

ANNEX 5: Survey of socially mobilized communities – methods and results

The study on Socially Mobilized Communities (SMCs) was carried out during 2003 in 10 districts (*Dhankuta, Morang, Sindhupalchok, Chitwan, Syangja, Rupandehi, Surkhet, Dang, Doti and Kanchanpur*) of five development regions (taking one Hill and one Tarai district in each). The Social Mobilization Agencies (SMAs) comprised cooperatives and banks, (SFCL and Nirdhan), INGO-implemented programmes (AAN, CARE and the Red Cross), government-implemented programmes (BAP and Khageri irrigation), donor-assisted programmes (VDP of UNDP and LFP of DFID), technology-focused programmes (CEAPRED and SAPPROS), women's empowerment programmes (PACT), alliance-building programmes (SAP) and NGO-targeted programmes (BASE and FECOFUN). The Participatory Learning and Action method was adopted as the major research approach. To collect the necessary data, the Survey used four major types of instruments: 20 SMA interviews, 40 stakeholder interviews, 38 focus group discussions and 599 individual member/household interviews. The distribution of sample size is shown in the table below.

The average score or ranking (AN) is calculated as:

$AN = 1/N[1x(\text{freq. for rank1}) + 2x(\text{freq. for rank2}) + 3x(\text{freq. for rank3}) + 4x(\text{freq. for rank4}) + 5x(\text{freq. for rank5})]$, where N = total frequency

On a five-point scale, the average rank of an indicator lies between 1 and 5. Inferences are based on whether the average rank is nearest 1 (signifying a very low rating of the relevant indicator) or, at the upper end, 5 (signifying a very positive indicator rating). A score of 3 on the five-point scale represents an average position between the lowest and highest possible ranks. The average scores summarize the percentage distribution of responses within this five-point range.

The selected SMCs were examined in terms of four attributes: process, outcomes, impact of conflict and impact of programme. Analysis was done based on the aggregate index of different indicators underlying different dimensions of organizational capacity building (*see table 1*). The perceived impact of SM programmes on varied dimensions of livelihood, and level of satisfaction after the programme intervention are shown in *table 2 through 4*.

Distribution of sample size

Group	Sample	Group	Sample	Group	Sample
Poor	325	Rural	325	Eastern	120
Non-poor	274	Urban	274	Central	120
Female	121	Hills	121	Western	120
Male	478	Mountain	478	Mid-western	120
Targeted	298			Far Western	119
Holistic	301				
Total	599	Total	599	Total	599

Source: UNDP 2004c.

To classify the 20 SMCs in groups with similar and dissimilar characteristics, the Cluster Analysis method was used. Although models vary from one another in many respects, in terms of making the greatest impact on livelihood conditions and also in the aggregate of process outcome and impact, the most noteworthy are those implemented by the government (BAP) and those supported by UNDP (VDP) and DFID (LFP). By contrast, the others emerged as relatively poor in terms of desirable impact on livelihood conditions and also in the aggregate of process model and impact (see table 5).

Analysis based on the aggregate index of different indicators showed that the targeted

models are stronger in terms of process, while the holistic models are stronger in terms of outcomes and impact on people's livelihoods. Their horizons are broader in terms of developing coordination with other agencies, mobilizing resources and enhancing the strengths of people in their command area. In short, because the holistic models generate greater synergy, they produce greater impact overall on the livelihood conditions of the people they mobilize. However, the weakness that often besets holistic models is a "process" that tends towards "exclusion of ultra-poor". If a holistic model sets out to eliminate this "weakness" by targeting the ultra-poor within its framework, its effectiveness may well increase.

TABLE 1 Rating of different attributes of organizational capacity and empowerment in sample SMCs

Indicators	Poor	Non-poor	Female	Male	Targeted	Holistic	Total
Participation in decision-making processes							
Selection of executive body	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.9	4.7	4.8
Formulation of rules	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6
Selection of programme	4.4	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Programme implementation	4.5	4.5	4.2	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.5
Inspection and evaluation	3.6	4.2	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9
Aggregate index	4.4	4.52	4.28	4.46	4.5	4.36	4.46
Level of participation in community activities							
Formulation of rules	3.5	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
Programme selection	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5
Community development	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.5
Implementation	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
Maintenance	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5
Inspection	2.7	3.1	2.9	2.9	2.7	3	2.9
Aggregate index	3.3	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4
Knowledge about the process and transparency							
Programme objective	2.9	3.3	3	3.1	3.2	3	3.1
Loan and investment	2.9	3.2	2.9	3	3	3	3
Seed money/revolving fund	2.2	3.1	1.9	2.1	1.9	2.2	3
Community rules	3.1	3.5	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2
Government's attitude	1.5	2.1	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8
Other organization and co-ordination	2.1	2.4	2	2.3	2.1	2.4	2.3
Aggregate index	2.5	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.7
Accountability of groups and members							
Leadership accountability to group	3.4	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5
Other members' accountability	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5
Accountability of stakeholders to leadership	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6
Aggregate index	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5

Contd...

TABLE 1 Rating of different attributes of organizational capacity and empowerment in sample SMCs

Indicators	Poor	Non-Poor	Female	Male	Targeted	Holistic	Total
Quality of group leaders							
Honesty	4	4.2	4.2	4	4	4.1	4.1
Dedication	4	4.1	4.1	3.9	3.9	4	4
Accountability	3.9	4	4	3.9	3.9	3.9	4
Trustworthiness	4	4.2	4.1	4	4	4	4.1
Skill/capacity	3.7	3.9	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.8
Aggregate index	3.9	4.1	4	3.9	3.9	4.1	4
Relations with other partner/support organizations							
Groups of other I/NGO	3	3.3	2.6	2.7	2.5	2.8	3.1
VDC	2.8	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.5	3.2	2.8
DDC	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.2	2	2.6	2.3
District line agency	2.4	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5
Financial institution	1.9	2.2	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.4	2
Group federation	1.9	2.2	2.5	1.9	1.9	2.2	2
Other groups	3.4	3.4	2.4	2.9	3	2.5	3.3
Aggregate index	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.6
Mutual trust and solidarity							
organizational capacity to work together and manage inter/intra group conflicts							
Demand for public facilities	3.3	4	3.6	3.3	3.4	3.4	4
Working together with other groups	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4
Manage inter-group conflict	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.5
Manage intra-group conflict	2.8	3.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	3.4
Aggregate index	3.2	3.7	3	2.9	2.9	2.9	3.6

Source: UNDP 2004c.

TABLE 2 Perceived impact of SM programmes on livelihood

SMCs	Poor	Non-Poor	Female	Male	Targeted	Holistic	All
Health	3.9	3.2	4	3.9	4	4	3
Education	4	4	4.1	4	4	4	4
Information	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Natural resources	3.8	4	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.8	4
Loan facility	4.1	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8
Improved technology	3.5	4.2	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	4.2
Market facility	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5
Public facilities	3.7	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.5
Training	3.4	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.7
Employability	3.7	3.5	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.8	3.5
Household income	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7
Dependency on landlord	1.9	3.7	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	3.7
Dependency on SMCs	2.5	1.8	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.5	1.9
Social evils	3.5	2.3	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.4	2.4
Mutual work	4	3.6	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.6
Mutual trust	4	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1
Economic status of marginalized	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.1
Socioeconomic status of women	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4	3.8	3.9
Aggregate index	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6

Source: UNDP 2004c.

TABLE 3 Improvement in social/economic/political status

Area	Poor	Non-poor	Female	Male	Targeted	Holistic	All
Social	3.5	3.6	0	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5
Family health	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.4
Knowledge/skill	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.7
Respect	2.9	3.1	3.1	3	2.9	3.1	3
Economic	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4
Employability	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3
Physical assets	2.9	3.1	3.1	3	3	3	3
Income	3.3	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4
Comparability in income	3.4	3.6	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5
Political strength	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.4
Civil power	3.9	4.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	4
Aggregate index	3.3	3.5	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.4

Source: UNDP 2004c.

TABLE 4 Level of satisfaction after programme intervention (percentage distribution by group)

Group	Little satisfaction	As before	Some satisfaction	Great satisfaction	Total
Poor	1.5	2.8	56.6	39.1	100
Non-poor	0.4	1.5	44.2	54	100
Female	0.8	0.8	51.2	47.1	100
Male	1	2.5	50.8	45.6	100
Targeted	1	2	52.3	44.6	100
Holistic	1	2.3	49.5	47.2	100
TOTAL	1	2.2	50.9	45.9	100

Source: UNDP 2004c.

TABLE 5 Comparison of SM models by average scores

SMCs	Process	Outcome	Livelihood impact	Aggregate
Targeted	3.2	4.1	3.3	3.7
Holistic	2.6	3.3	3.9	3.6
Technology-focused	4.0	4.3	3.5	4.0
I/NGO-implemented	2.7	4.3	2.4	3.3
Government-implemented	3.0	3.0	5.0	5.0
UNDP-supported	2.0	2.5	5.0	4.5
Women's empowerment	3.0	4.5	1.0	3.0
Partnership-focused	2.0	3.5	3.5	3.5
NGO/CBO-targeted	3.5	3.5	1.5	3.0
Financial	2.8	3.7	2.5	3.7
DFID-supported	3.0	3.0	5.0	4.0
Khageri/water user group	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0

Note: In this table, average scores are calculated on the basis of cluster analysis. A model classified as best is given a score of five and that classified as poorest a score of one.