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Chapter 1: Introduction

Poverty is still one of the major problems in the so-called Third World, thus poverty alleviation is one of the major targets for international and national aid agencies. However, in the World Bank 1990 World Development Report we can read that ‘A clear link between aid and the reduction of poverty has been hard to find’ (World Bank 1990: 128). Yet another problem is that, among scholars there is still little agreement on the definition of poverty, while ‘clarification of how poverty is defined is extremely important as different definitions of poverty (...) may lead to the identification of different individuals and groups as poor.’ (Laderchi et al. 2003: 2) Moreover, Baulch’s (2006: 87) reviews of aid (Cassen et al. 1986; Mosley et al. 1991; White and McGillivray 1995) pointed out, that ‘whatever method is used to measure aid’s poverty focus, it appears that a relatively small proportion of total aid is spent on projects or sectors specifically aimed at the poor’. Thus, despite the high proportion of aid that is disbursed to developing countries, probably no more than 15–20 per cent of aid is spent on activities, which are intended to benefit the poor directly (Baulch 2006). While previous methods of poverty assessment\(^1\) were widely criticized for their one-dimensional character, a wave of participatory methodologies (Chambers 1994a, 1994b) has brought researches to a point where more than just strictly economic indicators are taken into consideration when measuring poverty. Yet, the world-wide acknowledgment that poverty is a “largely time-specific, place-specific and people-specific” (Dittoh 2008) phenomenon made defining and measuring poverty even more problematic.

Ghana is a West-African country that was and still remains to be one of the main recipients of international aid. Ghana’s biggest concerns concentrate on poverty alleviation, especially in its Northern Region. During the past 30 years, Ghana has received billions of dollars of international aid from various actors and institutions (Devarajan et al. 2001), yet still large numbers of people do not have access to adequate levels of food, credit, transport, and basic social services, including health and education. Deep poverty remains a constant issue, especially in the North where the harsh climate conditions adversely affect economic activities, the population’s health,\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) Poverty was mostly defined in an economic context as a lack of income, or in terms of consumption.
and agriculture and thus stimulates migration and perpetual poverty. Despite the presence of many development agencies and organizations\(^2\), Northern Ghana remains the poorest part of the country, where eight out of every ten people are classified as poor\(^3\) (Bugri 2007, GPRP 2003). In 1995, World Bank published its “*Report about Participatory Poverty Assessment in Ghana*”. It was one of the first publications of the Bank based on large-scale participatory research. An effort was made to follow the new participatory trend and thus understand better the social, economic and political dynamics that perpetuated poverty, with the particular focus on including the poor.

Many development agencies are trying to adapt and implement in their projects “new” participatory approaches. Yet still, in many countries, qualitative monitoring and evaluation processes are largely missing from efforts to measure development outcomes and impacts. Because existing methodologies for evaluating development have several shortcomings, the outcome of such attempts is not straightforward. (Petesch 2001) In 2007, ICCO, Prisma, Woord en Daad in cooperation with University of Amsterdam (UvA) and University for Development Studies (UDS) in Northern Ghana decided to establish a Participatory Development Assessment (PDA) project\(^4\) which will be looking for new ways to measure the long term as well as the short term impact of past and current projects. Northern Ghana and Southern Burkina Faso\(^5\) were chosen as research areas. Based on the results of earlier studies\(^6\), the opportunity was taken to ask UvA AMIDST to further develop the methodology of evaluating development interventions. The new methodology is much more holistic and participatory. It is holistic in the sense that people are allowed to talk about everything that is important to them, about their ideas of what the development project is and what impact it has on their lives. And it is participatory, as people themselves are the ones doing the evaluation based on their own definition of poverty and wealth. During meetings with

\(^2\) International and national aid agencies, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and Faith-Based Organizations (FBOs) are engaged in regional development. Despite Islam domination, FBOs are mostly Catholic organizations. (Bugri, 2007)

\(^3\) Poverty measured by income (GPRP 2003: 15)

\(^4\) The project started in 2007 and is scheduled to last for 5 years (December 2007 – March 2012).

\(^5\) There are nine research areas within these two countries: three in which there is a long-term and ongoing presence of Dutch-sponsored NGOs; three areas in which there has been such NGO involvement in the past; and three areas with very few external interventions.

\(^6\) Such as the Sahel study (Zaal et al. 2003) and the Kenya study of AMIDSt (Andiema et al. 2007).
the people, the researchers, using the Bebbington approach\textsuperscript{7}, facilitate a local-level assessment of over twenty years of changes, of interventions, and of the impact of those interventions on different capabilities. Furthermore, AMIDST was asked to work closely together with Southern partners to share knowledge and experiences ‘with the South’ all throughout the process. (Dietz 2007)

This thesis will evaluate past development projects and estimate the impact of the best projects on five wealth categories in a participatory and holistic way. The successes and pitfalls of the new methodology implemented within the PDA research project will also be evaluated. In addition, the World Bank participatory poverty assessment from 1995 will be compared to the present perception of poverty of the people in Northern Ghana in order to find out whether, after thirteen years, there have been any significant changes and differences in Ghanaian people’s perception of their poverty. Moreover, this research recognizes and respects the articles 12\textsuperscript{8}, 13\textsuperscript{9} and 14\textsuperscript{10} of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), which stand for freedom of expression and thought of all children. Therefore, children’s perception of poverty is also included in this thesis. Furthermore, because most demands for poverty assessment come from policy-makers and institutions, and traditionally there is a bigger demand for

\textsuperscript{7} Livelihood analysis is based on six different ‘capitals’ and ‘capabilities’: natural, physical, human, economic, social-political, and cultural (Bebbington 1999, Dietz 2007).

\textsuperscript{8} \textbf{Article 12:}
1. States Parties shall assure to the child who is capable of forming his or her own views the right to express those views freely in all matters affecting the child, the views of the child being given due weight in accordance with the age and maturity of the child.
2. For this purpose, the child shall in particular be provided the opportunity to be heard in any judicial and administrative proceedings affecting the child, either directly, or through a representative or an appropriate body, in a manner consistent with the procedural rules of national law. (UN 1989)

\textsuperscript{9} \textbf{Article 13:}
1. The child shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of the child's choice.
2. The exercise of this right may be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall only be such as are provided by law and are necessary:
   (a) For respect of the rights or reputations of others; or
   (b) For the protection of national security or of public order (ordre public), or of public health or morals. (UN 1989)

\textsuperscript{10} \textbf{Article 14}
1. States Parties shall respect the right of the child to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.
2. States Parties shall respect the rights and duties of the parents and, when applicable, legal guardians, to provide direction to the child in the exercise of his or her right in a manner consistent with the evolving capacities of the child.
3. Freedom to manifest one’s religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. (UN 1989)
quantitative, rather than for qualitative research towards poverty assessment (Brannen 1992; Carvalho & White 1997), in this thesis an attempt will be made to suggest possible future indicators for quantitative assessments of poverty based on qualitative data.

The following thesis is divided into six chapters. The second chapter focuses on the core elements of research. Within the theoretical framework, participatory research and the concept of poverty are evaluated; included are further research question and operationalization of the main concepts. Chapter 3 broadly describes the research location and research methodology. Chapter 4 summarizes the main results of the research, while Chapter 5 discusses the research findings and compares them to the outcome of the PDA workshops and to the World Bank Report from 1995. Finally, conclusions and recommendations can be found in Chapter 6.
Chapter 2. The Core Elements of The Research

In this chapter the core elements of the research are discussed. Firstly, within theoretical framework participatory research and concept of poverty are evaluated. Further, research question and sub-questions can be found. Finally, main concepts used in this research are being discussed.

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Participatory Research

“The “participatory” approach uses multiple, subjective indicators of poverty status that emerge out of the experience of the poor, collected through participatory techniques.” (Moser 1998: 2). In 1970, Paolo Freire published a book called “Pedagogy of the oppressed”, in which he argues that a Cultural Revolution can take place only through conscientization of the society and this can happen only through open dialogue, which generates critical thought and action. The problem that Freire raised was the fact that conscientization does not come easily for the “oppressed”: poor and exploited people, as they are a part of the “culture of silence” which means that they are not even aware of the fact that they do not have a voice. Because understanding without action does not bring any changes, scholars inspired by Freire started to focus more on the development of critical consciousness among the participants which would allow them to take action. The role of science thus had changed. It has been acknowledged that the research process should really contribute to social transformation via empowerment and conscientization of the “oppressed” that are the object of the research. The basics of empowerment can follow from participatory research, as it links personal history with political context through critical reflexion and action (Freire 1970).

11 Conscientization is the process of learning to perceive social, political and economic contradictions, and act. (Freire 1970).
The first attempts of participatory research (PR), however, were not very successful. Researchers were accused of performing “development tourism” rather than PR. Usually, participation was limited to passive observations of the community and the research was often biased\(^\text{12}\). In response to the biased perception derived from “development tourism” in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Robert Chambers proposed a new approach, which he named Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA). RRA focused on quick learning about local people and conditions using an essentially extractive approach by a researcher. Yet, it was still not enough, because the main aim of participatory research, in general, is to acquire indigenous people’s knowledge. Therefore, RRA evolved to PRA – Participatory Rural Appraisal. PRA focuses more on the empowerment of locals, as it is the researcher who is the outsider and who is learning from them and they \textit{all together} are trying to come up with a sustainable plan for future actions. Unfortunately, PRA is not a risk/bias-free method either. One of the main problems connected with PRA, as well as RRA, is its “rapidity”: in order to obtain the necessary information, up-to-seven-days seminars are usually organized by the research teams. During these workshops, representatives of all major social-cultural categories of the communities should participate. Yet, the question remains: who actually participates and whose knowledge is being accessed? The short-term character of these techniques forms one of the constraints, as it is hard to build trust and proper cooperation between the locals and the researcher within just a few days. Moreover, as an outsider, the researcher is unable to find out who actually participates in the research and – more importantly - why they were chosen to participate? What are the power-structures within the village? Who was excluded and why? And who excluded him/herself? Research methods had to be transformed in order to make another step forward in eliminating the weaknesses of PRA, therefore Participatory Action Research (PAR) emerged. PAR is a more anthropological approach, understood as a long-term process of enabling people to present, share and analyze their knowledge from the very beginning of the project. Local people should actively participate during all stages of the project; starting from the identification of the problem and the designing of a project, through the monitoring of the changes, and finishing with the final evaluation. Participation is no longer an obligation, but it is a right of all citizens with strengthening social rights and

\(^{12}\text{The most frequently mentioned includes the fact that villages on the real peripheries were not visited, but places with ongoing projects were favored; moreover, neither representative samples of respondents, nor the seasonality were taken into consideration.}\)
empowerment as its main aims. PAR is seen as the most “participatory” approach that
development-related research can be, however it requires a long-term commitment. That
is the main reason why not PAR, but still PRA stays the most frequently used method of
participatory research (Chambers 1994a, Chambers 1994b, Mosse 1994, Richards 1995,

As mentioned above, participatory research offers a promising methodology and is a
very popular tool among scholars. However, it is not a perfect tool for collecting
comparable data. Many constructive critiques have already emerged during the
evolution process of the participatory approach. Despite the considerable progress,
today’s methods and techniques are still not perfect. The most popular critique of
participatory research says that participation only remains a buzzword, usually adopted
in projects only to create an illusion of consultation. (Chambers 1997, Cornwall 2005).
Moreover, according to Cooke and Kothari (2001), participation even though well-
intentioned and well-executed, is not necessarily capable of delivering its key
principles: equality, sustainability and empowerment to the participants, and sometimes
achieves the opposite by supporting the local power-structures and development of local
elites. Some other critiques (Cornwall 2002) are tracing weaknesses in methodology,
techniques and issues such as reflexivity and validity of the decision-making process
about who is involved in participatory development and research and who is not.
Following Mosse (1995), Cornwall is arguing that the “community’s needs and wants”
(Cornwall 2002: 54) might be dominated by the more powerful members of that
community, or by other external actors. The question about “representativeness and
accountability of ‘participatory’ processes” (Cornwall 2002: 55) thus remains hard to
answer.

Some scholars argue (Barron 2000, Grover 2004, Christensen 2000), that truly honest
participatory research requires everyone’s involvement. Nevertheless, most
participatory researches have been basically undertaken with adults and relatively few
of them involved children. According to Article 1 of United Nation Convention on the
Rights of the Child (UN CRC), “a child means every human being below the age of
eighteen years unless under the law applicable to the child, majority is attained
earlier.” (UN 1989) A number of organizations have been already highlighting the
concerns that children are facing difficulties “in making their own claims for
recognition of rights such as those set down in the UN CR).” (Watson 2006: 229)
Thanks to the worldwide shift towards full participation, and international lobbying, growing importance and recognition of Children’s Rights, articles 12, 13 and 14 of the UN CRC, which stand for freedom of expression and thought of all children, finally have been well emphasized. Few additional factors helped in highlighting the importance of a proper investigation of children’s problems. First, children constitute a large proportion of the population in developing countries. Secondly, children are the most vulnerable group among the poor, as their lives usually depend on the resources of their parents. Moreover, today’s children are tomorrow’s adults, so the quality of their present life will have an impact on their future life condition in terms of health, skills, future job and social status. Therefore, it has been suggested that children should contribute more actively to the research process by taking their points of view into consideration more seriously as well as to allow them to hear themselves (Qvortrup 1990, Barron 2000, Grover 2004, Harpham 2005, Watson 2006).

Questions about and critiques of participatory approaches to sustainable development seem more than justified, since fulfilling the key promises raised by participatory research and achieving effective changes are difficult tasks for both researchers and participants. A careful critique, however, does not need to lead to rejection of the participatory approach, but should focus more on the improvement of recent methodology. That is why, in order to understand the value of a project and to do things better in the future, regular monitoring and evaluation and participatory impact research are so important (Rocheleau 1994, Rubin 1995, Cook and Kothari 2001, Dietz 2007, Munce 2005). However, while the potential of participatory models is broadly recognized, action on the ground is often very limited. Therefore, the development of a new promising methodology by the PDA research project contributes to the discussion over measurement of the impact of past development projects (Dietz 2007). Such participatory and holistic approach described and explained in more detail in the methodology section in the Chapter 3, has also been adopted in this research.

13 “In many countries, qualitative monitoring and evaluation processes are largely missing from efforts to measure development outcomes and impacts” (Petesch 2001: 31)
Poverty

Nowadays, there is a worldwide agreement on poverty reduction as a prior goal of development policies, but still there is little agreement on a definition of poverty. “Clarification of how poverty is defined is extremely important as different definitions of poverty imply the use of different indicators for measurement; they may lead to the identification of different individuals and groups as poor and require different policy solutions for poverty reduction” (Laderchi et al. 2003: 2). For many years poverty was defined in an economic context as a lack of income, or in terms of consumption (Rowntree 1901, Olson-Lanjouw 1997). Such one-dimensional understanding of poverty was a helpful assumption in measuring the relationship between economic growth and poverty reduction. That approach has also been used by international organizations and governments, in order to construct poverty lines and calculate poverty rates which afterwards might be used to “make comparisons across groups and to monitor changes in poverty over time in order to inform policy making” (Olson-Lanjouw 1997: 2).

Nevertheless, indisputably poverty is not one-dimensional, but it is a multi-dimension phenomenon. At the beginning of the 1990s, there was a shift observed towards subjective/participatory understanding of poverty more in terms of “insufficiency” rather than just in straightforward income/consumption terms. The “old” poverty concept was extended by adding to it such facts as: personal assets, vulnerability, marginalization, lack of access to knowledge and resources, people’s dignity and freedom, health, social status, religion (Sen 1981, Baulch 1996), or health, education and environmental issues (WB 2002). Furthermore, Dietz (in Dittoh 2008) pointed out, that poverty can be also understood as “a lack of capability to lead a decent life, as defined by the cultural norms of a particular society”. Therefore, poverty is not only an extremely complex and dynamic concept, but it is also “largely time-specific, place-specific and people-specific” (Dittoh 2008). Consequently, defining and measuring poverty became even more problematic.

---

14 To be precise it is a minimal level of utility determined by level of consumption which cannot be reached.
15 Such as UN, UNDP, WB, and the indicators such as HDI, HPI-1, HPI-2, etc.
16 Cannot afford enough food, adequate shelter, good health, schooling, security, to avoid abuse, etc. (Elbers 2007).
Another problem with defining and measuring poverty is the fact that scholars distinguish two main traditions of poverty analysis: quantitative and qualitative:

“The quantitative approach to poverty measurement and analysis is defined as one that typically uses random sample surveys and structured interviews to collect data – mainly, quantifiable data – and analyzes it using statistical techniques. By contrast, the qualitative approach is defined as one that typically uses purposive sampling and semi-structured or interactive interviews to collect data – mainly, data relating to people’s judgments, attitudes, preferences, priorities, and/or perceptions about a subject – and analyzes it through sociological or anthropological research techniques.” (Canvaro and White 1997)

Within the two traditions, there are some more popular approaches of how to define and measure poverty, such as: monetary approach, capability approach, social exclusion approach, or participatory approach (Laderchi et al. 2003). While quantitative approaches (i.e monetary approach) have been dominant, especially in policy-making circles, the shift in the development agenda and attempts to really understand the poor in their complexity, brought an increase in the use of qualitative approaches17. What is more, the supporters of the quantitative approach also acknowledged that poverty is not only related to economic growth and income distribution, but also to a wide set of other non-quantitative indicators18, such as those mentioned in the previous paragraph. (Bourguignon 2003, Sahn 2003) Therefore, there have been increasing attempts at integrating the two approaches.

The lesson learned thus far about the possible integration of the two approaches says, that what was traditionally identified as the strengths of qualitative methods should be incorporated into quantitative poverty measurement. One way to do that is to use the qualitative methods first. Thanks to this, perception and understanding of poverty within people from a particular geographical area would be analyzed and would be used as a guide to the design of a quantitative, large-scale survey (Barrett 2001, Kanbur 2001, Sahn 2001). Qualitative methods have several advantages, such as more in-depth understanding of the fact why people are poor, or how they move in and out from poverty, but we should not forget about pitfalls of the participatory approach that were mentioned in the previous section. Particularly scholars should take into consideration the problem related to internal social structures and power relation within researched

17 “Many bilateral and multilateral agencies now routinely commission studies in this tradition.” (Kanbur 2001)
18 “The "participatory" approach uses multiple, subjective indicators of poverty status that emerge out of the experience of the poor, collected through participatory techniques.” (Moser 1998: 2).
communities. Such powers might lead to the exclusion of certain people by members of their own community. Usually the excluded groups consist of the very poor and the poor, thus those most needy people still remain invisible and unheard. Finally, poverty assessment is not always consequential – some researches distinguish only three wealth groups in their analysis, such as rich, average and poor; while other distinguish four or five groups – i.e. adding very poor and disabled-people groups. Such inconsistency is also a consequence of a lack of one definition of the concept.

Some scholars argue that nobody knows poverty better than the poor themselves (Dittoh 2008: 3). This is such an obvious statement, yet it seems that donor-agencies still have a tendency to exclude the real “experts”, meaning the poor themselves, from the discussion about poverty-measurement. As a consequence of such attitude, a fair picture of poverty is still hard to assess. It can be argued that the definition and a right methodology are two major challenges. Thus, scholars should reach agreement over the definition and also find a way to reach the excluded groups. Unfortunately, in practice, this is very hard to execute (Lund et al. 2008, Andiema et al. 2007).

2.2 Research Question and Sub-questions

New measurement standards and participatory techniques have several advantages, nevertheless the major problem, how to measure non-quantitative indicators, remains unsolved. The main project of the PDA used new holistic and participatory M&E methods. Yet, during the PDA workshops the local elites were broadly represented. The question thus appeared: whether it is possible that during less formal student-community meeting also representatives of other wealth classes will participate? What is the rule and pattern of those who decide who will take part in such meetings? Whether power relations and elite domination exist in every area of social life in the villages? And whether because of that, development projects and further evaluations are also targeted at certain people? Whether the impact touches only certain groups of people? Whether a truly participatory research is actually possible? And what can be

---

19 Such as mentioned in the section before: Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA), Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) or Participatory Action Research (PAR) and others.
done, in order to translate the outcome of a participatory research into the language of policymakers?

**Research Questions:**

Do the results of the PDA Project at the level of North-West Langbensi reflect the opinions of people at village level if longer and more detailed research at that level takes place?

**Sub-Questions:**

1. What is the impact of the best projects on five wealth categories in the participating communities?
   a) What are the characteristics of five wealth groups: very rich, rich, not poor/not rich, poor and very poor?
   b) What kind of development projects are present in the area and what are the five best projects?
   c) What is the impact of the five best development projects on five wealth groups?

2. Are the members of particular groups of the society sharing the same views about poverty and the impact of development interventions?
   a) What are the main conclusions after PRA workshops?
   b) What are the differences/similarities between lists of projects made during PDA workshops and focus group discussions?
   c) What are the differences/similarities in the perception about the poverty assessment between PDA research, this research and the WB PPA Report?
   d) What are the poverty dynamics in the region?

3. What are the pros and cons of the new methodology?
   a) What is the possible bias?
   b) What are the reasons for possible bias?
   c) Who is included and who is excluded from participating in development projects and the PRA workshops?
   d) Who constitute the main excluded group?
e) What are other problems with the participatory impact research?

f) What does it mean for the methodology and what can be done in order to improve it in the future?

2.3 Operationalization

In my research the following definitions of concepts will be used for my operationalization.

**Poverty**

Indisputably, poverty is a complex and dynamic concept. Moreover, it is also “largely time-specific, place-specific and people-specific” (Dittoh 2008). Therefore, participants were asked to characterize five wealth groups: very rich, rich, not poor/not rich (NP/NR), poor and very poor. Afterwards, the answers were divided into categories as shown in Table 1. As a result, definition of the particular wealth groups used in this research reflects local conceptions of poverty and it is broadly discussed in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

**Table 1. Categories of the poverty concept**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Group</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Rich</td>
<td>Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Poor/Not Rich</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eating habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ceremonies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Position in the society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State of mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation

Participation was broadly discussed in the theoretical framework section above, but it should be highlighted that this thesis agrees with statement made by Obure (2008) that the participation of stakeholders should be accompanied by advocacy for underprivileged groups in society, as the “aim of participatory development is to increase the involvement of socially and economically marginalized people in decision-making over their own lives.” (Guijt 1998: 1; in Cook and Kothari 2001). Therefore, the inclusion of other members of the communities, who were not participating during the PDA workshops, would help me to verify how well the new methodology employed by the PDA project in this stage of evaluation was able to cover the feelings and impressions of the community (as a whole) about previous development projects and poverty assessment. Table 2 shows in details how the concept of participation will be analyzed in this thesis.
Table 2. Operationalization of participation concept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>Participation in development projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sense of integrity</td>
<td>Project Participatory Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Voices and demands of the community properly evaluated and adapted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Do members of the community want to be a part of the project?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Do the community actively participate in the projects?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Representativeness</td>
<td>Does the participation in development projects as well as in PRA workshops make the community participants feel more empowered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Community

Community will be defined as: “all people living in the area of the research”. It will be assumed that community is not one homogenous group of people, but it is diverse with differences in religion, class, ethnicity, gender and age.

Power Relations

This research recognizes that there are power relations within every social system: a society/community; moreover “[t]hey are multiple; they have different forms, they can be in play in family relations, or within an institution, or an administration - or between
a dominating and a dominated class” (Foucault 1988: 38). Power refers to those aspects that might be translated as “influence”, “making a difference” or “having an effect”. What is more, the actions of one person affect the thoughts or actions of another person. Therefore, people “in power” could be characterized as those who are the dominant ones, strong and in control. Power might also be connected to wealth, as lack of certain consumption items, which affect social participation. Therefore, it is easier for rich people to take advantage from the unequal distribution of power by lobbying and influencing the decision-making processes, rather than the poor. Consequently, such behavior contributes to the perpetuation of existing inequalities (Mansuri et al. 2004, Gouch et al. 2006).

**Development Project**

For the purpose of this research, ‘development project’ was defined very loosely. Participants were allowed to include all mentioned activities – including their own initiatives – that improved/worsened the situation in their community. The flexibility in understanding “a development project” makes it difficult to establish boundaries between development project and non-project. Yet, apart from just a few truly individual initiatives\(^{20}\), development projects can be defined as all interventions which were organized on a higher than household level.

**Impact**

Impact assessment aims at reaching the targeted results of a development project, as well as the information about the way in which the project was started and implemented. (Andiema et al. 2007). As a response to efforts made to measure development outcomes and impacts, participatory monitoring and evaluation (M&E) techniques can be implemented. Nowadays, participatory M&E is an exercise, that systematically and objectively measures development outcomes and impact. Participatory M&E is trying to answer specific questions such as: whether underlying

---

\(^{20}\) Such as introduction of a certain crop in a village by one person who brought it from a different country, or buying NHI for people in the village by a candidate for a MP, as this was only an element of the political campaign.
theories and assumptions used in development programme were valid, what worked and what did not work and why. By encouraging the participation of stakeholders, it is possible to analyze past interventions together with the involved society, and therefore, use local advices and experience when designing future projects (WB OED 1999, Dietz 2007, Petesch 2001).

2.4 Conclusion of Chapter 2

From the 1970s onwards, scholars inspired by Freire started to focus more on the development of critical consciousness among the participants of their studies, since it was discovered that the basics of empowerment can follow from participation in a research process. Across years, the participatory research with its promising methodology became more and more recognized and accepted among scholars. Nevertheless, it is not a perfect tool yet. Many critiques of participatory research emerged, such as: participation is just a buzzword, that only creates an illusion of consultation, or that participation even when well-intentioned and well-executed, is not necessarily capable of delivering to the participants its key principles, such as: equality, sustainability and empowerment, and sometimes achieves the opposite by supporting the local power-structures and development of local elites. Some other scholars argue that participatory researches have been basically undertaken with adults and relatively few of them involved children. Questions about and critiques of participatory approaches to sustainable development seem more than justified. A careful critique, however, should not lead to rejection of the participatory approach, but should focus more on the improvement of recent methodologies. While the potential of participatory models is broadly recognized, action on the ground is often very limited. Therefore, the PDA research project, which aims at development of a new participatory and holistic methodology for evaluating development interventions, might be an initiative that will succeed in finding a new way to measure the impact of past development projects.

The proper and objective methodology that will measure the impact of past development projects is thus important, as it can help to understand the value of a project and do things better in the future. The well-designed development interventions should contribute directly or indirectly to the improvement of the situation in the area, and will hence result in poverty reduction. A proper methodology, however, is not the
only challenge. Clarification of how poverty is defined is also extremely important. For many years poverty was defined in an economic context as a lack of income, or in terms of consumption, but at the beginning of the 1990s, a shift was observed towards subjective/participatory understanding of poverty more in terms of “insufficiency” rather than just in straightforward income/consumption terms. Still though, scholars distinguish two main traditions of poverty analysis: quantitative and qualitative, and apart from increasing attempts to integrate the two approaches, there is still an ongoing debate how it should be done. There is a world-wide acknowledgment that poverty is a “largely time-specific, place-specific and people-specific” (Dittoh 2008) phenomenon. However, defining and measuring it became very problematic. Some scholars argue, that nobody knows poverty better than the poor themselves, yet there is still a tendency to exclude the poor (or the society itself excludes them\textsuperscript{21}) from the discussion about poverty-measurement. Moreover, different definitions of poverty imply the use of different indicators for measurement and consequently may lead to the identification of different individuals and groups as poor. This also influences different policy solutions for poverty reduction. As a consequences of such attitudes a fair picture of poverty is still hard to get.

All in all, it can be argued that the definition and a right methodology are two major challenges in assessing poverty. Thus, scholars should reach agreement over the definition and also find a method to reach the excluded groups. This research wants to contribute to this discussion by trying to find answers for questions such as: who decide who will take part in participatory research meetings? Whether power relation and elite domination exists and whether because of that, development projects and further evaluations are also targeted at certain people? Whether the impact touches only certain groups of people? Whether a truly participatory research is actually possible? And what can be done, in order to translate the outcome of a participatory research into the language of policymakers? However, before presenting the outcome of the research, Chapter 3 will provide the information about the geographical context and methodology used during the process.

\textsuperscript{21} See the critique of participatory approach paragraph above.
Chapter 3. Description of Study Area and Method of Research

This chapter intends to provide the context and methodology used in this research. It begins with a broader description of Northern Ghana, to further narrow the focus to East Mamprusi District and three rural villages where the research was conducted. The next section focus on the methodology implemented in this research. It starts with explanation of data collection methods, while the following sections explain the process of data collection, target population, unit of analysis, and data analysis procedure. The chapter concludes with a statement of ethics as well as with the acknowledgment of possible limitations of the study.

3.1 Background of the research location

North Ghana

The Northern Region of Ghana occupies an area of about 70,383 square kilometers and is the largest region in Ghana in terms of land area. The region is divided into thirteen districts, which are governed by District Assemblies. The population is 1,820,806 and represents 9.6 per cent of the country’s population. North Ghana has a rather low population density, which varies widely across the region.

North Ghana can be described as “a relatively flat stretch of savannah-woodland interspersed with grass” (Benneh&Dickson 1970 quoted in Kasanga 1995: 22). It is characterized by drought-resistant trees, such as the acacia, baobab, shea nut, locust (known locally as “dawadawa”), mango, and neem. (ODI, 1998/9).

The climate of the region is relatively dry, with a single rainy season that begins in May and ends in October. The dry season starts in November and ends in March/April. As an effect of poor soils and low rainfall, agricultural production is limited to staple food such as rice, yam, maize and millet. Food insecurity persists in northern Ghana.

---

22 The majority of information in this section was taken from http://www.ghanadistricts.com/region/?r=6&sa=120 – access 9 March 2009 http://www.ghana.co.uk/history/history/religion.htm, access online 10 March 2009.
particularly during the lean season from March to September. Despite those difficulties, the majority (71%) of the productive age group consists of peasant farmers and the agricultural sector is the key employer in the region. (GSS, 2005).

There are two dominant religions in the North: Christianity and Islam. Islam was introduced in the North by pre-colonial Trans-Saharan traders. It remains the predominant religion in the region and influenced cultural, social and traditional spheres of life in the North. The “success” of Islam might be explained by the fact that some principles of Islam were similar to people’s traditional beliefs\(^\text{23}\). The presence of Islam also influenced development of the region. It has been argued that because of the strong position of Islam, children were more likely to attend Koranic schools rather than those led by Catholics. Thus, literacy development provided by the Christian missionaries was rather limited. This consequently led to a lower education level in the region in comparison to the south of the country. This gap is still very visible, but across years there have been other factors, described below, that also caused such differences. Nevertheless, today’s domination of Islam and Christianity, does not mean that Ghanaians have totally abandoned their traditions. It has been said that in times of real crisis, people still practice their traditional rituals no matter whether they are Christians or Muslims.

The Northern Region consists of many ethnic groups, which all together speak over 30 local dialects. In the past, “[the nature of social and power relations among the ethnic groups [...] has been a major source of conflicts” (Kusimi, et al. 2006: 210-211). However, over the years cultural and ethnic divisions have made members of society to accept each other, so nowadays everyone lives in relative peace and harmony.

Therefore, it is not a complex interplay between ethnic and religious groups that make Northern Ghana a “problem region” (Webber 1996). It is a deep poverty, which remains a constant issue in the North. The harsh climate condition adversely affects economic activity, people’s health and agriculture of the region and thus stimulating migration and poverty. Northern Ghana had been caught in the poverty trap already back in the colonial period. During British rule, the northern regions were marginalized

\[^{23}\text{Polygamy, existence of secret societies, certain ceremonies and practices that were rooted in traditional practices are also allowed by Islam.}\]
and remained underdeveloped and undereducated, as the British wanted to keep those regions as a cheap ‘labor reserve’. By preventing investments and implementation of certain policies\textsuperscript{24} the colonial regimes made sure that the Northern Territories remained underdeveloped (Plange 1979, Shepherd 2004). Ever since, the gap between North and South has been so deep that despite the presence of many development agencies and organizations\textsuperscript{25}, Northern Ghana remains the poorest part of the country, where eight out of every ten people are classified as poor\textsuperscript{26}. (GPRP 2003). Involvement in international programmes, such as the Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy I and II\textsuperscript{27}, UN Millennium Campaign or Millennium Challenge Account\textsuperscript{28}; as well as national programmes, such as the Livelihoods Empowerment Against Poverty\textsuperscript{29} programme, the government’s decentralization programme, Educational Reform Programme or National Health Insurance Scheme\textsuperscript{30} (GPRS II 2005: 3) shows that Ghana’s concern about poverty alleviation is a top priority in the policy agenda. Yet, still large numbers of people do not have access to adequate levels of food, credit, transport, and basic social services, including health and education, which in combination with poor infrastructure would make the road towards poverty reduction long and bumpy, especially for the Northern regions (Kusimi, \textit{et al.} 2006: 210-211, Lund \textit{et al.} 2008, GPRS II 2005).

\textbf{East Mamprusi District}

East Mamprusi is one of the 18 districts of the Northern Region with its capital in Gambaga. The current population has been estimated as 180,877 people (with women constituting 51\% of this figure) (http://www.ghanadistricts.com/region/?r=6&sa=120 – access 9 March 2009). Around 39\% of the district population is in the age group between 0-14 years, another 41\% in the age group of 15-44 years, and 20\% in age group 45-60 and above.\textsuperscript{31} Settlement patterns are largely dispersed, with concentration in five

\textsuperscript{24} Such as i.e. restricted educational development and other missionary activities in the North (Thomas, 1974)
\textsuperscript{25} International, national aid agencies, NGOs and FBOs are engaged in regional development. Despite Islam domination FBOs are mostly catholic organizations. (Bugri, 2007)
\textsuperscript{26} Poverty measure by income (GPRP 2003: 15)
\textsuperscript{27} Ghana Poverty Reduction Strategy II aimed at making Ghana a medium-income country by 2015
\textsuperscript{28} Millennium Challenge Account financed by the United States Government made funds available for reducing poverty
\textsuperscript{29} Livelihoods Empowerment Against Poverty programme gives cash handouts to the extremely poor
\textsuperscript{30} National Health Insurance Scheme “guarantee every Ghanaian access to a professional health care from “cradle to grave” at affordable cost” (GPRS II 2005: 3)
\textsuperscript{31} In a socio-economic study of the Onchocerciasis-freed zones in Ghana, a sample survey was carried out in the District by the National Onchocerciasis secretariat in 1997. It should be taken into consideration
urban settlements: Nalerigu, Gambaga, Langbensi, Nakpanduri, and Bunkprugu. The majority of the people are Muslims, yet there is a number of Christians and Traditional Religion worshipers as well (GSS 2005). The major ethnic group in the District is the Mamprusi who speak Mampruli. Other ethnic groups found in the region are Bimobas, Konkombas, Frafra, Gonja, Mossi, Talensi, Hausa, Fulani and Chokosi, as well as single representatives of other ethnic groups.

Agriculture and livestock rearing is the main occupation of the adult population in the District. As a result of migrations, deep poverty and declining soil fertility, in the lean season families are usually facing food shortages. Because men were no longer able to provide enough nutrition to feed their families only from the farm outcome, women had to start contributing to the household economy as well. Small-scale business activities, such as production of shea butter, pito, fish, carving and weaving of traditional textile and baskets are carried out mostly by women. As a result of being a member of the family who also brings money home, the status of women has changed. Today, women became more empowered and have more to say in decision-making processes that affect the wellbeing of their family and their community, compared to the recent past. Still though, lack of proper infrastructure and services negatively influences the district’s economy and development.

The scattered nature of settlement patterns in some parts of the District makes accessibility to the major social and economic infrastructure very difficult. Most of the roads linking such places are only footpaths or roads in very bad conditions. The major road across the District linking Walewale with Nalerigu is motorable throughout the year, yet it needs to be repaired after every rainy season.

East Mamprusi District has also limited access to safe drinking water. Out of the 143 communities almost a half (48.8%) of all settlements has no access to potable water, and most of the hand-dug wells are not deep enough to provide water throughout the year. Consequently, people drink from unprotected sources, which causes the increase of

---

a time lapse and the sample size (350 households), so the figures may not be the exact current situation of the age distribution but may reflect the general trend.
water-borne diseases\textsuperscript{32}. (http://www.ghanadistricts.com/region/?r=6&sa=120 – access 9 March 2009).

Health care is limited to one hospital in Nalerigu, three health centers and three health posts. Presently, only about 7,000 people benefit from the National Health Insurance Scheme in the District. Generally, the major problems related to the health care are: the shortage of qualified personnel, weak financial base and difficult access to health facilities from remote communities in the district. (http://www.ghanadistricts.com/region/?r=6&sa=120 – access 9 March 2009; GPRS II 2005).

In terms of education, in total, there are 103\textsuperscript{33} established Basic Schools in the District. There is also one Senior Secondary School and one Vocational institution. Total enrollment rate of all school-age children is 69\% and is increasing throughout the years. Nowadays 61\% of girls in school age attend school, yet the dropout rate is still higher for girls (13.5\%) than for boys (6.37\%), which results in a higher illiteracy rate for women. There are only 372 teachers in the District, which means that pupil-teacher ratio is 55:1. It results in overcrowded classrooms, which consequently negatively influences the quality of education. What is more, the quality of existing facilities is questionable. In many schools there is a lack of basic equipment, like chairs, desks or teaching and learning materials; and many of the buildings need to be entirely renovated (http://www.ghanadistricts.com/region/?r=6&sa=120 – access 9 March 2009; GPRS II 2005).

The above problems, together with low educational levels and high fertility rates, also have negative impacts on the general well being and development of the district. Therefore, East Mamprusi District is considered as an area of the country where mass poverty exists, and where household real incomes are too low to satisfy people’s basic needs.

\textsuperscript{32} Water borne diseases such as diarrhea, bilharzias, dysentery and cholera.
\textsuperscript{33} Currently there are 24 Pre schools established, 64 primary schools, 15 Junior Secondary Schools.
Overview of rural research communities

During the PDA workshop, villages were divided according to their geographical position for Langbens Central, North-East, North-West and South. The villages, which had been chosen to be included in my research also represent such division. The research thus was conducted in three villages: Wundua, Kasape and Gbangu. The village of Wundua represents the South of the District, Kasape represents North-West and Gbangu represents North-East of the District. In addition, ethnic characteristics of those villages were taken into consideration Pictures 1 and 2 show the geographical position of the villages, while Table 3 briefly summarizes the communities.

Picture 1. Map of Ghana

![Map of Ghana](Source: www.mapsofworld.com access online 27.07.2009. Own edit.)

Picture 2. Geographical position of researched communities


34 Research with adult participants was not conducted in Langbens Central, as the town is one of the biggest settlements in the District, as well all it is mixed in terms of ethnicity. It was assumed that it would be better to focus on smaller settlements. Moreover, the comparative analysis of a village representing the group “Langbens Central” developed during PDA workshops was made by Lahai (2009).
Table 3. Summary of researched communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Position</th>
<th>Distance to Langbensi</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Dominant ethnic group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>10 km</td>
<td>Wundua</td>
<td>3850</td>
<td>Mossi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West</td>
<td>4 km</td>
<td>Kasape</td>
<td>2118</td>
<td>Gonja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East</td>
<td>13 km</td>
<td>Gbangu</td>
<td>2845</td>
<td>Mamprusi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Fieldwork Data.

Wundua is a village located 10 km south from Langbens. The majority of people living there are Mossi from south Burkina Faso, who migrated many years ago to look for more fertile grounds. However, the land belongs to the Mampruis, who were the first people in the area. Following traditional land ownership law, the first who settle in a place are the ones who own and rule the land. Therefore, apart from strong superiority in numbers of the Mossi in the village - the chief is a Mamprusi. Wundua is also regarded as a village with a very strong Muslim tradition – almost all inhabitants are practicing Islam, with only 14 Christians and 4 traditional believers among 3,850 inhabitants. Mossi are also known from the fact that they continue the Female Genital Mutilation practices. Apart from a strong presence of Islam, women in the village seem to be highly empowered. They speak freely during community gatherings and their opinions are respected. Both men and women admit that this change is very visible, as many years ago, women were not even allowed during such meetings. Therefore, Wundua can be a good example of a village where the status of women has changed.

A strong position of women was also visible in the second visited community - Kasape. Kasape is a small village located 4 kilometers north-west from Langbens, with a population of 2,118. A majority of the people are farmers from the Gonja ethnic group. There is no dominant religion – both Islam and Christianity are present, with few cases of traditional believers. Kasape can be considered as a rather poor village. There is one primary school and only two boreholes. The literacy level is low, especially among women. Kasape is a village with limited presence of development activities.
Gbangu - the third visited village - is a strictly Mamprusi settlement. It is located on the hill about 3 km from the main road, 13 kilometers north-east from Langbensí. The population is estimated to be 2,845 and Islam is the dominant religion. Gbangu has two schools - a primary school and a Junior Secondary School, few boreholes, a small clinic, a corn mill and a warehouse. Yet again, the literacy level is rather low, especially among women. The major occupation of people is farming, with few small-scale business activities, carried out mostly by women.

Even though those three communities seem similar, yet they are remarkably different in terms of size, population characteristics and features. These differences and other characteristics were hoped to represent different perceptions of poverty and community development.

### 3.2 Methodology

**Data Collection Methods**

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is regarded as the most “participatory” approach that development-related research can be, but it requires a long-term anthropological commitment. Regarding the fact that my time for data collection was limited, implementing PAR was not possible. Apart from many critics of participatory research mentioned in the theoretical framework section in Chapter 2 in this thesis, the participatory and holistic methodology developed during PDA workshops has been adopted in this research. Such participatory and holistic approach represents an interesting mix of constructivism\(^{35}\), post-positivism\(^{36}\) and critical theory\(^{37}\) (Crotty 1998, Kane et al. 2001). Therefore, it was still regarded as the best available methodology for the purpose of this research.

---

\(^{35}\) Constructivism is an epistemology, which holds that meaning is created through the interaction between subject and object.(Crotty 1998).

\(^{36}\) Post-positivism believes that human knowledge is not based on unchallengeable, rock-solid foundations, but it is conjectural.(Crotty 1998).

\(^{37}\) Critical Theory acknowledges that the explicit role of science is to contribute to social transformation, as well as that the research process should empower and conscientization.(Crotty 1998).
The data collection process was based on two main PRA methods: focus groups and “seed technique” (PRA Manual, nd). Yet some information included in this research was taken from non-formal or semi-formal interviews or loose conversations with the villagers and PAS-L workers after the workshops.

In addition, in every village, a representative of every focus group was given a camera and they were asked to capture on pictures what was discussed during our meetings. Therefore, the visualization of wealth groups, or development projects, or things that they found relevant to the discussed topics were hoped to be presented. Unfortunately, because of technical problems that were caused by photo-cameras many pictures were spoiled, thus a proper analysis of all pictures was not possible. Nevertheless, the pictures that were possible to develop, are used in this thesis in the further sections.

**Focus Groups**

During the data collecting process, six focus group sessions were carried out with community representatives, and three with the youth from Junior High Schools. I spent two days in each of the three research communities. During that time, two focus groups took place: the first day meeting the male group, and the female group the following day. The first exercise engaged all participants. They were asked to make a list of development projects in the village and rank the five best according to their subjective feelings. After this exercise, participants were divided into age groups: young(er) and old(er). They were to decide themselves to which group they belong. In such subgroups, the following exercises were performed. It started with the discussion and characteristics of five wealth groups in the village, so whom they considered as very rich, rich, not poor/not rich, poor and very poor. Furthermore, participants were asked to estimate the impact of the five best projects on five wealth categories, as well as indicate which group of wealth dominates in the village by using the so-called seed technique method.

---

38 One man from a Male focus group and one woman from the female focus group in every village were asked to accomplish this extra assignment.

39 Photo-cameras that were available in the area were very defective and caused many problems especially with rewinding the finished films. Consequently, films were exposed and many pictures were impossible to retrieve.
The meetings were also held in three Junior Secondary Schools, with pupils from the third (last) class, both boys and girls. Pupils from the third grade should be at least 12 years old. In practice though, in one class ages can vary from 12 up to 18. Pupils that age were chosen as a target youth, as they should have already general knowledge to understand the principle of the discussion, as well as I thought they should speak fluent English and have no problem with writing basic sentences in English. The discussion with the youth was similar to those with the adults. At the beginning of the meeting, a list of development project was made and the five best projects were ranked by the whole class. Afterwards, boys and girls were divided into gender-groups without any particular age division. They continued to work in such subgroups on the characteristic of the five wealth categories, as well as on the estimation of the impact of the five best projects on those five wealth categories using seed technique method.

**Seed Technique**

“Seed technique” is a perfect tool for understanding the community structure and distinguishing different groups that exist in the area. Originally, seeds are used to get the approximate estimates, however they can be replaced with stones, rice grains, small twigs, or other available materials (PRA Manual, nd). During the data collection process, in order to get an approximate estimate on the impact of the five best projects on five wealth categories: very poor, poor, not poor/not rich, rich and very rich, the participants were asked to distribute ten stones over those five wealth groups, per each of the best five projects ranked at the beginning of our meeting. Ten stones represented the whole (100%) community and all stones had to be distributed among the five wealth groups. The question that participants were asked to answer was as follows: according to you, to what extent will each wealth group profit from a certain development project? Additionally, in order to understand the community wealth structure, participants were asked to show which wealth groups dominate in the village, using the same method⁴⁰.

---

⁴⁰ Community wealth structure was not assessed in case of school youth. Within one class, pupils are coming from many different villages, thus it was impossible to ask about a general picture of one community’s wealth structure, as every child would take into consideration their own village, not the area of the school.
3.3 Data Collection Process

The data collection process covered a period of about two months. I was staying in the guesthouse of Langbensi Presbyterian Agric Station, from where I commuted to the other communities with a motorbike by a PAS-L worker or by a mini-bus. The help of PAS-L was important, although I tried to avoid their direct interference in the research process, and I think I succeeded. Apart from their hospitality, they helped me to choose the three most fitting villages to the research purpose, introduced me to those communities and helped with the logistics.

Also the members of the communities were very hospitable, kind and helpful. For example, during my official introduction to the Chief and the community of Wundua, I was informed that not only I am more than welcome, but also the fact that “I am a white, non-Muslim woman will have no impact on the research’s outcome, and they are ready to cooperate with me in 100%”. In practice, it was exactly as the Chief promised. The high participation was not only a fact in Wundua, but in all three communities, and in the schools as well.

Data were collected with the help of translators during focus group discussions (with adults), and semi-formal “lessons” performed in JSSs. During meetings, notes were taken and recorded with a digital recorder, as a backup for the notes. The outcomes of the meetings were already transcribed during the fieldwork period.

During the data-collection process the help of translators was necessary. Mostly, in the communities, there were one or two people who could speak both English and a local language. Those people were very keen and enthusiastic to help me with translation and facilitation of the group meetings. Mainly though, they were men. Only in Kasape, I did have a female translator for the women group. In Kasape, I still had to ask a PAS-L female worker, Belinda Adiaba, for an additional help with translation and facilitation, because for the meeting almost 50 women arrived. Mrs Adiaba also helped me to facilitate the men’s group in Kasape, as only one male translator was available during the workshops. Nevertheless, in both Wundua and Gbangu, there was not a single woman present in the village who was both bilingual and literate to make notes and properly facilitate the meetings. In that situation, I had to work with male facilitators.
Because the topic of our discussion was regarded as neither “delicate”, nor controversial, it was assumed that the fact of male facilitators would not influence the outcome of the discussion. Still though, at the beginning of the meetings, women were asked whether the fact of having men as facilitator would possibly bias their judgments, but they denied.

During meetings with JSS’s pupils, translation was not necessary, apart from JSS in Gbangu. The problem though, was the class size, especially in JSS in Langbensi and JSS in Gambaga, as they both cover a wide area for school children in the District. In Langbensi, the class consisted of 51 pupils, while in Gambaga, this was a class of 110 students - as two classes were joined. Therefore, even after dividing students in smaller groups, in each group there were still many of them, which made it hard for everyone to contribute to the discussion. Furthermore, the meeting in Gbangu, despite exceptionally small class size – only 14 students - was probably one of the most difficult I had to perform. At the beginning, children were afraid to talk, they also did not speak English very well, so the help of the teacher was crucial to translate and to explain the purpose of our meeting in a local language. It was especially hard, when children were asked how they understood the words: “development” and “development project”. They gave no answer. After few examples of what it can be, they started to “feel” the problem and the list of projects was filled. Usually though, all the given examples were starting with “Some strangers came and gave/did/etc”. This illustrates well the perception of “development” of the youth in Gbangu. Additionally, students were having problems with writing and expressing themselves in English, which only indicates the very low level of education in the village.

3.4 Target Population

Ghana was chosen as the country of my study because of my personal involvement in the PDA research project which has its geographical focus on the north of this country (and in Southern Burkina Faso). Therefore, my study was conducted in three villages and in three Junior High Schools in East Mamprusi District, Northern Ghana. Those
villages represent the groups of villages used during the PDA workshops. This division allowed me to further compare my research findings with the outcome of the PDA workshops.

Selection of Junior High Schools was based on slightly different assumptions. In the area, JSSs can only be found in three villages: Langbensi, Gbangu and in Gambaga. In Langbensi and in Gambaga there are more than one JSS. In case of Gambaga, the choice of a school was based on non-formal conversations with people, who indicated that JSS “Zobzia” might be a good choice, as this is “the oldest school in the whole District”. In case of Langbensi, I took advantage from on-the-spot possibility of being introduced to the head teachers by one of the colleagues.

3.5 Units of Analysis

As this research was using participatory methodology, it was assumed that people should actively participate during all stages of the research, starting from the identification of the participants. Therefore, a person from the previously chosen communities – PAS-L-contact person for that community – was asked to organize a sample group that would consist of twenty men and twenty women who would be the representatives of all major social and cultural categories of the community. The contact persons were asked then to invite for the focus group meetings younger and older people; men and women; those who are farmers, and those who are traders; those who are members of certain community groups, and those who are not. Moreover, these were preferably people who were not present during the PDA workshops, since this might have influenced the outcome of the further discussions. All in all, almost 220 people contributed to the discussion, mostly women. Moreover, in all three village communities two participants happened to be present in both the PDA workshops and the focus group meetings. Table 4. below summarizes the number of adult participants present during the focus group discussions in the three chosen villages.

---

41 During the PDA workshops, villages were chosen based on the presence of PAS-L activities in those villages.
42 I.e. women saving group, farming groups, and all other groups.
Table 4. Number of participants present in the villages during the focus group discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Village</th>
<th>Nr of ♂ participants</th>
<th>Nr of ♀ participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Participants also present during PDA workshops*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wundua</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasape</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbangu</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>60</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>218</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Comparison of lists of focus groups’ participants with Live History Report Round 1. (Van der Geest 2008)

As a target youth, pupils from third grade of JSS were chosen as children that age were expected to understand the principle of our discussion, to speak fluent English and have no problem with writing basic sentences in English. In total, 180 pupils of Secondary Schools contributed to the discussion. In contrast to adult’s group discussions, here a relative balance between girl- and boy-participants can be observed. Table 5 below present the summery of the youth participants in three chosen Junior Secondary Schools.

Table 5. Number of pupils present during the discussions in Junior Secondary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Nr of ♂ participants</th>
<th>Nr of ♀ participants</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSS Langbensi</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS Gbangu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS Gambaga</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>87</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
<td><strong>180</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Data Analysis Procedure

Data analysis was primarily drawn from qualitative PRA findings. In many cases, participants were able to name the actors involved in developmental activities: they usually knew names of organizations or whether it was a government intervention. Nevertheless, human memory might be elusive. Therefore, the information about the name of organizations, or information about the initiator, such as: was it government, NGO, or FBO, or other initiative, was cross-checked with the existing data\(^{43}\), if possible.

\(^{43}\) I.e. in Wundua men group indicted only PAS-L as a initiator of distribution of dry-season gardening tools for farmers, while women group said that it was Care Int. through PAS-L who founded the project. After consulting PAS-L workers, it was confirmed that indeed it was Care Int. who was responsible for delivery of dry-season gardening tools, while PAS-L was just facilitating its distribution. Therefore, this project was ranked as the one commenced by a NGO, not as another project initiated by PAS-L which would be regarded as FBO.
The outcome of the meetings were examined and compared in order to search for some commonalities. Data has been categorized and examined in order to reach combined conclusions. Moreover, projects that had been selected within “best projects” have been divided into eight major categories: health programmes, education, water projects, improvement of farm and livestock conditions, PAS-L, provision of food, infrastructure and “others”\textsuperscript{44}, and further analyzed with SPSS.

### 3.7 Statement of Ethics

Scheyvens (2003: 139) pointed out that fieldwork in the Third World can give rise to a number of ethical dilemmas. Indeed, the ethical issues had to be taken into consideration, in the case of my research as well.

All respondents were fully informed about the purpose, methods and intention of my research. It was clearly said, that as a research student I can’t promise any changes, nor that this research will be followed by any development activities. Therefore, all participants were voluntarily taking part in the meetings.

### 3.8 Limitations to the Study

The data-collecting process can raise questions about representativeness of the respondents and possible bias of this research. Firstly, the fact that I allowed other people –PAS-L contact persons – to organize the focus group meeting, could have influenced the choice of respondents to those also connected to PAS-L.

Secondly, due to the timing of my research and limited possibility to stay in the villages\textsuperscript{45}, it was definitely not enough to get a true feeling of life in those villages. Therefore, it was also hard to find out who really were the participants, what are the local power structures and relations, and who was excluded from the research and why. In order to answer these questions, an anthropological research will be necessary, which might be an idea for future research.

\textsuperscript{44} More about that in Chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{45} I could have stayed only for two days in each village.
Finally, my first contact with the people was through PAS-L, which together with the fact that I was also living on the area of PAS-L might have influenced the perception of me – as an independent research – in the eyes of respondents. Strong assurance that my ties with the Station are rather loose may not have been enough. Therefore, I still could have been regarded as an “Agric-person”, which all in all, may have influenced the process of collecting data and biased the outcome of my research.

3.9 Conclusion of Chapter 3

Chapter 3 provided the information about the geographical context and methodology used during the research process. All in all, Ghana was chosen as the country of my study because of my personal involvement in the PDA research project which has its geographical focus on the north of this country. Northern Ghana is one of the poorest areas of the country. The harsh climate condition adversely affects economic activity, population’s health and agriculture of the region and thus stimulating migration and poverty. East Mamprusi District is one of the 18 districts of the Northern Region with its capital in Gambaga. Agriculture and livestock rearing is the main occupation of the majority of the adult population in the District. East Mamprusi District is considered as an area of the country where mass poverty exists, and where real household incomes are too low to satisfy people’s basic needs.

The research was conducted in three villages in East Mamprusi District: Wundua, Kasape and Gbangu. The villages were chosen because of their geographical position—similar to those developed during the PDA workshops – areas of North-East, North-West and South of the Districts. All in all, six focus groups were carried out with community representatives, and three with the youth from Junior Secondary Schools. A sample adult group should consist of twenty male and female representatives of all major social and cultural categories of the community, yet in practice the groups were much bigger. As a target youth, pupils from third grade of JSS were chosen, as children that age were expected to understand the principle of our discussion, to speak fluent English and have no problem with writing basic sentences in English. This research adopted the participatory and holistic methodology developed during PDA workshops. The outcome of the meetings was examined and compared in order to search for some
commonalities and to reach a combined conclusion. The results are presented in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4: Results

This chapter summarizes the main results of nine meetings with both adults and youth from East Mamprusi District. Research findings are based on participatory and holistic methodology developed during the PDA workshops. The first section of this chapter analyzes the lists of development projects made by participants as well as discussing the ranking of the five best projects. The second section is about the outcome of the poverty assessment exercise, where participants were to describe five wealth groups: very rich, rich, not poor/not rich, poor and very poor in their villages. The final section discusses the impact of the best projects on five wealth categories.

4.1 Project Analysis

During the meeting with the participants, both women and men made separate lists of projects. All participants were able to come up with a long list of development projects. The longest list was constructed for the community of Wundua – both men and women indicated 45 and 47 project respectably. In Gbangu male and female participants mentioned 26 and 28 project respectively in the area; and in Kasape – 21 and 16 for male participants and female participants respectively. Afterwards, the lists were compared and an integrated list for each village was made in order to count only once the projects mentioned by both men and women. Surprisingly, the young participants from Junior High Schools came up with a long list of project. Pupils from JSS Langbensi mentioned 27 project, in Gambaga 40, and in Gbangu 47, which is even more than the adult participants were able to recall during the focus group discussion in this village.

Adult participants do seem to be aware of “who did what” in their communities. Nevertheless, human memory might be elusive. Therefore, the information such as the name of organization, or was it government, NGO, FBO or was it other initiative, was cross-checked with the existing data, if possible. In Kasape, the community was least aware of actors involved in the developmental actions, and there were a few projects, which had to be ranked as “other intervention”, as it was impossible to determine who initiated the project. Table 6 below shows how many projects were indicated by
particular focus group (men/women) divided by actors involved in the project. Since young participants from Junior High Schools were not able to indicate, as detailed as the adult participants, which actors were involved in certain interventions, it was not possible to add the projects mentioned by pupils to the Table 6 below.

Table 6. Summarized list of projects ranked by the actors involved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wundua</th>
<th>Kasape</th>
<th>Gbangu</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>♂</td>
<td>♀</td>
<td>♂+♀</td>
<td>♂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>28 (44%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While analyzing the integrated lists, it can be observed that the majority of projects indicated by participants in Wundua and in Gbangu was initiated by NGOs. By contrast, in Kasape, NGOs were least present; there FBOs activities dominated the ranking, followed by “other” and governmental interventions. In Wundua, there were many “other” interventions (mostly own community interventions), as well as governmental, followed by the activities sponsored by FBOs. In Gbangu, governmental interventions were the second most frequently mentioned, followed by FBOs and “other” interventions. There is almost 50% overlap between projects mentioned by female and male participants, except in Kasape where such overlap is rather small. The relatively limited overlap shows the importance of asking women and men separately, as they seem to have different life worlds and different experiences (and memories) with regard to ‘projects’.

Wundua is a community where the highest number of development activities takes place. The village will soon have electricity and a new school is in progress of building. Surprisingly, in such a strong Muslim society, Islam-based organizations seem not to be active. Within the list of projects, there is only one initiative founded by the Libyan Government about Islam Teaching. Participants do not seem to be embittered by that fact, as they are all very positive about the interventions founded by the other faith-
based organizations. Wundua is also the only community out of three studies in this research, where the education on human rights, as well as a campaign to stop Female Genital Mutilation (FGM) practices took place. In Wundua, there were not that many differences between the lists of projects made by men and women. Naturally, men were more keen to mention projects related to farming and agriculture, while women mentioned a few projects targeted only to them, such as distribution of mosquito nets for pregnant women and children, or education on proper child care. Surprisingly, none of the women mentioned the campaign to stop Female Genital Mutilation practices, while men, in contrast, did. Nonetheless, Wundua is a village that has a relative balance in between male and female consciousness and involvement in development interventions.

Kasape, apart from (or because of) its proximity to Langbensi, is a village with the smallest number of development interventions. Men were able to come up with a list of 21 projects, while women mentioned only 16. Most of the projects mentioned by both men and women were introduced or facilitated by PAS-L. What might surprise, most of the projects related to agriculture and introduced by PAS-L were mentioned by women. Women also mentioned their own initiative: Alafia Group – collective savings in a local bank - within “projects”, as they said it improved the situation of many of them, and the definition of “a development project” adopted in this research allowed for that as well. Mostly though, participants were complaining about lack of developmental activities, rather than its presence.

Gbangu is a village with “regular” developmental activities. By “regular” it is understood that the agencies support development projects in the village on a regular basis. Both men and women were able to come up with almost 30 projects. Both male and female participants were aware of many development activities in the village. Nevertheless few of the mentioned projects were just one-off emergency interventions after the drought or flood that affected the area in recent years. What is more, the fact that the village has both primary school and JSS is rather an exception in the area. Apart from big towns, such as Langbensi and Gambaga, there are almost no villages that have JSS. JSS in Wundua, which is being built, would be the second case of a JSS in a village, after JSS in Gbangu.

Research made by Zaal et al (2009) confirms that in the area the majority of development activities are founded by Christian-Based Organizations.

Apart from big towns, such as Langbensi and Gambaga, there are almost no villages that have JSS. JSS in Wundua, which is being built, would be the second case of a JSS in a village, after JSS in Gbangu.
possible reason for that might be the fact that the Chief of the village used to be involved in education service in the area. Moreover, he is a highly educated, respected and well-known person in the District, thus it is a plausible reason why Gbangu is not “forgotten” by developmental agencies. In Gbangu, the study was also conducted in the local JSS. Interestingly, pupils were able to come up with a list of projects that consists of more projects (47) than the list made by adult participants in the village. If we then compare the list of projects made by adults and those made by pupils, it shows that for 37 projects mentioned by the adults, pupils repeated 19 of them, and above that they recall 28 other projects. Within those 28 projects, 20 were related to school or youth. It seems that there has been a lot of support for the schools in Gbangu, however only the school children remember that with that level of detail.

Apart from some initial difficulties in JSS in Gbangu described in chapter two of this thesis, workshops performed there and in two other JSSs should be considered as a success. Pupils from Langbens and Gambaga were very keen and actively participated in the discussion and group work. Young participants were aware of the development activities in their villages and in their schools. They mentioned many “adult” projects as well, but more importantly, they mentioned many projects related to school and targeted at school youth. It was important, to add voices of the youth, as otherwise many such projects would not be included in the research. It is even more visible, when the list of projects is analyzed by the category to which the project was related to, such as projects related to farm and livestock, education, water, health, improvement of infrastructure, food distribution or enhancing small-scale business activities. Table 7 below represents such division. It can be seen that adult participants most frequently mentioned projects related to farm and livestock, while school-children most frequently mentioned projects related to education. The second most numerous category for all was “Health” – all men, women and youth mentioned many projects related to health. As third, men were more keen to mention water projects, while women mentioned more education

48 Initiatives such as: Health Club (sexual education, AIDS/HIV prevention), distribution of school bags and books or other things that took place in the school.
49 Except Men group from Wundua, which mentioned more projects related to education and health was on the third place.
50 Except pupils from Gambaga, who mentioned more projects related to Infrastructure, leaving Health projects on the third place.
interventions. The school-pupils also indicated many projects related to farm and livestock, as well as infrastructure.

Table 7. List of projects by category the project was related to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Wundua ♂</th>
<th>Wundua ♀</th>
<th>Wundua ♂+♀</th>
<th>Kasape ♂</th>
<th>Kasape ♀</th>
<th>Kasape ♂+♀</th>
<th>Gbangu ♂</th>
<th>Gbangu ♀</th>
<th>Gbangu ♂+♀</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm &amp; Livestock</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. List of projects by category the project was related to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>JSS Langbensi</th>
<th>JSS Gambaga</th>
<th>JSS Gbangu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm &amp; Livestock</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Marketing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After making a list of projects, participants were asked to choose and rank the five best interventions. This exercise always provoked big discussions, but especially the young participants were deeply involved in it, and finally pupils had to vote in order to agree. Moreover, it was often hard to chose the five best projects, so in two JSSs, the list consisted of six projects, as otherwise agreement would not be reached. In Langbensi, students chose UNICEF Programmes as the best project, in Gambaga pupils chose Ghana Education Service as the best, while in Gbangu it was a clinic. Basically, the youth’s attitude towards project ranking was very mature. Not only they were aware of development activities, but they were also able to argue logically about their choices. For example, in Langbensi, UNICEF Programmes were chosen as the best, because the participants themselves were their direct beneficiaries. In Gbangu, it was the clinic, as
“health is very important and if something is happening or someone is sick – this person can get an immediate help in the place, without the necessity of going to the faraway village to look for help”. In Gambaga, the main argument for choosing Ghana Education Service as first was that if it had not been for GES, the students “would not be even able to be here – at school and learn – and education is a key to development”. Mostly, youth were choosing projects which indeed are very important and usually best for the whole community: boreholes, projects related to health care, training of farmers or activities of the World Food Programme. The ranking of projects was not that different from the ranking made by the adult participants. The full project ranking list per group per village is represented by the Table 8 below.

Table 8. Project Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wundua Men</th>
<th>Wundua Women</th>
<th>Kasape Men</th>
<th>Kasape Women</th>
<th>Gbangu Men</th>
<th>Gbangu Women</th>
<th>JSS Langbens</th>
<th>JSS Gambaga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health Programmes*</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>UNICEF Programmes*</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>School JSS</td>
<td>School JSS</td>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Boreholes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Soya beans and groundnuts production</td>
<td>NHI</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Vaccinations</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>HIV Programme</td>
<td>Vaccination Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Livestock capacity building</td>
<td>Initiation of soya and groundnut production</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>ALAFIA Group</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Toilet facilities</td>
<td>Clinics and support of health programmes</td>
<td>Distribution of school uniforms and school bags</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>Tree-seedlings</td>
<td>Food distribution</td>
<td>Climate Change Education</td>
<td>Distribution of mosquito nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Training of farmers</td>
<td>Grounding Mill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* NHI, Polio Vaccinations, School Health Programme
** Distribution of bikes for girl-students, Distribution of school bags and books for orphans, Distribution of mosquito nets, Vaccination Programme.

As far as the adult participants are concerned, in Wundua, men indicated all health-related projects and activities as the best, while women chose the clinic. The presence of
the clinic in the village is regarded as very important, though lack of electricity makes it impossible to properly operate, so in more serious cases, patients still have to be sent to health facilities further away in order to get medicines which require low temperature storage. Therefore, both men and women ranked electricity within the best five projects, even though it is not working yet. Similarly, JSS that had just begun to be built was ranked between the five best projects. Participants assumed that when these two projects will be finished, it will be an incredible asset for the community. In the area, only Langbensi, Gambaga and Nalerigu have electricity, and these are the biggest urban settlements in the Districts. Wundua would be the first village with electricity. The experience from other communities shows that it will not only improve the present situation in the village – i.e. like improvement in delivery of medical services or simply a living standard, but it also may be followed by other development interventions, which already require some basic infrastructure. That may lead to greater development of the community. In terms of the school, the community is looking forward to the new building, as presently the building of the primary school is far too small for all attending children. Therefore, the plan is in the future to use the new (bigger) building for the purpose of the primary school, while the “old” school will be the “new” JSS. Participants were complaining that overcrowded classes and lack of proper conditions negatively influence the quality of education. As a result, the new school, as well as the new building, will not only bring “higher education” to the village\textsuperscript{51}, but should also improve the quality of primary education. Moreover, men mentioned PAS-L as the sixth best project. Presbyterian Agric Station-Langbensi is not “a project” as such, yet again the adopted methodology allowed the participants to mention all activities that improved/worsened the situation in their community and classify it as “a development project”. Participants were insisting on ranking PAS-L within the list of best projects, as they said, without its presence many other interventions, such as those connected to agriculture or those facilitated by the Station – also ranked within the five best projects – would have never taken place in their village.

For the same reason as participants in Wundua, participants in Kasape ranked PAS-L within the five best projects. Men ranked it first place, while women ranked it in fifth place. It does not surprise, since although there is a small involvement of other agencies,

\textsuperscript{51} Presently, children need to walk many kilometers to JSS in Langbensi or in Gbangu, or in Gambaga.
PAS-L seems to be the major actor involved in many development activities in the village. Women though decided to put boreholes in first place – while men ranked it as second best. Within the list, they both mentioned school and health-related programmes (men – clinic; women – vaccinations); men also highlighted the importance of tree-planting, while women ranked their own initiative – Alafia Group among the best five.

In Gbangu, women and men were almost unanimous. There was a slight difference, as men chose the clinic as the best project, while women preferred boreholes. The second place for both is just the reverse. They both ranked the school as third best. Men further chose a warehouse and tree-seedling project, while women highlighted the importance of toilet facilities and food distribution during the hunger period and after the flood. After the ranking, participants were divided in two age groups (younger/older) in order to perform the poverty assessment exercise.

4.2 Poverty Assessment

The poverty assessment exercise was very difficult to perform. Participants were asked to broadly describe five groups of wealth in their villages, so who they considered as very rich, rich, not poor/not rich, poor and very poor. They were asked to mention any possible features in terms of what they possess (cars, houses), how they behave, what is their social status or even their state of mind. They were free to mention everything that cross their minds. Surprisingly, there were no significant differences in perception about various wealth groups between men, women, older or younger people. Therefore, it was possible to draw a clear and combined picture of the wealth classes with some particular nuances distinguished by certain groups of participants.
Very Rich

People in the village regarded as very rich are those in possession of a car or a motorbike\(^{52}\). They can also have a lorry or lorries, and apart from that an additional car, motorbike and bicycle.

Moreover, in Wundua, which is considered a Muslim-community, it was indicated that a very rich person can afford going to Mecca, and not only himself, but he can also send other members of the family. A very rich man has many wives – even more than four\(^{53}\) and many children. The majority of children go to school and they are able to continue their education up to Senior High School or University level. A very rich person is not only able to take good care of his children, but also of the whole family. They live in a nicely-finished house, with zinc roof, cemented floors and furniture inside. They are all properly dressed. "A wife of a very rich man, looks like a wife of a very rich man"\(^{54}\); they are all wearing expensive clothes, having many pairs of sandals and slippers; Muslim women have many nice veils.

\(^{52}\) In Kasape and in Gbangu nobody has a car.

\(^{53}\) In Islam, four is the number of wives that a Muslim man can marry. It is possible to marry more wives if one of the wives is "retired". Traditional beliefs do not restrict the number of wives you can marry.

\(^{54}\) All quotes are taken from the focus groups’ discussions in the villages and JSSs.
Children have a few school uniforms, so they can change them during the week and always look clean. In addition, there is no hunger in the family. In a very rich house, there is enough food throughout the whole year. They use a “modern” kitchen to cook. Not only there is enough food to feed the family three times per day, but there is also something left that can be sold afterwards. Very rich people are also buying additional food in order to supplement their diet, so they can have well-prepared dishes with meat and with all balanced ingredients. Therefore, they are also having less problems with their health, as proper diet and access to clean drinking water allow them to stay in a good shape. Nevertheless, if there is such a need, there is no problem for them to get to the hospital or use medical help, as all family members are covered with National Health Insurance. When the woman is pregnant, she attends regular checkups; small children are also regularly weighted in the hospital. When a woman is in labor and if there are no complications – she will rather give birth in a village, if there is a problem though, she will be quickly transported to the hospital. Child mortality is present, though it is relatively low.

A very rich person has a large and vast land to farm. He is using a tractor to plough, and he employs many people to help him on the field, as his children do not farm. He can afford agro-chemicals and fertilizers, so his crops look nice and he usually has very good harvests. What is more, he is able to buy other farm products when they are cheap, then he stores them and sells later when the price
A very rich person is in possession of many different types of animals: he has lots of cattle, sheep, goats, turkeys and fowls and they are all well-kept.

A very rich person is highly respected and recognized in the community. He is honored and highly considered in decision making – his voice is always heard. A very rich person is in a position to help the ones in need. He supports his family, but also non-family members both with money, in kind or in deeds. This is also a person who supports or initiates developmental projects and always contributes enough if there is such a need. A very rich person is also described as patient and very quiet. In addition, he recognizes all “categories” of people – so no matter whether you are rich or poor – a very rich person talks to everyone and he does not like to quarrel with others, as this may reduce his wealth by missing people’s support. Yet, the picture of a very rich person as a “good Samaritan” is not that straightforward. Especially in Kasape, both older men and younger women said that a very rich person cares only for his own affairs and does not help the poor.

A very rich person is able to perform expensive ceremonies, such as funerals and marriages without any support. All his ceremonies are highly recognized, which means that many people will come and sympathize with the family. There is plenty of food and drinks. There is “drumming and dancing all over the place” for a couple of days, up to a week.

The next thing that describes a very rich person is the fact that he is always happy, as there are no problems in his life. However, older women from Kasape added, that apart from his happiness, also potential danger comes along with his wealth and it brings no peace in his mind.

All in all, being very rich means being able to do everything he wants, as “people in the community are listening to him more than the others”. He is able to solve his problems before others get to know that he actually has one. This is someone who does not know the total amount of his own wealth and doesn’t know whether there is hunger in the

---

55 He can use his tractor to plough for other farmers, or uses his farm input during farming season to support other farmers, or helps others with food and accommodation during ceremonies.
56 During ceremonies, drummers and dancers have to be paid in order to perform.
community. It is interesting to note that, while talking about very rich people (but in other categories as well) people mostly talk about ‘he’, but it includes the wife/wives and other members of the household. In some cases the very rich men also have wives, who are rich entrepreneurs (often traders) themselves.

**Rich**

A person that is considered as rich “*lives a better life, but not as good as a very rich person*”. He is happy and peaceful-minded, as he can cope with his problems on his own and he rarely needs support from others. He often “*plays a role as a middleman between the very rich and those who want to borrow*”, as he “*has more understanding and compassion than the very rich*”. Therefore, he is highly respected by the community members – even more than the very rich. People like him and honor him, so “*at the market he always gets nicer things – like nicer tomatoes, etc*”.

Asked about further characteristics, a rich person was often referred to as “*almost like very rich, but just...rich*”. Therefore, he has a motorbike, or in bigger villages like Langbensi and Gambaga, a car or an old car; he has more than one wife and many children – but “*not as many as the very rich*”. His children are properly educated. A rich person is also able to visit Mecca. A rich family lives in a nice and decent house, wears nice and clean clothes, school children have more than one school uniform. They eat proper meals – twice or three times per day. Usually there is enough food throughout the whole year and, apart from Gbangu\(^57\), they don’t expect a hunger gap during the usual 3-month lean season.

A rich family has easy access to hospital services – they will always go to the hospital, if there is such a need. Usually, all the family is covered with NHI, nevertheless they sometimes prefer to contact traditional healers instead. Their children don’t die easily of

---

57 In Gbangu a rich person might experience one or two months of food shortage as they farm outcome will not be enough and they would have to buy food.
diseases, as they regularly attend clinic for checkups. Similar for pregnant women – they pay regular visits to the clinic and have proper maternal care.

A rich person is in possession of a big farm. He uses a tractor, but also bullocks and hands to plough. His children help him with farming, but he is also able to hire a few extra people to help. His yields are always nice with a variety of crops; and the outcome is satisfactory. He also has lots of animals – sheep, goats, hens, etc – and they are all well-kept. Yet, he has just a few cattle, if he has cattle at all.

His ceremonies are highly recognized, but they are not as big as those of the very rich – “they are just… rich”. A rich person is very respected, yet older women in Kasape and in Gbangu mentioned that actually a rich person can sometimes be mean, and does not want to make friends with the poor especially in the lean season. Apart from that comment, it is clear that a rich person has a strong position in all communities.

**Not Poor/Not Rich (NP/NR)**

A person who is not rich, not poor is considered to be somewhere “*in between poor and rich*” – average. This is someone who sometimes helps others, but sometimes somebody must help him. He is respected, attends social gatherings and takes part in decision-making processes. He is considered trustworthy. He is able to borrow money from other people – if there is such a need – and is able to pay them back. In addition, his state of mind strongly depends on the season – during the first part of the year (when he has enough food) he is happy, while during the second half (when there is no food) – he is rather sad.

A NP/NR person sometimes can have a motorbike, but only in a big town, such as Gambaga, as usually he rides a bicycle or he walks. A family that is considered NP/NR usually consists of a husband, two wives and about ten children. Not all children are sent to school, and those who attend schools do so up to a certain level (usually up to JSS). The rest of the children will help in the household and on the farm. They live in a nice, simple house built with mud, which is well-plastered and floored, with thatch roof or half-zinced; with mattresses, but without beds. They are having nice clothes: “*not*
“good, but better”. Perhaps they do not change their dresses frequently, but they always wash their clothes. Their school children will have only one uniform to wear throughout the week. Older women in Gbangu indicated that when eating twice per day, in such families men are able to provide food for six months from their farms, but for the next six months those are women who will supply the family with food. Their diet does not vary much: “it is usually TZ\textsuperscript{58} in the morning and in the evening or rice”. Despite all the problems, a NP/NR person is able to feed the family throughout a year.

A NP/NR person is in rather “average health”. The family is only partly covered with NHI. Pregnant women are going to the hospital for checkup, but they give birth in the village and more often experience child mortality than rich or very rich people. If there is such a need, money will be borrowed from relatives and they will be able to hospitalize the person in need.

A “not poor/not rich-farm” is rather small, but it is enough for the family. They use bullocks to plough. Their children are helping, but sometimes they are also able to hire somebody to help with ploughing and weeding, while in Wundua, they even can afford to hire a tractor. They keep some livestock, like guinea fowls, fowls, sheep and goats, but no cattle.

As far as ceremonies are concerned, it has to be said that their ceremonies are recognized by the community, but they are rather basic. They do not last too long –

\textsuperscript{58} TZ is a local staple food, made from millet porridge that is eaten with spicy soups.
there is a short period of drumming and dancing, yet a NP/NR family can perform them without or with just a little support from their relatives.

All in all, a NP/NR person is somebody who can take care of himself and the family, but not much above that.

**Poor**

A poor person usually walks to his/her destination, but at least he has his shoes on. Sporadically though, he can cycle.

A poor man usually has one wife and many children. Mostly, he cannot afford children’s education. In few cases, it is possible to send only one or two children to school, while others are helping in the household or work for very rich or rich people. When in school though, there is a problem with fulfilling some basic school conditions, such as paying tuition fees, buying books or school uniform. These obstacles result in decisions about quitting the school. The dropout rate is thus higher for children from poor families. This is more common with girls from poorer families because of frequent cases of teenage pregnancy\(^59\).

A poor man cannot take proper care of his family – his children look dirty, have un-kept hair, wearing torn clothes. His wife always wears used clothes and skirts. They live in a small compound house with a roof from grass, with no furniture; the rooms are floored but the yard is not. He cannot feed his family three times per day. They usually eat once per day or there is no food at all. They rely on “seasonal eating schemes” which means that in a lean season they are simply out of food and they have to look for support from relatives.

---

\(^{59}\) More frequent cases of teenage pregnancy happened among girls from poorer families, as a result of their poverty. Participants mentioned the fact that those girls are more keen to go for sex in exchange for money or food, which together with limited sexual education, as well as lack of proper protection lead to pregnancy.
They have small farms, plough by hand, occasionally with bullocks, yet they don’t have enough seeds to grow enough food, and their land productivity is very low. They do not have many animals – perhaps just a few fowls or hens. They cannot access quality health care, nor provide health care for expected and nursing mothers. When the person is sick, he cannot afford hospital fees, so “he is lying down and suffering before somebody shows some compassion and helps him”. Nevertheless, afterwards he has to give the money back or work for that help.

A poor person cannot organize nor perform his ceremonies very well. The ceremonies are usually basic - there is not much food, not many people come to sympathize with the family, there is no dancing, no drumming, as simply there is no money for that. He would only perform the “obligatory” ceremonies, such as funerals. Poor people usually do not participate in other ceremonies either, as they are “hiding and isolating themselves”.

The community does not count a poor person among others. Therefore, a poor person is not well-recognized in the society and is not involved in decision-making processes either. If he attends community gatherings, “he sits lonely on the side and does not participate”. He is not respected and no one wants to be his middleman in the community, therefore it is hard for him to borrow some money, and that makes his problems even more difficult to solve. Yet, even if he gets to borrow, he is not able to pay the money back. His children often cry and are jealous, as they do not have things that their colleagues have, which might push them to steal. They are always sad, and there is no peace, nor happiness for them at all.
Very Poor

A firm picture of a very poor person is hard to draw, as there were some differences between the villages. Usually though, being very poor means to be a single and lonely person: widows, or widowers, older persons with no one to take care of him/her, a divorced wife (may be with a child); a bachelor man; the handicapped or people with some mental disorders. Generally they are “those without families, with no relatives”. And even if they have relatives, they rather prefer to pretend that they are not related.

A very poor person usually does not own his own house, but attaches himself to someone else, where he can find a room or a small piece of floor to sleep.

The conditions of the house that he would live in are very poor though. If a very poor woman has children, they will not go to school at all. A very poor person wears torn and dirty second-hand clothes, that were given to him/her by others, and can be described as “the second selection of second-hand clothes”. He (she) has no shoes, so wherever he goes, he walks bare foot. He will always have problems with a proper diet. He has to beg for food or do some community work in exchange for food. He might have only one meal per day or eat nothing at all, and usually he goes to sleep hungry. Because he relies on others, a very poor person has no choice: he has to eat, dress and take what he is given in order to survive.

A very poor person is rarely in possession of land. If he has a farm, it is very small and not very well-kept. Young boys from JSS in Langbens defined a very poor person, as
“someone who is going to farm every time and anytime of the day, but at the end of the season he will bring nothing home”. It is because he does not have money to do the proper farming, so his land is not fertile any more. They also do not keep any animals. Therefore, he cannot even produce a thing that would somehow support his life.

Because very often such people live in poor and non-hygienic conditions, does not drink clean water as he has no money to dig or use a public borehole, and does not eat properly, he is often affected by diseases. Needless to say, he does not have access to proper health care and he can’t pay hospital fees himself. Only young men from Kasape and older women from Gbangu said that the community will contribute and help him in such need, yet all other participants claim that nobody will send and pay for a very poor person’s access to the hospital.

It is impossible for him to borrow some money, as he is unable to give it back. He can only count on food support from others. He is not able to organize any ceremonies. When a very poor person dies, people from the village will organize a small funeral for him to avoid social stigma, yet those ceremonies are not very well recognized.

Generally speaking, someone who is considered very poor is completely dependent on other people in every aspect of his life. Therefore, he is not respected by others and also not recognized in the community as a proper member of the society, simply as he is unable to contribute anyhow. Therefore, he is not considered in the decision-making processes either. He does not even attend social gatherings. Actually, not many people know him, as “he does not come near people”. He is isolated and has no friends. A very poor person is always very sad, but he is peaceful, because he already “lost confidence in all aspects of life, so he does not care anymore”. Elderly men from Kasape added a brutal truth, “when he [a very poor person] dies it is better for him than when he lives”.

***

The main purpose of the poverty assessment exercise was to explore local conceptions of wealth and poverty, as well as to prepare the base for the next exercise. Thanks to this discussion, participants also got a clear picture of the five wealth categories in their villages. It was easier for them to move to the next exercise – measuring the impact of
the five best projects ranked at the beginning of the meeting on the discussed five wealth categories.

4.3 The impact of the best projects on five wealth categories

The last exercise was about linking the list of projects made by the participants at the beginning of the meeting with the poverty assessment exercise. Since the projects were ranked within the five (six) best, they should be the best for the whole community and preferably everyone would profit in the same way. In practice though, it was observed that mostly these are the rich and very rich people who mainly benefit, while poor and very poor people are often excluded or benefit in a very limited way from certain projects.

Analyzing the project ranking in Table 8, it was noticed that certain types of projects, that had been ranked by participants are the same. Therefore it was possible to divide them into eight categories shown in Table 9 and described below.
Table 9. Ranking of the best projects from Table 8 with the color division into eight categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
<th>Project 3</th>
<th>Project 4</th>
<th>Project 5</th>
<th>Project 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wundua Men</td>
<td>Health Programmes</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>UNICEF Programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wundua Women</td>
<td>School JSS</td>
<td>School JSS</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>UNICEF Programmes</td>
<td>Boreholes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasape Men</td>
<td>Soya beans and groundnuts production</td>
<td>NHI</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Vaccinations</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>HIV Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasape Women</td>
<td>Livestock capacity building</td>
<td>Initiative of soya and groundnuts production</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>ALAFIA Group</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Toilet facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbangu Men</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>Tree-planting</td>
<td>Tree-seedlings</td>
<td>Food distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbangu Women</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS Langbensi</td>
<td>JSS Gbangu</td>
<td>JSS Gbangu</td>
<td>JSS Gbangu</td>
<td>Health Centre</td>
<td>Health Centre</td>
<td>Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS Gambaga</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>WFP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The projects have been divided into eight major categories: broadly understood “health programmes”, including clinic, vaccinations, National Health Insurance, but also distribution of mosquito nets, building toilet facilities – as this project is regarded as the one promoting and improving hygienic behaviors which consequently lead to improvement of health. The second category is education. Schools in villages – both JSS and primary - are regarded as best projects by almost all participating groups. Thirdly, projects related to improvement of water delivery have been categorized together. The fourth category gathers all projects related to improvement of farm and livestock conditions while PAS-L is analyzed as a separate category. Another category that has been distinguished, is “Food Provision”, which includes World Food Programme and projects of the government and Care Int. in Gbangu. Electricity in Wundua is part of the infrastructure category. The last category – “others” – includes all
Unicef Programmes ranked by JSSs’ pupils, and the women’s initiative in Kasape: “ALAFIA group”.

In such division, by using the most simple ranking – giving six points for the projects ranked as first best, up to one point for the last – sixth – place, it can be observed that the most important are the projects related to health, education, improvement of farming and livestock capacity building and water. The summary of this ranking is given in Table 10 below.

Table 10. Summary of the project ranked by points for the category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>∑</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Water</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Farm and livestock</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Food Provision</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact on wealth groups**

The majority of the projects that participants ranked among the five (six) best seem to reach mostly those who are considered to be very rich. The very rich people profit the most from five out of eight categories, such as: health programmes, education programmes, water programmes, infrastructure, and from farming and livestock programmes.
The farm and Livestock Programs’ category is a category that raised certain analytical problems, since PAS-L as Agric Station is also strongly connected to the farming and livestock programmes. A separate analysis of PAS-L was thus necessary, as PAS-L is not only regarded as an Agric Station, which focuses on farming programmes only, but they are also facilitators of projects established by other NGOs. Therefore, people still consider their presence as crucial not only from the “agric” perspective, but also as
facilitators: “there would be no other projects present in the area, if not PAS-L”. That is why I decided to analyze this category in two ways: firstly, excluding PAS-L within farming and livestock programmes, and secondly, including PAS-L support. Additionally, a separate analysis of PAS-L as such was conducted. There were some differences observed between the outcomes of the analysis. Since PAS-L generally cooperates with middle-class farmers or farmer groups, thus middle class wealth groups in our study, the analysis of PAS-L support as such confirms that those regarded as NP/NR seem to profit the most from this cooperation. Furthermore, by including PAS-L support in the analysis of farming and livestock programmes, the distribution also skews towards NP/NR. In both cases: PAS-L as such and farm and livestock programmes, the outcome is similar to the generalized distribution (see Chart 6 and Chart 7 below), while the exclusion of PAS-L made the graph a bit skewed to the right – indicating the biggest share of very rich people (see Chart 5 above).

The projects that reached those regarded as poor and very poor are food distribution programmes, such as WFP and food relief programme in Gbangu, and programmes categorized as “other” - women savings group: “ALAFIA Group” and Unicef Programmes ranked by the youth from Langbensi. Food distribution and Unicef Programmes are projects targeting the poorest members of communities and they also managed to reach them. As food relief programmes are concerned, participants clearly stated that during floods or droughts when the food was distributed in the village, those who were having some supplies, like the very rich and rich, simply refused to accept this support, explaining that “There are people in bigger need than they were”,

Chart 6. PAS-L

Chart 7. Farm and Livestock Programmes including PAS-L
therefore they did not profit from it much. Within the UNICEF Programmes, programmes such as: distribution of bikes for girl-students, distribution of school bags and books for orphans or vaccinations were distinguished, thus more vulnerable groups (girls, orphans) were targeted. About their own initiative, the “ALAFIA Group” , women from Kasape said that all wealth groups profit, as it does not matter whether you are rich or poor – if you are a member of that group everyone profits to the same extent. It would have been interesting to see who actually belong to that group (in terms of our wealth categories) , but I did not have time to do that.

Wealth distribution among villages

The participants were also asked to use the seed technique to illustrate the wealth division in their villages. The outcome is very clear: in all three villages the majority of people are regarded as poor.
It can also be observed that in Wundua and Kasape the majority of people are considered to be poor, yet in Gbangu the distribution is not that straightforward as in the two other villages. Indeed, in Gbangu the majority of people are poor, but there are more people considered to be very rich than rich. It happened to be like that, as the older women group indicated that the majority of people in the village are considered to be very rich, while three other groups indicated a rather minor percentage (10%) of people to be very rich.

Indeed, some other differences can be found in the perception of wealth according to age and gender. Younger people tend to be more “pessimistic” and regarded more people as poor, while the “older” participants tend to believe that more people are better off. One can argue, that the younger people are simply more aware of “what they might have, but cannot afford”. The development of cell-phones’ network, TV, internet and also images of people who were able to (e)migrate and “be successful” is the unreachable thing that might disrupt the image of what they actually have. On the contrary, the older inhabitants, also claim that the majority of people are poor, but they still seem to be more “optimistic”. They remember the times when they had nothing and it was worse than today. Therefore, they seem to appreciate more the changes, as compared to the past nowadays it is perceived to be “better”. On the other hand, one can argue that the younger people consider their wealth in a more “material” way, while

---

60 Meaning that the NP/NR, rich and very rich category are more numerous among “older” participants.  
61 Such trend was also observed by Martha Lahai (2009: 68-69) who conducted her research in the same region.
the older people still value some traditional views that also bring them profit, but not necessarily in an economic way.

In terms of gender, women regarded fewer people as poor to the wealthier groups’ advantage, while in men’s point of view a larger proportion of the communities is inhabited by those who are rather very poor, poor or NP/NR.

This result can also be caused by a bias that is related to the age distribution between gender groups (Table 11). It can be observed that on average, there were more younger participants in the men’s groups than in the “young” women’s groups. On average, women participants were older than men, therefore the outcome of the gender analysis is influenced by the age factor.
Table 11. Average age distribution between gender groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Age YOUNG MAN</th>
<th>Average Age YOUNG WOMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wundua</td>
<td>28,82</td>
<td>29,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasape</td>
<td>32,38</td>
<td>43,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbangu</td>
<td>38,67</td>
<td>41,81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Age OLDER MAN</th>
<th>Average Age OLDER WOMAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wundua</td>
<td>44,8</td>
<td>53,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasape</td>
<td>60,38</td>
<td>55,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gbangu</td>
<td>60,73</td>
<td>66,38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Average Age MAN  | 43,98                 |
| Average Age WOMAN| 48,49                 |
| Average AGE      | 47,25                 |

All in all, Chart 17 below represents a summarized wealth ranking for the three villages. The picture of the wealth categories drown by the participants from three villages lead to the conclusion that the area of East Mamprusi District is mostly populated by people who are locally regarded as poor.

Chart 17. Summarized wealth rank of the East Mamprusi District according to the people participating in the workshops from the three villages

4.4 Conclusion of Chapter 4.

This chapter summarized the main findings obtained by the use of a participatory and holistic methodology for evaluation of the past development interventions developed during the PDA workshops, in three villages and three Junior High Schools in East Mamprusi District, Northern Ghana.
Participants came up with long lists of development interventions that took place in the area. The majority of projects that were initiated in the researched area was sponsored by Faith-Based (Christian) NGOs and related to agriculture, health and education. Wundua is a community where the highest number of development activities took place, while Kasape, apart from (or because of) its proximity to Langbensi, is a village with the smallest number of such interventions. The research was also conducted in three Junior High Schools in the area. Young participants were aware of the development activities in their villages and in their schools. By adding voices of the youth, many new projects, especially related to education, were added to the list. Within the five best projects, participants tended to rank mostly projects related to health, education, water, farm and livestock, food provision, infrastructure as well as PAS-L as such. Participants drew also a very clear picture of five wealth groups: very rich, rich, NP/NR, poor and very poor in the area. According to the participants, all three villages are mostly populated by people who can be regarded as the poor. Nevertheless, the workshop participants concluded that the very rich people profit most from the majority of the best-ranked projects. The only projects that reached those regarded as poor and very poor were food distribution programmes, such as WFP and food relief programmes, the women savings group (“ALAFIA Group”) and Unicef Programmes. There were also some differences in the perception of wealth distribution in the villages in terms of age and gender. Younger people regard more people as poor, while the “older” participants tend to believe that more people are better off. Also in terms of gender, women regarded less people as poor, while men think that the communities are mainly inhabited by those who are rather very poor, poor or NP/NR, however gender analysis was influenced by the age factor.

The next chapter will compare these findings to the outcome of the PDA workshop and to the World Bank Report from 1995: “Poverty Assessment in Ghana Using Qualitative and Participatory Research Methods” (World Bank 1995).
Chapter 5. Discussion of the Research Findings

In this chapter the research findings discussed in Chapter 4 of this thesis will be compared to the outcome of the PDA workshop, as well as to the World Bank Report from 1995: “Poverty Assessment in Ghana Using Qualitative and Participatory Research Methods” (World Bank 1995). During the PDA workshop participatory poverty assessment took place. However, this exercise was then regarded more as an experiment and there was not enough time to properly evaluate it. My research discusses broadly the participatory poverty assessment in the region and also evaluates the impact of the best projects on five wealth categories in a smaller area of the region, and more in-depth. I also wanted to test the new methodology implemented during the PDA project in a slightly different context. Moreover, the comparison of the outcome of the research made in 2008 with the 1995 WB Report is also important, as the fieldwork for that Report was conducted more than ten years ago, so it was assumed that together with the development of the region, the peoples’ poverty assessment could also have changed.

During the PDA workshops, as already mentioned, participants were chosen from villages based on the presence of PAS-L activities in those villages. Furthermore, people who were invited for the workshop were considered to be local experts on local history and should represent all major social-cultural categories of the communities, also including the local political and opinion leaders. It raised the concerns that this might have caused a bias within the research outcome, as the selected participants were people who were representatives of mostly “NP/NR”, “rich” and “very rich” wealth groups. Therefore, this research made an attempt to compare the outcome of the participatory poverty assessment from the PDA workshop with its likely bias towards the “higher social classes”, to the outcome of a separate research I made in the three communities in the District with people who (almost all) were not present during the PDA workshop. That is also the reason, why this study was constructed in such a way that the chosen villages represented the groups of villages developed during the PDA workshops: the village of Wundua represents the South of the District, Kasape represents the North-West and Gbangu represents the North-East of the District. The comparison of the list of projects made by the participants of those two researches is
discussed in section 5.1 in this Chapter. In addition, the villages were also chosen based on their ethnic division, as it was assumed that possibly some particular differences within different ethnic groups could be found. By including voices of the youth in this research, another age category to poverty assessment and to the project evaluation was added, as youth was not present during the PDA workshop. Because in the case of my research, there were no particular differences between villages, nor between men and women, or between younger and older, a combined picture of particular wealth classes was possible to draw and this was broadly described in Chapter 4 of this thesis. Therefore, in the section 5.2 in this Chapter, the integrated poverty assessment from my research will be compared with the integrated poverty assessment from the PDA workshop, and with the WB PPA.

Comparison of the research findings with those of the WB Report may also cast light on the dynamics of poverty in the region. This will be discussed in the section 5.3. The World Bank Report was published in 1995, and it was based on the Ghana Participatory Poverty Assessment (PPA) that was conducted over three phases between 1993-1994 in a total of fifteen communities. The research methods selected for the Ghana PPA were predominantly drawn from a set of techniques of Participatory Rural Appraisal, such as focus groups and conversational and semi-structured interviewing. The Report claims that it gives a representative picture of the living conditions of the poor in the whole of Ghana, and it represents both the rural and urban dimensions of poverty in different regions of the country. Wealth ranking adopted in the World Bank Report is slightly different from the wealth groups assumed in this research. The Report also assumes the existence of five wealth categories, but these groups are as follows: the rich, not poor/not rich, poor, very poor and disabled people. Therefore, the extreme group of very rich is not distinguished in the Report. Moreover, in my research the participants included the disabled people within the “very poor” group. For the purpose of this research, my findings will be compared only with the picture of “rural poverty” and wealth ranking drawn after the meeting in one village in the Mamprusi District from the Report, as this area is in the vicinity of my own research villages.

The chapter concludes with the observation on the methodology implemented in that research and discussion over possible bias and limitations of these studies.
5.1 Comparison of the lists of projects

Comparing the lists of projects made by the participants of the PDA workshops and by the participants of my three focus groups can help to find out to what extent the people present during the PDA meetings were representing the village/area.

During the PDA workshops, two people from Kasape, two from Gbangu and two from Wundua were present (Van der Geest 2008), while the focus groups in those villages constituted mostly 20-50 people (see also Table 4). Participants of the focus groups were able to come up with relatively long lists of projects, similarly during PDA workshops where also long list of projects were made. It can be seen, that in general, almost half of the projects were mentioned by participants of both: the focus group meetings and the PDA workshops. The projects not mentioned during the PDA workshops, but indicated during the focus group discussions were mostly related to improvement of the Farm and Livestock conditions and health, and were mostly sponsored by NGOs, Government, FBOs or “others” – meaning usually community’s own initiatives (Table 13. and Table 14 below). Lists of projects made by school pupils did not take into consideration the initiators of the projects, however by comparing the projects divided by category with the outcome of the PDA workshops, it can be observed that the overlap with the PDA workshop is rather small. Nevertheless, children mentioned many “new” projects, most of them related to education.

While analyzing the lists of projects, it can be stated that the representatives of the villages during the PDA workshops were able to contribute with 66% of the projects launched in their area, while the participants of the focus groups mentioned 53% of the projects (Table 12). However, a couple of projects that were not mentioned during the PDA meetings but that were indicated during the focus group meetings, were relatively big interventions on the District or on the village level. Thus, one can argue that this partly confirmed the hypothesis, that during the PDA workshops, indeed, the

---

62 This is the only place where the outcome of the PDA workshops from Langbensi Central is taken into consideration.
63 When it is compared to the total number of projects mentioned by all participants (PDA workshops and focus group discussions).
64 Interventions, such as mass immunizations or food distribution programmes.
local elites were represented, as those ‘forgotten’ projects during the PDA were mostly targeting the less wealthy members of the communities.

It can be observed (Table 13) that the projects that were not mentioned during PDA workshops were mostly related to agriculture, but also often targeted at farmers, thus mostly the NP/NR wealth group. Moreover, the programs such as food distribution or initiatives that were to help in rebuilding houses after the floods, and some health programmes were not mentioned either. Those mentioned during the focus group discussions and omitted by the participants of the PDA workshops, refer to distribution of drugs, vitamins or free vaccinations, thus people who cannot afford visits in the clinic were the biggest beneficiaries of such projects. That is also a reason why the representatives in the PDA workshops could be considered as the representatives of “the higher classes”, and the outcome of the PDA project might also be biased towards the elites.

**Table 12. Number of projects listed during PDA workshops and during the focus groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr of projects</th>
<th>West/Kasape</th>
<th>East/Gbangu</th>
<th>South/Wundua</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total nr of project per area**

| %   | 20% | 50% | 31% | 66% | 19% | 34% | 53% |

*without common projects
Table 13. Comparison of projects listed during PDA workshops and during the focus groups by the category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>West/Kasape</th>
<th>East/Gbangu</th>
<th>South/Wundua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PDA Project list</td>
<td>Common Projects</td>
<td>Other Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm &amp; Livestock</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit/Business/Marketing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Langbensi Central/JSS</th>
<th>Langbensi</th>
<th>East/JSS Gbangu</th>
<th>East/JSS Gambaga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PDA Project list</td>
<td>Common Projects</td>
<td>Other Projects</td>
<td>PDA Project list</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm &amp; Livestock</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit/Business/Marketing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14. Comparison of projects listed during PDA workshops and during the focus groups by the actor initiating the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>PDA workshops</th>
<th>The same as PDA</th>
<th>Other Projects</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Kasape</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Kasape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Gbangu</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>Gbangu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Wundua</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>Wundua</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FBO</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Projects initiated by more than one actor.

The same trend can be observed, if we compare the rankings of the best projects made during the PDA workshops and those made during the focus group discussions (Table 15). Only two or three projects listed were ranked as the best in the area by all participants. Moreover, the projects ranked by almost all were schools, boreholes, a clinic and, in case of Wundua/South also soy beans and groundnuts production. If we take a closer look at the projects ranked by the PDA participants, it can be observed that the projects that have been chosen are rather those that reach the “higher classes” meaning very rich and rich, and partly NP/NR. Projects such as: National Health Insurance, loan scheme, micro-credit schemes or road are the projects from which the very rich and the rich will profit the most. It was said during the discussion about wealth classes that the family of a very rich and rich person is covered with NHI, within other
group maybe some members of the family are or nobody. The same situation refers to
the credits schemes – in order to get a loan, you have to be part of a group, be able to
contribute, as well as have the capital to get it. As far as roads are concerned, they are
made for people who can actually use them, so for those with a car, motorbike or a
bicycle, thus very rich, rich and NP/NR. By analyzing the ranking of projects made by
the participants of the focus group discussions, it can be stated that the majority of those
people were the representatives of the NP/NR wealth class. This statement is based on
the observation that the participants of the focus groups were choosing more often
projects that were classified as those that did reach poor people, but the majority of
projects were still targeted at NP/NR. This can be said about PAS-L, the food
distribution project (targeted at the poorest), and tree-planting initiatives. Other projects,
ranked by all participants, were still regarded as those where the very rich and the rich
are the main beneficiaries: schools, clinics or boreholes, as will be evaluated in the
further section of this chapter. During the focus groups, it was not possible to gather the
representatives of all social and wealth classes, and I was able to reach mostly people
considered to be the NP/NR, while during the PDA workshops mostly elites (rich and
very rich, and also some NP/NR) were represented. As such bias influenced the lists of
projects and the rankings, it did not influence the outcome of the poverty assessment
much.
Table 15. Comparison of projects ranked as the best projects during PDA workshops and during the focus groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>North West PDA Men</th>
<th>Kasape Men</th>
<th>North East PDA Men</th>
<th>Gbangu Men</th>
<th>North East PDA Women</th>
<th>Gbangu Women</th>
<th>South PDA Men</th>
<th>Wundua Men</th>
<th>South PDA Women</th>
<th>Wundua Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Health Insurance Scheme</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Borehole</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Establishment of Agric Station</td>
<td>Boreholes</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Health Programmes</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Borroholes</td>
<td>Improvemenent sheep and goats</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Schools built (all kind)</td>
<td>Borroholes</td>
<td>Nutrition Centre (Mobile Small Clinique)</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>Junior High School (JSS);</td>
<td>Livestock Health Management Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Introduction of Maize</td>
<td>Clinic</td>
<td>Nutrition centre</td>
<td>Vaccinations</td>
<td>Health Insurance Scheme</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Borroholes/ water pipes</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Health (Wundua Clinic and Other Weighing Centers)</td>
<td>Facilitate soya beans and groundnuts production;</td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Borroholes</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Loan Schemes</td>
<td>ALAFIA Group</td>
<td>Improvemenent sheep and goats</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>Introduction soya beans</td>
<td>Toilet facilities</td>
<td>Soya</td>
<td>Livestock capacity building of farmers;</td>
<td>Links to Community Rural Banks by SFMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Improvement sheep and goats; Tree Planting</td>
<td>Tree Planting</td>
<td>Shea butter extraction</td>
<td>PASS-L Support</td>
<td>Tree-seedlings</td>
<td>Improvement sheep and goats</td>
<td>Food distribution</td>
<td>Borroholes</td>
<td>Electricity;</td>
<td>Soya</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bullocks’ Distribution</td>
<td>Micro-credit</td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PAS-L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tree planting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HIS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction of cooperation groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2 Comparison of Participatory Poverty Assessments

By comparing the three outcomes of participatory poverty assessment: my research, the PDA research and WB 1995 Report, one can conclude: there are no particular differences in describing wealth classes between those three researches. If it is about the comparison of my research to the outcome of the PDA research, this is not a big surprise, as the same methodology was implemented in the same region and in relatively the same time. The main difference assumed was the targeted population. During the PDA workshops the participants were the representatives of middle- and higher-classes, meaning NP/NR, rich and very rich. My research, apart from its ambition to reach all wealth groups, did not succeed in that point – this will be discussed in details in the further section of this chapter, thus it should be acknowledged that the participants of the focus group discussions were mostly representatives of the NP/NR wealth group, with a few “rich” representatives. The WB Report, by contrast, said that they consulted a range of stakeholders including the poor (although it is not clear how they succeeded to get them involved; and I have my doubts). Yet, apart from this difference, today’s perception of poverty and wealth did not change that much since the early 1990s. It was expected that together with the development of the region, certain problems could be eliminated and thus the image of certain wealth groups would change. Nevertheless, it seems that in the Northern part of Ghana, the development of the region is not that dynamic. Table 13. (in the Appendix) shows the summary of the three Participatory Poverty Assessments: mine, PDA research and WB Report from 1995.

There are only a few differences between the assessment of my research and PDA research. For instance, participants of the PDA workshops said that a very rich person can profit extra from his own borehole by selling water to the poor; or they mentioned that the rich and very rich make use of their social status to ask for land that is idle and often owned by the poor in order to expand their cropped area. Those two things were not mentioned during my research. There are some slight differences if the PDA and my research are compared to the WB Report, such as the fact that according to the WB Report the rich can have up to three hundred cattle or that he makes contributions on behalf of the community for the development of the community. In my research this was the characteristic of a very rich person. Moreover, the WB Report also said that a
NP/NR person does not seek support from other people, while in the two other researches, participants indicated that “sometimes he helps others, but sometimes somebody must help him”. This differences can be caused by the fact that the WB Report did not distinguish the category of a very rich person. Therefore, both very rich and rich people were considered as one category, and the slight differences between those who are very rich and rich has been lost. Moreover, it should be mentioned that the WB Report did not describe the wealth groups as detailed as this research.

During the PDA workshop already certain categories of poverty were distinguished, but the exercise was not complete, thus it lacked some data. Therefore, the participatory poverty assessment for the region is analyzed most thoroughly in my research. All in all, after analyzing the outcome of the three participatory poverty assessments, it can be seen that certain categories can be easily distinguished as the indicators of people’s wealth, such as: means of transport, size of the family, level of education, quality of housing and clothes, eating habits, size of the farm, amount of animals, access to healthcare, scope of the ceremonies, position in the society or state of mind. Table 13 in the appendix, compares and summarizes the three Participatory Poverty Assessments according to those indicators.

5.3 Dynamics of Poverty in the District

Table 16 (in the Appendix) shows us that people’s perception of poverty in the region did not differ much. Poverty existed many years ago, and it is still an unsolved problem. People struggle, especially if they are not part of the privileged social groups, meaning the very rich and rich, who profit from the majority of interventions. Moreover, if we take a closer look at the development and dynamics of poverty in the area, it can be said that, indeed, there were many projects launched in the region across past decades, but together with solving certain issues, some new problems arose. Participants of the PDA workshops were grateful for the projects that took place in the area, and rarely considered a project as “bad” (PDA workshops notes 2008). Yet, they were complaining about some new problems, which appeared across those years, such as declining soil fertility, bush fires or lack of proper watering systems, which would allow them to start i.e. dry-season gardening. Thus, new challenges were identified.
In 1990s, the main identified problem sectors in the region were food security, water, access to health care and education (World Bank 1995: 16). In the rural North, the main source of livelihood was and remains farming. Yet, about 30 years ago, the farmers could produce enough foodstuffs to feed the family throughout the year. Across years, the soils became poorer and farming became less lucrative. Moreover, people could no longer produce enough food to feed the family throughout the year. Thus the women had to start supplementing their household’s food requirement by starting small-business activities. The fact that 71% of the population in the North are peasant farmers should make food security a key to poverty alleviation within the regional development agenda. Nevertheless, apart from many development interventions targeting farmers, like introduction of new species of plants, or promote new ways of farming, the problem still remains unsolved.

The next big problem, mentioned already in the early 1990s, that has not been solved, is access to water. There were many projects launched in the District concerning water security, especially those of NORRIP and CIDA (World Bank 1995: 18; Fieldwork notes 2008), yet access to clean water is still difficult. In 2008, the participants said that, indeed, boreholes were constructed, wells were dug. However, it is still not enough. The existing water sources should be more accessible for all people, as usually those which exist might be too shallow or too far from certain households. What is more, in a dry season some wells dry up, so people still have to walk long distances to the other water sources, further away. By securing access to potable water, many problems can be solved, especially those connected to health care.

In terms of health care though, things seem to be better. But still, participants were highlighting some difficulties in access to health centers, or the fact that NHI is still not accessible for all. What was probably more important, was the fact that because of lack of basic infrastructure – like mentioned before – access to potable water, or other,

---

65 Access to water is particularly difficult for the poor and the very poor, as in some cases you have to pay for using the borehole – especially if it is a private one – as the participants of the PDA workshop mentioned. Moreover, there is usually only a few places where you can fetch the water, so some people have to walk further than the others in the community. In some cases though, this might bring some extra profit for the poor or the very poor. In Gbangu, older women and older men indicated that the very poor profit a lot from boreholes in the community. As an explanation, it was said that they fetch the water and sell it to the very rich or the rich, who do not want to walk further to use the facility.

66 I.e. the existence of only one hospital in the whole District.
like proper waste management, toilet facilities, or food shortage, people are still having health problems. This will not be overcome without solving the other problems first.

In terms of education, in the 1990s participants were complaining that there are not enough schools in the region. Throughout the years, many schools were indeed constructed, yet right now, new problems appeared: overcrowded classrooms, low quality of education, shortage of teachers in schools in the rural areas, and corruption on the higher levels of education. Therefore, apart from many development interventions, initiated across the years, the problems within the same domains remain unsolved. It thus gives this overall impression that actually not much has changed.

Nevertheless, over the years, two main differences have been observed. First, the status of women. In the Report from 1995, the differences in perception of poverty were divided by gender, as “men tended to define poverty in terms of a 'poor man' and women in terms of a 'poor woman’” (World Bank 1995: 11). Such a difference in men’s and women’s perception of poverty was not observed during my meetings. This can be another sign of women’s empowerment and the fact that man and woman are more likely to be considered equal than it used to be a few years ago. The second change observed was mobile phones network development. Nowadays, the mobile phone network managed to cover almost all parts of the country. The development was so fast that there are not enough transmitters and the network is often busy. It does not change the fact that quite a few people in villages have a mobile phone, thus communication is no longer a problem. People can easily contact PAS-L, can contact their relatives in the South, in different villages or those who are abroad, not to mention calling the doctor or an ambulance in case of emergency. Mobile phones are relatively cheap, as well as texting or calling, therefore many people can actually afford them. According to the WB Report, people who are migrating from the villages often cut their ties with the family and the community. Better and easier communication, help with maintaining closer
relations between family members no matter where they are, thus keep the remittances flowing.

5.4 Methodology

Another aim of this thesis was to check the new methodology implemented during the PDA workshops in a different setting. During the PDA workshops certain problems arose, such as the observation that the methodology is biased towards higher- and middle-class. That was the reason why participants chosen for the meetings with me should represent all wealth categories. Therefore, the contact persons were specifically asked to invite “everyone”: younger and older people; men and women; those who are farmers, and those who are traders; those who are members of certain community groups, and those who are not. Moreover, these were preferably people who were not taking part during the PDA workshops. Thanks to such representatives, it was assumed that it would be possible to reach those wealth and social categories that were not present during the PDA workshops, such as “poor” and “very poor” in particular. However, apart from great attendance and a feeling of ‘inclusiveness’ during our meetings, the majority of people were considered to represent the NP/NR class, while those who are poor and very poor were not present. Participants, during the wealth group exercise pointed out that those people are socially excluded, thus hard to reach. A poor person is not well-recognized in the society and is not involved in any social processes either; while a very poor person is not respected by others, neither recognized in the community;, he is not considered in the decision-making processes, nor attending social gatherings; he is isolated and has no friends. Because of such attitude, they were not invited and not even informed about the possibility to join our meeting, even though I specifically asked my contact person to invite “everyone” – meaning representatives of all major social, cultural and wealth categories of the community. My contact person explained that the people who were invited were those who would be able to answer my questions, while “the others”- meaning the poor and very poor – since they are excluded and isolated, are not aware of any development activities in the village. “What is the point to invite them for such meetings, if they cannot contribute in the discussion?” he said. Thus, in such a situation, it is rather clear that these wealth groups are rarely or are not represented in any of the social actions or groups.
The poor and very poor have a limited share or they are excluded from participating in development interventions initiated in the villages. It was also confirmed by the participatory evaluation of the past development projects. The projects, which were ranked as the five best were assumed to be the most profitable for the whole community. This simple assumption was, nevertheless, undermined by the outcome of the workshops. In most cases, these were the very rich people, rich and in few cases NP/NR who benefited the most from the development interventions in the villages. Because the projects were not fully reaching those mostly in need, it will make poverty alleviation even more difficult, especially because the area, as mentioned in Chapter 4, is mostly populated by the poor people. It was often said that "the poor are invisible" – then how can they finally become visible and how can NGOs properly reach these groups, if the society itself isolates and excludes them?

It also has to be mentioned that the research had a few additional assumptions, yet they had to be rejected during the process of collecting data. One of such, attempted to have a mono-ethnic division within focus groups’ participants in every village, in order to check on the ethnic component within understanding poverty. In practice, however, as a result of marriages and migrations, representatives of many ethnic groups live in every village. During our meetings, participants were not regrouped by ethnicity, as it could have been regarded as discrimination or segregation, thus it was impossible to capture the ethnic element in poverty assessment. Moreover, even if the villages would be mono-ethnic, such as Gbangu\textsuperscript{67}, there is the fact that such ‘ethnic’ components would be affected by past migrations activities, thus interaction with many other cultures. Because of these problems, I had to discard this assumption. Furthermore, in practice, I expected another problem with proper representatives within focus groups. Lack of representatives of the poor and very poor was not the only problem. During focus group meetings, in every village two of the participants had also been present during the PDA workshops. Moreover, in all cases, men groups consisted of 20–21 participants, while female groups were more numerous in all villages. It might be partly explained by the time that the meetings took place. October/November is a time for harvesting and farming, so men were busy on their farms. However, since women were also busy with their housewife’s obligations, why then so many women arrived? It might be one of the

\textsuperscript{67} All participants in Gbangu were Mamprusis.
signs of their empowerment, but also curiosity and willingness to actively participate in any social events. They highlighted that the social side of our meeting was very important for them. It gave them an opportunity to network, as it brought participants together, and this may result in new connections and cooperation. Moreover, the meeting with female groups was usually taking place the following day after meeting the men. Therefore, women heard from men that “Sulemima [a white person] is asking some interesting questions”, so they should go and contribute to the discussion. Participating women also pointed out, that they were simply curious about me and the purpose of my research. That was the reason why they decided to come and contribute to the discussion.

5.5 Conclusions of Chapter 5

Northern Ghana is an area where many development interventions were initiated. Together with the development of the region, women became more empowered and almost the whole district was getting mobile phone coverage during the past decade. Both changes are regarded as positive and might contribute to the faster development of the region. Participants were grateful for the projects that took place in the area, however they were complaining that problems within the same domains: agriculture, water, health, and education remain unsolved.

On the level of methodology, it has to be concluded, that in practice, the new methodology is working very well and can be considered as successful. However, it still has a weak point. The main problem observed during the PDA workshops, as well as during the focus group meetings was a bias towards the higher- and middle-class participants, thus a representativeness of all social and wealth groups was not possible to be achieved. Comparison of the list of projects made during the PDA workshops and those made by the participants of the focus groups shows that not only new projects and priorities were identified but also the bias towards elites during the PDA workshops was confirmed. It also influenced the impact evaluation, since the participants of the PDA workshops were more keen to rank the projects that reached mostly the “higher” wealth classes meaning very rich and rich, and partly NP/NR. Certain projects that actually managed to reach the poor, were mentioned only during the focus group discussions, thus by mostly representatives of the NP/NR wealth class. This problem, however, is
very hard to overcome. Since one assumption of the participatory methodology says that local people should actively participate during all stages of the project, me – as an outsider could not judge nor influence the selection of the participants process, but had to rely on the insider/contact person. Often though, the community and its members exclude those who are not able to actively participate and contribute in the social life and the development of the area. Those groups consist mostly of the poor, the very poor, disabled, handicapped – actually those who need help most and moreover, constitute the most numerous wealth group in the area. Power relations and social networks exist in every society but are extremely strong in the African context, so the question whether it is actually possible to reach and include all people, should be answered negatively, at least with this approach.

The bias towards higher wealth classes did not influence, however, the outcome of the poverty assessment. During this exercise, a clear picture of five wealth classes was drawn. Moreover that picture did not differ much from the outcome of the WB PPA from 1995. Not only wealth classes were described in detail, but it was also possible to distinguish the indicators of people’s wealth, such as: means of transport, size of the family, level of education, quality of housing and clothes, eating habits, size of the farm, amount of animals, access to healthcare, scope of the ceremonies, position in the society or state of mind. Since all people are taking those categories into consideration while describing someone’s wealth, they might constitute a good basis for future indicators of measuring the poverty in the area. They will also be helpful in targeting and proper identification of wealth groups while designing a development project. Moreover, they might be useful to identify the potential participants, representatives of all wealth groups, while organizing the follow up meetings for the PDA research in Langbens, thus help to overcome the existing bias towards “higher” wealth classes.

---

68 People strongly rely on each other and support their peers and relatives whenever they can.
Chapter 6. Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter will summarize the results of this research and connect the research questions to the findings of the research. The chapter concludes with recommendations.

Summary

Chapter 5 addressed the main research question: Do the results of the PDA Project at the level of North-West Langbensi reflect the opinions of people at village level if longer and more detailed research at that level takes place? The findings indicated that, apart from many positive sides of the new participatory and holistic methodology, it was not possible to overcome the most common problem related to the participatory methods, meaning a proper representation. Therefore, it is plausible that the assessed impact of development interventions in the area was dominated by the more powerful members and was not reflecting the views of all local wealth groups of the society, but was biased towards elites (during the PDA workshops) and middle class (during my own focus group discussions) groups.

In reference to Sub-Question 1\(^69\), addressed in Chapter 4, the East-Mamprusi District is an area mostly populated by poor people, where many development interventions took place. Participants in the researched communities came up with long lists of development interventions. The majority of projects were initiated by Faith-Based (Christian) NGOs and were related to agriculture, health and education. It was also important to add voices of the youth to the research, as many new projects, especially related to youth and education were identified. When identifying the five best projects, participants tended to rank highly projects related to health, education, water, farm and livestock, food provision, infrastructure as well as PAS-L. It was, however, indicated that these projects primary benefit the very rich, the rich and the NP/NR. During the research process, characteristic of five wealth groups: very rich, rich, NP/NR, poor and very poor.

---

\(^69\) What is the impact of the best projects on five wealth categories in the participating communities?
  a) What are the characteristics of five wealth groups: very rich, rich, not poor/not rich, poor and very poor?
  b) What kind of development projects are present in the area and what are the five best projects?
  c) What is the impact of the five best development projects on five wealth groups?
very poor were assessed. In addition, the indicators of people’s wealth, such as: means of transport, size of the family, level of education, quality of housing and clothes, eating habits, size of the farm, number of animals, access to healthcare, scope of the ceremonies, position in the society, and state of mind were distinguished.

In regard to sub-question 2, a comparison of the list of projects made during the PDA workshops and the one made by the participants of the focus groups confirmed that the participants of the PDA workshops were representing the “local elites”. This bias might also influence the outcome of the impact evaluation exercise, since the participants of the PDA workshops were ranking the projects that reached primarily the “higher” wealth classes, meaning very rich and rich, and partly NP/NR. Certain projects whose impact actually managed to reach the poor were mentioned only during the focus group discussions by representatives of the NP/NR wealth class. This bias did not influence, however, the outcome of the poverty assessment exercise. The picture of five wealth classes did not vary much between the participants of the PDA workshops and the focus groups, nor from the outcome of the WB PPA Report from 1995. As far as the dynamics of poverty are concerned, the findings show that despite many interventions over the years, problems within the same domains: agriculture, water, health, and education remain unsolved, giving the impression that not that much has changed.

In regard to sub-question 3, the findings confirmed the bias towards higher and middle-classes, thus the participants of all meetings were representing mostly NP/NR, 

---

70 Are the members of particular groups of the society sharing the same views about poverty and the impact of development interventions?
   a) What are the main conclusions after PRA workshops?
   b) What are the differences/similarities between lists of projects and made during PDA workshops and focus group discussions?
   c) What are the differences/similarities in the perception about the poverty assessment between PDA research, this research and WB PPA Report?
   d) What are the poverty dynamics in the region?

71 What are the pros and cons of the new methodology?
   a) What is the possible bias?
   b) What are the reasons for possible bias?
   c) Who is included and who is excluded from participating in development projects and the PRA workshops?
   d) Who constitutes the main excluded group?
   e) What are other problems with the participatory impact research?
   f) What does it mean for the methodology and what can be done in order to improve it in the future?
rich and very rich wealth groups. The question thus arises: whether the problem lies in the methodology or in the society? This research project made a strong attempt to reach all wealth groups in the community, however, even in the less formal student-community meeting, it was not possible to overcome the dominating power relations and the problem with social exclusion. Therefore, it can be argued that the problem lies more in the society than in the methodology. Still though, the developing methodology should therefore acknowledge this problem and try to find a solution to overcome the existing biases caused by such social behavior. This is even more important, as the East-Mamprusi District is an area populated mostly by poor people and this wealth group is also the main excluded group. Participants often said that “the poor are invisible” – how do they finally become visible and how can NGOs properly reach these groups, if the society itself isolates them? These questions will be addressed in the recommendation on the issue of methodology section below.

Recommendations

In this thesis it has been argued that a clear definition of poverty and a valid methodology are two major requirements to properly assess poverty and reach the excluded groups. Therefore, the recommendations are given on these two issues.

On the issue of poverty assessment

In order to properly target developmental projects, a proper and widely-accepted definition of the wealth classes is necessary. Lack of such definition leads to the identification of different individuals and groups as poor and consequently influences different policy solutions for poverty reduction. It was important to distinguish five wealth groups: very rich, rich, NP/NR, poor and very poor, as this allowed researchers to capture certain nuances that were lost in the WB PPA Report, especially related to the extreme groups of the very rich and the very poor. It was also important to add voices of the youth by conducting participatory poverty assessment with school children. The outcome of such meetings indicated that children perceive poverty in a very mature way. Furthermore, the categories of people’s wealth were distinguished in a participatory way. Such categories are having a very universal character, as all people at some point analyze the poverty using the same subjective categories. Therefore, it is
actually believed that wealth categories distinguished by the participants of the PDA workshops and the focus groups could be relevant not only in the area of Northern Ghana, but also in other geographical locations. They might well constitute the future indicators for the large-scale surveys, which would measure poverty in a quantitative way.

Dittoh (2008) said, that “poverty is largely time-specific, place-specific and people-specific”. A systematization of the concept of poverty might help in proper identification of beneficiaries, thus improving the targeting of the poorest and most needy groups of a society while designing development projects, hence indirectly alleviating poverty.

**On the issue of methodology**

The new methodology works very well in practice, however it is still not bias-free. The findings confirmed the bias towards higher and middle-classes representatives. The fact of reaching numerous middle-class representatives should be considered a success of this research, however the poor and the very poor people still constituted the main excluded groups. It should be mentioned though, that it happened also because the society itself excludes those people from social life. Since a very clear picture of the poverty in Northern Ghana was produced by this research, these definitions might be used in further research which would use both quantitative as well as qualitative techniques. For that purpose, a survey based on the distinguished categories of poverty could be constructed and conducted in one of the villages. It should then cover the whole village. This will help to identify and map households that belong to one of the five wealth categories, and it minimizes the necessity of working with PAS-L and make the position of a researcher more independent. Afterwards, a qualitative research that would use the same participatory and holistic methodology, could be conducted on the sample groups of people from previously identified (very) poor households. Not only focus group discussions and project ranking exercises would be performed, but it will also involve analysis of life histories of the participants. This perhaps would enable the researcher to identify certain trends and reasons why people in this area are moving in and out of poverty. An additional exercise, should also include school children. The discussion about poverty and development interventions should be prolonged for
another day. Children would receive a home assignment to talk about the wealth groups and development projects with their parents, relatives and neighbors after school. Such an extra input might be a valuable and interesting contribution to already excising and collected data. Above all, the categories of wealth that were distinguished and broadly discussed in this thesis might be useful criteria to identify the potential participants who would represent all wealth groups when organizing PDA follow up meetings in 2010-2011.

There is a concern, however, that it would be still impossible to reach the poor. Even if included in the workshops, the contribution of the poor and very poor will be limited if the discussion is dominated by the “higher classes”. It is hard to determine the local power structures and relations; for that a separate anthropological research is required, by a person who would stay long enough to develop intensive contacts with the (very) poor, and become trusted.

Of course, we should –at the end of this study- add an important remark. On a global scale, even the rich and NP/NR people in Northern Ghana can be considered as poor, and the positive impact of development projects on their lives certainly is also a contribution to the development of this very poor region. Development projects that do not succeed to reach the (ultra) poor in a poor region, are not ‘bad projects’, which ‘failed’. They only failed if their explicit intention had been to reach/include the (very) poor in that particular area. However, as ‘poverty alleviation’ is an explicit goal of many development agencies, it is not enough to alleviate poverty of relatively well-off people (although belonging to the global poor), and hope for their indirect spread effects towards the very poor in the same area. Poor and very poor people should be targeted directly as well, but then they first have to become visible.
References


References


www2.ohchr.org/english/law/pdf/crc.pdf

Http://Users.Fmg.Uva.NL/Kgeest/Pda/Reports.Htm


**Internet Sources**


Other:

PDA Workshops Notes 2008
Fieldwork Notes 2008.
### Appendix

Table 16. Summary of three Participatory Poverty Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wealth Gr.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>My Research</th>
<th>PDA research</th>
<th>WB PPA Report 1995&lt;sup&gt;72&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Rich</td>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>Car, motor, lorry, bicycle</td>
<td>Own vehicles, even trucks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Many wives, many children, go to Mecca</td>
<td>Wives and many children; wives take good care of husband and children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>The majority of children go to school up to Senior High School or University level</td>
<td>Able to educate children very well; pay fees for SSS and tertiary education (or bribe their way in schools for which (high) fees have to be paid, even after children have failed JSS exams)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>A nicely-finished house, with zinc roof, cemented floors and furniture inside</td>
<td>Owns a complete block house with zinc roof; evening: light in the house; own generator; whole house has roofing sheets; high quality doors, borehole on the compound (and some sell water to the poor); rooms all painted; armchairs, ‘real’ beds, TV and generator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>Wearing expensive clothes, having many pairs of sandals and slippers; Muslim women have many nice veils; Children have a few school uniforms</td>
<td>Always high quality; clearly visible that all clothes are expensive; children also have shoes in schools and always nice clothes, often new;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eating habits</td>
<td>Enough food though whole year; using a “modern” kitchen to cook; always something left that can be sold afterwards; buy additional food to supplement the diet with meat and all balanced ingredients.</td>
<td>Always eat three times a day; always fish or meat;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>72</sup> Under this category widows and orphans are classified; in the Report handicapped people were a separate category, yet in this table, there will be added under “very poor” with (*) next to it.
<p>| <strong>Farm</strong> | A large and vast land to farm; using a tractor to plough, employs many people to help him on the field, as his children do not farm; can afford agro-chemicals and fertilizers; is able to buy other farm products when they are cheap, then he stores them and sells later when the price rises | Use tractor (services) for farming; produce high yielding crops; buy large quantities of farm produce at very low prices and store to resell and also transport down south; in the area there is no big difference (yet) between farm families in land entitlements, although the very rich make use of the social custom to ask for land that is idle (often owned by the poor), and expand their cropped area |
| <strong>Animals</strong> | Many different types of animals: he has lots of cattle, sheep, goats, turkeys and fowls and they are all well-kept | Many cattle, sheep and goats; hired shepherds |
| <strong>Health</strong> | Go to the hospital, all family members are covered with National Health Insurance. When the woman is pregnant, she attends regular checkups; small children are also regularly weighted in the hospital | If ill: always go to hospital |
| <strong>Ceremonies</strong> (including funerals) | Perform expensive ceremonies. There is plenty of food and drinks | Lots of people, also from (very) far; lots of food and drinks, many days of drumming and praise saying |
| <strong>Position in the society</strong> | Highly respected and recognized within the community - honored and highly considered in decision making; supports or initiates developmental projects and always contributes enough | well respected (sometimes regarded as above the law because police will not arrest them even if they commit a crime) ; often seen as an arbitrator (resolves conflicts between people); support development projects in community; very generous ones support others |
| <strong>State of mind</strong> | Patient and very quiet; always happy | |
| <strong>Others</strong> | Help the one in need, but sometimes a very rich person cares only for his own affairs and does not help the poor | Buy some commodities from down south to sell up north; some help others; others are greedy and not really respected in the community |
| <strong>Rich</strong> | Transport | Motor, sometimes a car | Own motor bike, sometimes vehicles | Vehicles |
| <strong>Family</strong> | More than one wife and many children, able to visit Mecca | Have many wives and children; takes good care of wife and children; supports wives to get into business | Can support his family, |
| <strong>Education</strong> | Children are properly educated | Send children to SSS or tertiary education, but with problems | |
| <strong>Housing</strong> | A nice and decent house | House is built of blocks and roofed with zinc; always: light in the evenings: candles or torches; no ‘real’ bed; but good mat; floor well plastered; chairs and tables; most houses have roofing sheets, although it may take time to buy them for all structures | A cement block house and owns property including other buildings, grinding mills |
| <strong>Clothes</strong> | Nice and clean clothes, school children have more than one school uniform | High quality, but not as expensive as the very rich; people wear their clothes with confidence (&quot;you can know a rich person by the way he/she walks&quot;) | |
| <strong>Eating habits</strong> | Proper meals, enough food throughout the whole year | Able to feed family daily from own barn | |
| <strong>Farm</strong> | Big farm; use a tractor, bullocks and hands to plough; children help with farming; able to hire few extra people to help | Very large farm sizes; own bullocks, ploughs and other accessories; use fertilizer -&gt; much better crops ; like the very rich, he will make use of the social custom to ask for land that is idle (often owned by the poor), and expand their cropped area; buy agric produce to sell later, but not in large quantities; | |
| <strong>Animals</strong> | Lots of animals – sheep, goats, hens, etc – and they are all well-kept; a few pieces of cattle, if he has cattle at all | Many kraals: can own 40 – 50 cattle; many goats, some sheep | Has cattle, sheep and goats; can have up to three hundred cattle |
| <strong>Health</strong> | Easy access to hospital services, always go to the hospital, if there is such a need; usually whole family is covered with NHI; sometimes prefer to contact traditional healers; pregnant women pay regular visits in the clinic | Modern treatment | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Ceremonies (including funerals)</strong></th>
<th>Highly recognized, but they are not as big as those of the very rich</th>
<th>Last more than one day, long drumming and praise saying; lots of food and drinks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in the society</strong></td>
<td>Highly respected, can cope with his problems on his own</td>
<td>Well respected in the community; everybody agrees with whatever he says</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Makes contributions on behalf of the community for the development of the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of mind</strong></td>
<td>Happy and peaceful-minded.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>Plays role as a middleman</td>
<td>Help others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can support others; helps poor people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not poor/not rich</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td>Bicycle or walk</td>
<td>Some have bicycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>Two wives and about ten children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Not all children go to school, and those who attend schools – they do so up to a certain level (usually up to JSS)</td>
<td>Able to send some of their children to SSS, but children do go to PS and JSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td>A nice, simple house built with mud, which is well-plastered and floored, with thatch roof or half-zinced; with mattresses, but without beds</td>
<td>House is well organized, well roofed with thatch with cemented floors and walls; rooms have doors and windows; no sofa chairs in rooms; mostly: light in the evenings: candles or torches; some stools, no table; often no cement floor; gradually roofs are sheeted, but it takes a long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clothes</strong></td>
<td>Nice clothes: &quot;not good, but better&quot;; always wash their clothes; school children will have only one uniform</td>
<td>Normal clothes, but nothing special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eating habits</strong></td>
<td>Eating twice per day, men are able to provide food for six months from their farms, but for the next six months it is the women who will supply the family with food; diet does not vary much</td>
<td>Feed family though not throughout the year; take care of basic needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Can feed his family adequately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm</strong></td>
<td>Rather small, but it is enough for the family; use bullocks to plough; children are helping, but sometimes they are able to hire somebody to help with ploughing and weeding</td>
<td>Always has seeds for planting; may share a bullock to form a span for ploughing and other farm work; balanced selling and buying of farm produce;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bullock and two ploughs, he does not work on other people's farms. He does his own farming. He plants his own seeds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animals</strong></td>
<td>Has livestock, but mostly few sheep, goat, fowls – no cattle</td>
<td>Own few small ruminants (1 – 7); own goat/sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A few sheep of about twenty (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Average health; the family is partly covered with NHI; pregnant women are going to the hospital for check-up; more often experience child mortality</td>
<td>Mixed treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceremonies</strong></td>
<td>Recognized by the community, but they are rather basic, but can be performed without or with just little support from their relatives</td>
<td>Many people come, but mainly from around, day long drumming and praise saying; enough food and drinks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(including funerals)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in the society</strong></td>
<td>Respected, attends social gatherings and takes part in decision making processes; trustworthy - is able to borrow money from other people and is able to pay them back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of mind</strong></td>
<td>Depends on the season – during the first part of the year (when he has enough food) - happy, while during the second half (when there is no food) – sad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>Sometimes helps others, but sometimes somebody must help him</td>
<td>Can support other relations in times of need (where there are no resources to support he is always physically present in times of crisis); beg others for help in difficult years, but not during normal years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He does not seek alms from other people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor</strong></td>
<td>Walks to the destination, but with shoes on</td>
<td>Mostly walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td>One wife and many children, cannot take proper care of his family - children look dirty, have un-kept hair</td>
<td>Have children but often cannot take care of them; give children to others to be taken care of when they are in school (if children go to school); hire children out to others to herd cattle (shepherds); cannot feed himself and family all year round; eat seeds for sowing and rely on others for planting seeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>Cannot afford children’s education; sometimes, it is possible to send only one or two children to school, but problems with paying tuition fees, buying books or school uniform</td>
<td>Children drop out of school in difficult times (labor needed; children hungry; bad clothes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>A small compound house with roof from grass, with no furniture; the rooms are floored but the yard is not</td>
<td>Dilapidated house walls not well plastered; thatch for roofing not properly made; no mats to sleep on; only stalks; floor not cemented; no roof sheets, unless grown-up children go ‘down south’ and send money to buy sheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes</td>
<td>Wearing second-hand and torn clothes</td>
<td>Try to keep clothes tidy, but not easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating habits</td>
<td>Usually eat once per day or there is no food at all; rely on “seasonal eating schemes” which means that in a lean season they are out of food and they have to look for support</td>
<td>Beg for help/food in lean season; Cannot feed his family and has to suffer for everyday's food because he cannot store food for the following day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>Small farms, plough by hand, occasionally with bullocks; don’t have enough seeds to grow enough food, and their land productivity is very low</td>
<td>Use hoes for farming; can sometimes afford to organize work parties of tillers using hoes; occasionally sell crops, but at the ‘wrong’ moments with low prices; He cannot establish his own farm because he has no food to eat to go to farm. He ends up working on other people's farm ‘by-day’ to earn a little to feed his family and himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>Just a few fowls or hens</td>
<td>Have a few poultry: some (guinea) fowls; maybe one goat and do not keep them for long because always selling them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Cannot access quality health care, nor provide health care for expected and nursing mothers; when the person is sick, he cannot afford hospital fees</td>
<td>Mainly use traditional medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceremonies</td>
<td>Only perform the “obligatory” ceremonies; need a support from others in order to perform them; the ceremonies are basic - there is not much food, not many people come to sympathize with the family, there is no dancing, no drumming</td>
<td>Not much food and only limited drumming/music (to be paid!), unless assisted by family and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in the society</strong></td>
<td><strong>Do not participate in other ceremonies either, as they are “hiding and isolating themselves”; community do not count him among others - not well-recognized in the society and is not involved in decision making processes; not respected - cannot borrow money from anyone, as he is not able to pay the money back</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of mind</strong></td>
<td><strong>Always sad, and there is no peace, nor happiness for them at all</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td><strong>Children often cry and are jealous, as they do not have things that their colleagues have, therefore they steal sometimes</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very Poor</strong></td>
<td><strong>If he goes somewhere, he walks bare foot</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td><strong>Always walking (but not getting far; the very poor often consist of handicapped and old people; you may find them on the local markets on market days, begging)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family</strong></td>
<td><strong>A single and lonely person: widows, or widowers, older person with no one to take care of him/her, a divorced wife (may be with a child); a bachelor man; handicapped or people with some mental disorders. Those without families, with no relatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Old women and men without children or anybody to take care of them are very poor. Also young widows who have not remarried and have small children who cannot earn a living; handicapped people</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td><strong>If a very poor woman has children, they will not go to school at all</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Often do not send children to school</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Does not own his own house, but attaches himself to someone else, where he can find a room or a small piece of floor to sleep</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Sometimes have no place to sleep; if he has a house, it is dark in the evenings, no candles or torches; dilapidated house; shack; nothing in the house; sleep on stalks on bad floors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clothes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Wears torn and dirty second-hand clothes, that were given to him by others</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Difficulty in getting clothing; dirty, torn clothes of men, women and children</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Do not have good clothes to wear; their dresses have to be given to them by somebody</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Eating habits** | Has to beg for food; only one meal per day or eat nothing at all, and usually he goes sleep hungry | Begging for food and help even before the lean season starts; depend on others for meals most of the time; do often not eat supper during lean season, or even before; no bought vegetables in the sauce, only those collected in the bush | They always need support; People give them food to eat because they cannot work, they are begging for food*
The blind people do not know the type of food they eat nor the water they drink* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farm</strong></td>
<td>Rarely in possession of land. If he has a farm, it is very small and not very well-kept; does not have money to do the proper farming, so his land is not fertile any more</td>
<td>Very poor crop harvest because of no resources to farm; only use hoes for farming; do not have crops to sell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animals</strong></td>
<td>Do not keep any animals</td>
<td>Have no poultry or livestock</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health</strong></td>
<td>Often affected by diseases; does not have access to proper health care and he can’t pay hospital fees himself</td>
<td>If children are sick they never can go to hospital or clinic, depend on herbs and roots;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ceremonies (including funerals)</strong></td>
<td>Not able to organize any ceremonies</td>
<td>Few people are coming and paying respect; hardly any drumming (too expensive) and praise saying (but depends on family; they may assist with food, drinks and some cash, but often social relationships are limited)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position in the society</strong></td>
<td>Not respected by others and also not recognized in the community as a proper member of the society, not considered in the decision-making processes; he is isolated and has no friends</td>
<td>Always isolated from others in society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State of mind</strong></td>
<td>Always very sad, but peaceful</td>
<td>Do not often look cheerful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td>Completely dependent on other people in every aspects of his life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>