with membership and institutional links", indicated that majority at 81.8 per cent rejected the statement while only 16.6 per cent concurred with that statement. This implies that communities in Puge area in Tabora are not structured with membership and institutional links towards the water projects and therefore the implementation and sustainability of such projects are at the danger state. The results in Table 4.9 further show that 23.8 per cent of the participants indicated that they trust each other in the processes involved in the planning implementation and monitoring the water project while the majority of them at 73.8 per cent argued that they do not trust each other pertaining the water projects. This may have a detrimental effect on the participation among community members in the projects which in turn deter not only its performance but also its sustainability.

This study also examined if the participants had senses of ownership and belonging towards the water project. Based on this examination, only 26.9 agreed with the statement while the majority of the participants 70.7 per cent reject the statement. This indicated that the sense of belongingness and ownership as an element of structural social capital is not realized in among community member and thus, it may be difficult to enhance the performance of social amenities projects specifically the water projects implemented in the visited area.

Although most of the components of structural social capital are not realized in influencing the performance of social amenities projects in the visited area, some of them are essential in

promoting such projects. For instance, 76.2 per cent of the participants reject the statement that "There have no by-laws governing their water project" while only 21.5 per cent supported the statement. This implies that there are by-laws established by the community members to promote the performance of their water projects. That is to say, the bylaws are essential in governing all processes concerning the water projects which include but not limited to planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, maintenance, water usage and bills. Similarly, very few participants at 19.8% agreed with the statement that, "There is no committee to oversee the water project but a majority of the 74.6 per cent disagreed with this statement. Based on the response indicated by the majority of the participants, it can be re-stated that there is a committee established to oversee the development and sustainability of the water project. Thus, this structural social capital influences the performance of water projects positively in the visited area which are meant to improve the livelihoods among households in Puge area of Tabora Region in Tanzania. The findings in table 2 also reveal that most of the people living in the community (83.3 per cent) have an idea and were aware of the budget instilled in their water projects. Based on this peculiar finding, community members may agree to offer the resources they have for the performance of the water projects when the need arises.

Apart from that, the interview also was conducted to elicit information on the influence of structural social capital on the performance of water projects as one of the social amenities projects. One of the interviewees pointed out that,

> *"The water projects are there and the people are involved. To justify these many meetings are conducted to make the project effective. However, people lower their participation in water project when challenges emerge especially those which require them to contribute". (2019)*

Likewise, the second interviewee replied that,

> *"Yes, we have rules and regulations to govern our water project and they were decided by the community members themselves. We instill charges to those who impeach them" (2019).*

Far from that, one of the government officials insisted that,

> *"I was a leader responsible for water, I always insist leaders at the local level and the non-government institutions to make sure that they involve the people in all processes during the establishment of the water projects. These are their projects for their betterment".*

These findings relate to Gorton et al (2010) who argue that satisfactions of community members to water-related projects positively and significantly relate to structural social capital. Generally, the findings in mean that the influence of structural social capital on the performance of social amenities projects is very low because most of the components relating to structural social capital are rejected by the participants. Based on this argument, it can be assumed that most of the people living in the target community are not aware of the issues that form structural social capital and which is one of the crucial factors in improving both the performance and sustainability of social amenities projects.

### 4.3 Relational Social Capital and Performance of Social Amenities Projects

This section presented the findings of the second research objective. This objective was explored the contributions of relational social capital on the performance of social amenities projects especially the water projects being instilled and implemented in Puge in Tabora region of Tanzania. The findings for this objective is summarized in Table 3

**Table 3: Relational Social Capital and Social Amenities Projects**

| Items Measured | SA | | A | | N | | D | | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | % | F | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |
| The community members are trustworthiness. | 7 | 5.6 | 21 | 16.7 | 7 | 5.6 | 43 | 34.1 | 48 | 38.1 |
| There are social interactions and relationships among the community members. | 75 | 59.5 | 31 | 24.6 | 5 | 4.0 | 6 | 4.8 | 9 | 7.1 |
| There are social networking and support among community interests on the water project. | 23 | 18.3 | 88 | 69.8 | 3 | 2.4 | 4 | 3.2 | 8 | 6.3 |
| The community has strong cohesion and associability on the water project. | 14 | 11.1 | 19 | 15.1 | 3 | 2.4 | 60 | 47.6 | 30 | 23.8 |
| We do not have meetings to decide on the water project. | 9 | 7.1 | 13 | 10.3 | 1 | 0.8 | 55 | 43.7 | 48 | 38.1 |

The results presented in Table 3 show that the community members were not trustworthiness to the water projects. This was to the fact that majority of the participants at 72.2 per cent rejected the statement, "The community members are trustworthiness". Only 22.3 per cent of the participants accepted the statement. This suggested that the majority of the people living in the community experience mistrust with the water projects, a thing which in turn limit not only the performance but also the prosperity of the water projects implemented. In other words, trustworthiness was reported to have less impact on the performance of social amenities projects.

Nevertheless, the results suggested that most of the respondents at 84.1 agreed that social interactions and relationships among community members as a component of relational social capital exist in their community. 11.9 per cent rejected this statement meaning that there are no interactions and relationships among community members. Considering the majority, healthy interaction and relationship among community members enhance their participation in the water projects which eventually improve the performance of such projects in providing them with the desired water services. Similarly, 84.1 per cent of the participants supported that there are social networking and support among community members towards the water project while only 9.5 per cent of them rejected the statement. The response given by the majority establishes a ground that community members support each other towards their common interests of obtaining safe and clean water in their domiciles. This may have a strong positive link with the performance and sustainability of water projects.

However, Table 3 indicate that, majority of the participants at 71.4 per cent disagreed with the statement that, the community has strong cohesion and associability on the water project.

This result indicated that this is one of the elements of relational social capital that is not realized in the community and therefore it can be assumed to have a weak contribution on the performance of social amenities projects. Apart from that, 17.4 per cent of the respondents argued that there are no meetings to decide on the water projects while the majority of them at 81.8 per cent support the statement. This indicated that meetings as a component of relational social capital are not experienced in the community. This may lower the performance of social amenities projects because ideas for improvement may be limited to a few people as opposed to a notion of total member involvement.

Apart from these quantitative data, participants also were interviewed on how relational social capital contributes to the performance of social amenities projects. The first interviewee pointed out that,

> *"Members of this community trust each other and collaborate in enhancing the performance of the water project". Besides that, the second interviewee said, "The water project in my area is effective and we are happy with it" (2019).*

However, another interviewee commented that,

> *"Poor financial management reduces cohesion and associability among the people towards the development of the project" (2019).*

The general looks on the results indicates that the contribution of relational social capital on the performance, social amenities projects are not linear. It is limited some of its components through this may be the matter of the context in which the study is carried out.

### 4 .4 Cognitive Social Capital and Performance of Social Amenities Projects

This part of this study presented the findings based on the third research objective that sought to find out the influence of cognitive social capital on the performance of social amenities projects. The findings for this objective are summarized and presented in Table 4.

**Table 4: Cognitive Social Capital and Social Amenities Projects**

| Items Measured | SA | | A | | N | | D | | SD | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % | f | % |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| We have shared norms and values on our water project. | 49 | 38.9 | 46 | 36.5 | 2 | 1.6 | 16 | 12.7 | 13 | 10.3 |
| We meet our obligations to make the water project run effectively. | 4 | 3.2 | 14 | 11.1 | 3 | 2.4 | 73 | 57.9 | 32 | 25.4 |
| The community has no shared goals and missions on the water project. | 13 | 10.3 | 8 | 6.3 | 7 | 5.6 | 27 | 21.4 | 71 | 56.3 |
| All community members have individual tolerance of diversity. | 76 | 60.3 | 22 | 17.5 | 5 | 4.0 | 15 | 11.9 | 8 | 6.3 |
| Social organization principles like trust and norms can help the society in solving dilemmas of collective action towards the water project. | 37 | 29.4 | 69 | 54.8 | 4 | 3.2 | 14 | 11.1 | 2 | 1.6 |
| We were not informed to contribute to the water project. | 61 | 48.4 | 40 | 31.7 | 2 | 1.6 | 18 | 14.3 | 5 | 4.0 |
| The water price was not approved by the community. | 70 | 55.6 | 35 | 27.8 | 3 | 2.4 | 13 | 10.3 | 5 | 4.0 |

The findings in Table 4 depict that 75.4 per cent d reported that norms and values towards the water project exist in their community while only 23.0 per cent rejected the statement in question. This implied that the existence of common cultural aspects towards water projects has a good contribution to the performance of social amenities projects. This was contrary to fulfilling obligations in making the water projects run effectively in which majority at 83.3 per cent indicated that there is no such thing in their community. These social amenities projects were mainly following the top-down system of planning, implementation, supervision and evaluation; thus, this lowers the level of feeling obliged among community members to contribute to the water project. For that reason, this aspect of cognitive social capital is likely to have a poor influence on the performance of social amenities projects.

Further, the majority of the participants at 77.7 per cent rejected the statement that their community has no shared goals and missions towards the water projects while 16.6 per cent support it. This finding informed that the community in the study area has shared goals and missions on the water project. In other words, the community desires to have enough sources of water or rather water schemes that can provide enough clean and safe water to all beneficiaries. Thus, this component of cognitive social capital may have a great contribution to both the performance and sustainability of the water projects in Puge Division of Tabora region in Tanzania.

This was in line with the majority of the participants at 77.8 per cent who agreed that there is individual tolerance of diversity among the community members concerning the water project. Similarly, 77.8 per cent supported the idea that social organizational principles such as networks of civic engagement, norms and trust could overcome the collective action

pertaining the water projects. This informed that if these aspects of cognitive social capital were realized, managed and lived, they have the potential to enhance the performance of water projects.

Different from that, majority of the participants at 80.1 per cent pointed out that no information was given to ask them to contribute to the water project while few of them (18.3 per cent) disagreed with the statement meaning that they were informed and asked to contribute to the performance of the water project. This result meant that community members were assumed to have no contributions to the development of the amenities project which is a false statement. If this aspect is not examined, then the performance of water projects as one of social amenities projects may be endangered. The other aspect of cognitive social capital that was explored was the decision of the water bills in which the results indicate that majority of the participants at 83.4 per cent indicated that the price for buying water or rather a water bills were not decided and approved by the community. This may promote vandalism of the water facilities especially among community members who is one way or the other fail to meet the eater bills and reaming struggling to obtain water from unreliable sources.

Lessor similar results were revealed during the interview. In one hand, one interviewee narrated that,

> *"The water project is there but it is in an average condition of performance because most of the community members do not fulfil their obligations and responsibilities fully and freely" (2019).*

On the other hand, another interviewee said that,

> *"The community members have a clear understanding of the need and performance of water projects. This is justified by their contributions when the need arises especially their manpower" (2019).*

Similarly, the government official pinpointed that,

> *"The community members play their roles towards water projects and they have tolerance. But, these projects cannot be successful fully without challenges. These challenges cause dissatisfaction among them. Due to this, my office is conducting capacity building on water management to local communities" (2019).*

This implies that the government is working with community members to make sure that their water projects perform effectively and sustain.

Thus, the ability of this aspect of cognitive social capital on the performance of social amenities projects is questionable. Based on the findings, it can be argued that the influence of structural social capital, relational social capital and cognitive social capital is not fully realized in Puge area of Tabora region in Tanzania. This is because the majority of the aspects of social capital were rejected by the participants. Thus, the likelihood that there is a massive decline in water projects is high. For that reason, the desire for enough, safe and clean water among community members is not yet fulfilled.

This study also included exploring participants views on the status of water projects in the visited area. This could give an individual on the development, performance and sustainability of social amenities basically water projects. The results are summarized and presented in Table 5

**Table 5: Status of Water Projects Implemented**

| Items Measured | YES | | NO | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Frequency | Per cent | Frequency | Per cent |
| Are your involvement in planning the water projects? | 23 | 18.3 | 103 | 81.7 |
| Are you satisfied with the water projects? | 34 | 27.0 | 92 | 73.0 |
| Do the water projects provide water at an affordable cost? | 85 | 67.5 | 41 | 32.5 |

The findings in Table 5 indicate that 18.3 per cent of the participants were involved in initiating and planning the water project while the majority of them at 81.7 per cent were not involved in such activity. Ahia blame, Engel and Venort (2012) argue that the public is not involved in the issues related to water projects in developing countries. This implies that social amenities projects rely on a few individuals. This may result in poor sustainability of these projects because most of the people may not be eager to contribute to such projects. That is why the majority of the participants at 73.0 per cent indicated that were not satisfied with the water projects implemented in their areas and only a few at 27.0 per cent are satisfied with the performance of social amenities projects. The findings in table 4:12 also show that although the development and sustainability of social amenities projects basically the water projects are questionable, majority of the respondents at 67.5 per cent pointed out that the water services emanating from the water projects are provided at a reasonable cost meaning that most beneficiary can afford. Only 32.5 per cent argued that the water cost was not affordable. This implies that few people in the project areas may have no ability to buy water or simply to contribute to the development of these social amenities projects especially when financial resources are involved. This is a question of social-economic differences in the community that are inevitable but must be handled high great care in that provision of social services.

Besides that, the interview also was conducted to district and local government leaders and water committee members to find out their perceptions on the status of the water projects available in their community. In this regard, one of the interviewees agreed that,

> *"I was involved in planning the water project. The officers from the district and Water Aid came and I participate to show the area where to install the water scheme" (2019).*

Another interviewee explained,

> *"We are consulted but to a low extent maybe those who were leaders at that time" (2019).*

Different from that, the third interviewee replied that,

> *"I am satisfied and I am very happy with project implementation despite the few challenges like running and maintenance costs" (2019).*

Based in these results, Laah, Adefila and Yusuf (2013) established a statistically significant difference in the levels of participation among people in project development and they are less involved instead community member is the receiver of information only. In other words, questionable growth of social amenities projects is a result top-down system of planning, implementing and evaluating such essential projects. Nevertheless, Haq, Hassan and Ahmed (2014) found that community participation has a strong positive relationship with water supply projects in rural areas. Thus, there is a need to restructure the system employed to initiate, plan, implement and evaluate social amenities projects in the visited areas so that the notion of total member involvement and total quality management (TQM) can be achieved and hence sustainable projects can be realized. About the results in Table 6, the participants were requested to cite reasons for their dissatisfaction with social amenities projects in their domiciles. The findings for this item are presented in Table 6.

**Table 6: Reasons for Dissatisfaction with Water Projects**

| Reasons | Frequency | Per cent |
|---|---|---|
| Lack of water | 48 | 18.0 |
| High running costs | 48 | 18.0 |
| Poor leadership | 51 | 19.2 |
| Vandalism | 21 | 7.9 |
| Poor community involvement | 53 | 19.9 |
| Technical errors | 45 | 16.9 |
| **Total** | **266** | **100.0** |

The findings in Table 6 reveals that lack of farm the project reported at 18.0 per cent and costs emanating from the water projects reported at 18.0 per cent make a majority of community members dissatisfied with social amenities projects implemented in their areas of jurisdictions. The respondents pointed out that poor leadership; vandalism and poor community involvement at 19.2 per cent, 7.9 per cent and 19.9 per cent respectively are among the reasons for poor implementation and development of social amenities projects including the water projects.

The results further reveal that 16.9 per cent and 12.8 per cent of the participants indicated that technical errors are root causes of dissatisfactory social amenities projects in their areas. A close examination of the findings in table 4.13, poor community involvement was ranked the highest factor (with 19.9 per cent) dissatisfactory performance of social amenities projects while vandalism was the least. However, all the listed reasons may have more or less similar intensity in influencing the poor performance of water projects in the study area. These findings concur with the findings in a study by Peter Nkambule (2012) who found that poor involvement of the community in decision making and inability to meet running costs had a detrimental effect on the establishment and sustainability of social amenities projects including water projects. Peter and Nkambule gave a notion of some members may have the ability to contribute to the sustainable development of water schemes but they may not be willing to do. Based on these findings, unwillingness to add value to water projects may be influenced by poor involvement of community members in the establishment of those projects. That is to say, it is difficult to begin at the end stages of the projects while the beginning is unknown. Many of the social amenities projects including those dealing with water supply decline in the age of 5 years after their establishment due to operational and maintenance factors (Chepygon & Kamiya, 2018). This implies that private sector and government have goodwill toward establishment and performance of water projects to

increase water supply coverage but the projects fail due to technical know-how and extreme poverty among community members in such a way that they cannot afford the maintenance costs after the project has been handed to them.

Regarding, poor leadership and vandalism, similar results were reported by Obisesan and Famous (2016) that poor development of water projects as social amenities resulted from poor management and vandalism on the water project facilities. In other words, a community with poor leadership is likely to experience high levels of vandalism and therefore very few or no social amenities projects can perform in such a community. Interviewees also commented on the reasons for the ineffective performance of some water projects. For example, one interviewee explained,

> *"Some of our projects are in unsatisfactory condition because of lack of visionary leaders especially on collecting financial resource for maintenance" (2019).*

Inline, the second interview replied to the item by saying that,

> *"The many problems of our water projects are because we are not well informed and involved. They bring materials for water, we get the water and when they go, the system fails to operate" (2019).*

This implies that, if the community is not involved, they become foreign to their own water project and they do not belong to it which causes dependency syndrome. Thus, wherever there is such a situation social capital basically cognitive social capital cannot be effective and hence less performance of social amenities projects. A similar note was given by the third interview,

> *"The water projects are performing well. But some technical errors occur like improper positioning of a water reservoir which in fact causes water shortage among beneficiaries who are increasing in number" (2019)*

Based on these findings, Whittington et al (2009) contend that;

> *Systems failed because they were not repaired. As such, the technologies that were utilized were of no use to the projects. Besides, they contend that revenues were insufficient to meet costs because recovery cost was minimal. This affected the sustainability of projects in terms of maintenance costs because communities did not develop senses of ownership to water projects in their areas. Besides, the majority of those people were dissatisfied with the governments and donors who established such projects in their areas.*

Thus, the social amenities projects including the water projects were not giving the best results and therefore people's expectations to have well-performing and sustainable social amenities projects are not yet met in the study area. Despite these factors conflicting the sustainability of land satisfaction among community members with the performance of social amenities projects particularly the water projects, it is, however, possible to make water projects available, effective and sustainable. In this regard, the participants were asked to suggest some possible strategies that when implemented may result into the increase of and sustainability of water projects as one of the social amenities projects for improving people's

livelihood in their areas. Thus, table 7 summarizes some of the possible ways that can promote sustainability of the social amenities projects especially the water projects.

**Table 7: Possible Strategies for Effective Implementation of Water Projects**

| Strategies | Frequency | Per cent |
|---|---|---|
| Effective community involvement | 106 | 39.8 |
| Public awareness and capacity building | 41 | 15.4 |
| Alternative and effective power source | 33 | 12.4 |
| Independent community-based water committees | 47 | 17.7 |
| Establishment of many sources of water | 39 | 14.7 |
| **Total** | **266** | **100.0** |

Table 7 shows that 39.8 per cent of the respondents think that effective community member's involvement in social amenities projects may affect the welfare of such projects positively. In other words, if community members are effectively involved in all stages of the water project's development, there is a likelihood that their sense of ownership and commitment towards such projects may be high. Likewise, 15.4 per cent see the use of seminars, meetings and workshops to create awareness on the planning, management and evaluation of social amenities projects can improve the performance of such projects. This may enhance the ability of people living in communities to participate in these projects.

The other possible ways to enhance the sustainable performance of water projects were reported to be the use of an effective power source which was indicated by 12.4 per cent of all respondents. Writings in the questionnaires indicated the need for electrical power from the national grid managed by the Tanzania Electric Supply Company (TANESCO) and solar water pumps as opposed to the use of diesel generators which provide an unreliable power source, very costly and are not environmental friendly.

*"Generators are not user friendly especially in handling; require more money for fuel and therefore the give insufficient power to pump the water to the beneficiaries" (2019).*

One of the interviewees said. Additionally, 17.7 per cent of all respondents pointed out that there should be a formation of independent community-based water communities to oversee the need and development of social amenities projects in their domiciles. This perhaps helps to overcome leadership challenges in dealing with projects. 14.7 per cent argued that there should be more sources of water like water boreholes and increased water networking through pipelines to reach many community members. These findings are in line with those in the study by Sanders and Fitts (2011) which reported that instilling technical know-how through training either representatives or all project beneficiaries on technical issues can help in the maintenance of facilities used in the projects. This may have the potential to overcome not only some technical errors like the use of inappropriate project facilities but also supplement the few available professional water technicians.

On another point of effective community involvement, Tadesse, Bosona and Gabresenbet (2013) found that community involvement in deciding issues related to social amenities projects like water supply projects should be given a greater opportunity as it enables community beneficiaries to prioritize their projects needs and the type of mechanism of service delivery like technology that may be friendly to them. This is opposed to government

and NGO's being the main speakers and allocators of social amenities projects which eventually decline due to the absence of a sense of ownership among project beneficiaries. Thus, the bottom-top system of initiating, implementing and evaluating social amenities projects like water scheme projects may enhance effective performance and sustainability of such projects. The bottom-top system may include the formation of independent community-based water projects development committees to oversee the sustainability of such projects in their areas. Trigilia (2001) submits that for the effective influence of social capital on the development of local development projects, the interaction of these forms and political institutions must be carefully analyzed. Thus, the government and NGO's should help, advice, support and monitor the agreements and the use of facilities decided by community members concerning social amenities projects.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

This study evaluated the influence of social capital basically in relational, cognitive and structural social capital on the performance of social amenities projects. In this study, the water project as one of the many types of social amenities projects was the measure concern. It was established that structural social capital had a low influence on the performance of social amenities projects compared to cognitive and relational social capital which exhibited high level in influencing the performance of such projects. The influence of social capital on performance of amenities projects was examined by using some aspects in each type of social capital. Nevertheless, the performance of the water projects was found to be poor and most of the water schemes declined.

## 6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigated the performance of social amenities projects especially the water projects about structural, cognitive and relational social capital. Based on the findings of this study, the following are recommendations for action which include a recommendation for policy, practice and methodology. For these projects to perform effectively there should be collective measures emanating from effective research and community involvement. Similarly, there should be initiatives for community capacity building on the aspects of social capital and their impact on performance of social amenities projects. This will awaken them to practice and live these aspects which in turn may awaken them to fight for clean and safe water to improve livelihoods.

## REFERENCES

Alan. K. (2006). Social Capital, the social economy and community development. Community Development Journal Vol 41 No 2 April 2006 pp. 160– 173

Ale, M. O., Abisuwa, T. A., Olagunagba, F. O., &Ijarotimi, O. (2011). Rural infrastructural development, food security and city congestion in Nigeria. Journal of research in national development (JORIND), 1(9), 124-130

Colletta, N. J. and M. L. Cullen (2000), The Nexus between Violent Conflict, Social Capital and Social Cohesion: Case Studies from Cambodia and Rwanda, Social Capital Initiative: Working Paper No. 23, World Bank.

Collier, P. (1998), Social Capital and Poverty, Social Capital Initiative: Working Paper No. 4, World Bank.

David W (2019) Social Capital: Definition & Theory. Retrieved from https://study.com/academy/lesson/social-capital-definition-theory-quiz.html

Dawson, C. (2007). A practical guide to research methods: A user-friendly manual for mastering research techniques and projects (3rd ed.). Oxford, UK: How to Content.

Denscombe, M. (1998), The good research guide for small scale research projects. Buckingham Open University: Sage publication of Department Working Paper No.179, Paris.

Dumlao, S. N. and M. Fincham's (2004), "Social Capital", The Centre for the Study of African Economies, Working Paper Series, No. 214, http://www.bepress.com/csae/paper214 accessed Feb 2019.

Emmanuel O. M (2009). Social Capital and Rural Economic Development in Western Province of Kenya: An Empirical Analysis. PhD Thesis- Kenyatta University

Falk, I., & Lesley H. (1998). Indicators of Social Capital: social capital as the product of local interactive learning processes." Pp. 23. Launceston: Centre for Research and Learning in Regional Australia.

Feldman, M., Hadjimichael, T., Kemeny, T., &Lanahan, L. (2014). Economic development: A definition and model for investment. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Public Policy, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC.

Frankfort-Nahmias, Chava&Nachimias, David (1996). Research Methods in the Social Sciences (5th ed): London: St. Martin Press

Fukuyama, F. (1996). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Fukuyama, F. (1999), The Great Disruption: Human Nature and the Reconstitution of Social Order, London, Profile Books.

Gary P. G., Steven C. D., &Marcouiller. D. W., (2005) Amenities and Rural Development: Theory, Methods and Public Policy

Georg Wiesinger, (2007). The importance of social capital in rural development, networking and decision making in rural areas. Revue de Géographie Alpine | Journal of Alpine Research [Online], 95-4 2007

Ghafoor, A. (2000). Public infrastructure in developing countries: The case of electric power and telecommunications industries in Pakistan. Aldershot. UK: Ashgate Publish.

Gorton, M., Saner, J., Peshevski, M., Bosev, D., Shekerinov, D., Quarrie, S. (2010, 25-27 August). The dimensions of social capital and rural development: Evidence from water communities in the Republic of Macedonia. Paper presented at the 118th seminar of the EAAE, Ljubljana, Slovenia. Retrieved from https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/94916/2/Gorton-The_dimensions_of_social_capital_and_rural_development-106.pdf

Grootaert, C. (1998). Social capital: the missing link? Social Capital Initiative, Working Paper No. 3, The World Bank.

Hanka M. J., & Trent A. E (2018) Social Capital and Economic Development: A Neighborhood Perspective. Journal of Public and Nonprofit Affairs. Volume 11, Issue 4 (2018)

Haq, M.A., Hassan, S.M., & Ahmad, K. (2014). Community participation and sustainability of water supply program in District Faisalabad, Pakistan. Journal of Quality and Technology Management, X(II), 125-137.

Hean, S., Sarah C., & Angus F, (2003). The M-C-M' cycle and social capital.' Social Science Medicine 56: 1061-72.

Huntoon, Laura. 2001. 'Government use of nonprofit organizations to build social capital.' The Journal of Socio-Economics 30: 157.

Isaac, S., & Michael, W. B. (1995). Handbook in research and evaluation. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Services.

JICA (2011). The study on rural water supply in Tabora region in the united republic of Tanzania, p 1. Retrieved from _open_jicareport.jica.go.jp › pdf

Kilpatrick, Sue. (2000). How social capital facilitates learning outcomes for small family businesses. The University of Tasmania.

Laah, E.D., Adefila, J. O., & Yusuf, R.O. (2013). Community participation in sustainable infrastructural development in Riyom Area, Plateau State of Nigeria. Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development 4(19), 83-93.

Liu, A.Q, & Terry B. (2003) Social capital and participation in community improvement activities by elderly residents in small towns and rural communities. Rural Sociology 68: 343.

Manggat, I., Zain, R., & Jamaluddin, Z. (2018). The Impact of Infrastructure Development on Rural Communities: A Literature Review. International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 8(1), 647–658.

Manski, C. F. (2000), "Economic Analysis of Social Interactions," Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 14, 115-136.

Manyasa, E. O. (2007), Ethnic Conflicts, Social Capital and Economic Empowerment of Rural Women in Kenya, a Research Project Report for the 17th OSSREA Gender Issues Research Grant, Unpublished.

Manyasa, E.O (2009) Social Capital and Rural Economic Development in Western Province Of Kenya: An Empirical Analysis. PhD Thesis Kenyatta University

Martin K. (1991) Modern Development Theory. In: Martin K. (eds) Strategies of Economic Development. Palgrave Macmillan, London

Matula, P. D., Kyalo, D. N., Mulwa, A. S., & Gichuhi, L. W. (2018). Academic research proposal writing: Principles, concepts and structure. Nairobi, Kenya: Applied Research & Training Services.

Membiela M, & Pena-López (2017). Clarifying the concept of social capital through its three perspectives: Individualistic, communitarian and macro-social. European Journal of Government and Economics 6 (2)146-170

Mkulu, D. G., Adhiambo, J.M., & Katundano, T. (2017). Workplace administrative strategies for retention of academic staff in private universities in Southern Highlands Zone, Tanzania. American Journal of Sociological Research, 7(2), 77-84.

Mugenda, O and Mugenda, A (1999). Research Methods; Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. Nairobi: Act Press.

Obisesan, A., & Famous, O. (2016). Factors affecting water supply in Owah-Abbi, Delta State. Open Journal of Social Science, 4, 137-146.

Onyx, Jenny, & Paul Bullen. (2000) Sources of social capital. Pp. 105 – 135 in Social capital and public policy in Australia, edited by Ian Winter. Melbourne: National Library of Australia.

Peter G., & Nkambule, S.E. (2012). Factors affecting the sustainability of rural water schemes in Swaziland. Journal of Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, 50(52), 196-204.

Ploch, L. A. (1976). Community development in action. Journal of Community Development Society, 7(7), 5-15.

Pretty, J. (2003), Social Capital and Connectedness: Issues and Implications for Agriculture, Rural Development and Natural Resource Management in ACP Countries. Technical Centre for Agricultural and Rural Cooperation (CTA) Working Document No.8032 http://www.cta.int/pubs/wd8032/WD8032.pdf, accessed on 09.03.2019.

Productivity Commission, (2003). Social Capital: Reviewing the Concept and its Policy Implications, Research Paper, AusInfo, Canberra.

Putnam, R. D. (1993). "The prosperous community: Social capital and public life." The American Prospect 4

Sanders, H., and Fitts, J. (2011). Assessing the sustainability of rural water supply programs: A case study of Pagawa, Tanzania. Retrieved from https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/3649/Fitts_Sanders_MP.pdf

Schmid, A. Allan. (2000). "Affinity as social capital: its role in development." The Journal of Socio-Economics 29: 159.

Shahrukh R. K., Zeb R., &Sajid K (2007). Harnessing and Guiding Social Capital for Rural Development. Palgrave Macmillan. New York

National Malay Economic Conference of Malaysia PERKEM, 8 (3), 1536-1545.

Sullivan, A., & Sheffrin, M. S. (2003). Economics: Principles in action. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Tadesse, A., Bosona, T., & Gebresenbet, G. (2013). Rural water supply management and sustainability: The case of Adama Area, Ethiopia. Journal of Water Resource and Protection, 5, 208-221.

Taylor, D. L., Kawahita, T. M., Cairnross, S, &Ensink, J. H. (2015). The impact of water, sanitation and hygiene interventions to control cholera: A systematic review. Plus One, 10(8), 1-19.

.

Trigilia, C. (2001). Social capital and local development. European Journal of Social Theory, 4, 427-442. DOI:10.1177/13684310122225244

Twelvetrees, A. (2008). Community work (4th ed). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

UNESCO (2002). Social Capital and Poverty Reduction, Place de Fontenoy, Paris, France

Uslaner, Eric M. (2001). "Volunteering and social capital: how trust and religion shape civic participation in the United States." Pp. 104 – 117 in Social Capital and Participation in Everyday Life, edited by Eric M. Uslaner. London: Routledge

Verial D, (2008). Questionnaire Validation Methods, Hill Side Incorp California USA

Catholic Archdiocese of Tabora. (2018). Project implementation report. Tabora, Tanzania: Tanganyika Missionary Press.

Whittington, D., Davis, J., Prokopy, L., Komives, K., Thorsten, R., Lukacs, H.,...Wakeman, W. (2009). How well is the demand-driven, community management model for rural water supply systems doing? Evidence from Bolivia, Peru and Ghana, page 696. Water Policy, 11, 696-718.

Wollebaek, D, & Selle. P (2002). Does Participation in Voluntary Associations Contribute to Social Capital? The Impact of Intensity, Scope, and Type. Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly 31 (1): 32-61.

Woolcock, M. (2002). Social capital in theory and practice: Where do we stand? In: Social Capital and Economic Development: Well-being in Developing Countries, Isham, Kelly, Ramaswamy (eds.), Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham. http://dx.doi.org/10.4337/9781781950388.00011