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Abstract

Social capital is an important prerequisite for development however the form it assumes is one which has to be understood well by development practitioners. A lot of interest in social capital has been generated recently particularly in the Pacific as social relations in between people and various societal institutions in these islands are in many ways influenced by ethno linguistic affiliations. Only when these relationships between development agents and beneficiaries are understood in their local context can one truly appreciate it as a form of social capital. Hence, the term ‘wantokism’ which relates to social relations between people sharing similar ethno linguistic ties becomes an interesting topic of discussion in especially in the heterogeneous Melanesian countries of the Pacific. This subject is discussed in this thesis through comparing social relations between actors in two separate communities in Papua New Guinea.

The Buna community school project and Kokoda hospital project in the Oro Province of Papua New Guinea are examples of projects that involved a wide variety of people from all sectors of the community. The Kokoda project funded jointly by the Papua New Guinea and Australian government under the Australian War Graves office was successfully completed and is fully operational while the Buna project funded by the Japanese government under its Japanese International Cooperation Agency program was not completed. In a society where trust and cooperation among wantoks is expected to a higher degree this research explores this issue in both this projects and whether or not the lack of it or abundance in one may have contributed to its failure or success.

Through consultation with project board members, community members, provincial and district government personnel at both these locations this research raises the question of whether there is trust and cooperation between project boards and the wider community prior to and during the project work. More importantly it raises the question of whether there is trust and cooperation on the basis of wantokism. This thesis shows that the strong
bonding social capital inherent in wantokism is clearly exemplified in both communities. However, there was minimal trust among board members and the local community, and a lack of bridging social capital in particularly Buna which affected its ability to access resources from outside sources. In contrast, there was a higher level of bridging social capital, and better trust and cooperation between board members and the local community at Kokoda. Drawing together from firstly, a theoretical analysis of social capital, ethnicity and wantokism and secondly, from qualitative and quantitative research in these two communities, it reaches conclusions about the extent to which wantokism could be a form of social capital.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Introduction

Wantokism or the wantok system, as it is sometimes known as, is a term commonly used in the Melanesian countries of the South Pacific, in reference to a system of social relations between groups of individuals, who are have shared ethno-linguistic ties. People who share social relations and have common ethno-linguistic ties are called wantoks, whilst those that do not share these ties are called non wantoks or outsiders. Amongst other important factors for strengthening and sustaining these relationships are the notions of trust and cooperation. Wantokism thrives on the fact that the actors involved are willing to trust and cooperate with each other. This willingness to be involved in collective action is often influenced by cultural obligations, as the discussions in this thesis will demonstrate.

The social relations, which characterise wantokism, can also be considered a significant cultural factor that has the ability to nurture the growth of social capital (De Renzio and Kavanamur, 1999). Fukuyama (1995: 26) explained the significance of cultural factors and he specifically outlined the importance of trust, which he defined as “the expectation of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms.” He added that social capital, which is the ability of people to engage in collective action to achieve common goals, “arises from the prevalence of trust in a society.” and “requires habituation to the moral norms of a community and the acquisition of virtues like loyalty, honesty and dependability.” The presence of these virtues in wantokism allows the actors to trust and cooperate with each other.

Social capital, as a development issue, has generated a great deal of interest in recent times. Coleman (1999: 16) described it as “the structure of relations between actors and among actors” that encouraged productive activities. Putnam (1993: 167), in his research relating to two contrasting communities in Italy, described social capital as being in the form of “norms of reciprocity and networks of civic engagement” in an organisation,
group or society. The term could be used to describe the "complex relationship of norms, reciprocity and civic engagement that together are thought to promote trust and sustain societal cooperation" (Reilly and Phillpot, 2002: 906). Social capital not only forms and functions at the individual, group and organisational level, but it also permeates and transcends the political and geographic boundaries of nation states.

It is argued that societies that have a large stock of social capital function more efficiently, in the sense that they are able to solve the problems of collective action because their members have a high degree of reciprocal trust and cooperation. Sometimes, this reciprocated trust is confined only to a particular group and this creates distrust within those groups that are not part of this group, for example criminal gangs (Gambetta, 1993). This creates 'bonding social capital', where members of a group are willing to trust and engage in collective action only with members of their own group. In contrast, 'bridging social capital' is formed when members are willing to reach beyond their own groupings, in order to form bridging networks with those outside their own group. There is a wider sphere of trust and cooperation in this type of relationship (Fukuyama, 2000).

Both types of social capital have advantages and disadvantages and these will be visited in this thesis, during discussions on wantokism in Chapter Three. In the localities chosen for this study, a form of social capital has developed, which demonstrates characteristics of both bonding and bridging social capital, depending on the cultural setting and behaviours of the actors involved. Towards the latter part of this thesis, this will be referred to as 'local social capital'. Whilst people give primary loyalty to their own wantok group, this does not stop them from associating with outsiders. However, these outside associations are formed out of the need to access outside resources and they do not in any way diminish loyalty to their original group.
In an ethno-linguistically diverse society, such as Papua New Guinea (PNG), it is useful to gain a very clear and concise understanding of its complex social relations, which are often based on wantokism as it often forms the primary basis for social mobilisation. In the traditional rural setting, the definition of wantokism, presented at the beginning of this chapter, is more appropriate. Nevertheless, PNG is a changing society and therefore the original geographic, ethnic and linguistic affiliation, which characterised wantoks, now has a wider definition. Nowadays, the term is also used to refer to social relations in the urban environment. Wantokism in the urban setting could be described as a “system of relationships between individuals having a common language (wantok = one talk), common kinship group, common geographical area of origin, common social associations or religious groups” (De Renzio and Kavanamur 2000: 42). In the more traditional rural setting, people are wantok (one talk) by definition. The research for this thesis concentrates on wantoks, as defined in the traditional sense. Being a local person, I have noticed that, despite this change in definition in the urban setting, ethnic and linguistic affiliation still represents an important form of social capital for individuals and groups in PNG, generally in the form of kinship connections.

The discussions in this thesis will illustrate how the presence or absence of trust and cooperation, which are important aspects of social capital, has affected social relations amongst people who are wantoks and non wantoks in two local communities in Papua New Guinea. The significance of wantokism, as a form of social capital and its contribution to development theory and practice, has yet to be fully understood and appreciated. This thesis seeks to provide a contribution to this issue.

This introductory chapter is presented in five parts. Firstly, the research objectives for this thesis will be outlined. Secondly, it discusses the research questions and strategies used to achieve the above mentioned research objective. Thirdly, the rationale behind choosing wantokism and social capital, as a research topic, is articulated. Fourthly, the key concepts used in this thesis are defined and fifthly an outline of the thesis chapters concludes the chapter.
Situating the research objectives

In Papua New Guinea, wantokism can be seen as a form of social capital, since it embodies and provides a system of social relations, which in turn provides opportunities for cooperation and trust. In one of the few studies on social capital and wantokism in PNG, De Renzio and Kavanamur (1999: 42) noted, “The wantok system is a salient feature of social organisation in PNG” it also “constitutes a source of social capital since first of all it is embedded in social relations, and second because it provides opportunities for trust, cooperation and mutual benefit.” They argued that there was a high degree of social capital, which could be found lurking in social relationships that were defined along the lines of clans and family groupings. They acknowledged the importance of traditional social structures as important components of development in PNG and they showed how these close knit relationships fostered collective action.

However, their research did not provide a clear understanding of the extent to which these bonded relationships influenced new development initiatives. Their research also focused more on traditional social structures and it portrayed the extent to which the diverse traditional and ethnic social structures of PNG affected the type of social capital which has evolved and it focuses on a setting where interaction only occurs amongst wantoks. Thus their research does not offer any clear insights into issues that could surface in a contemporary PNG society setting, where actors involved are both wantoks and non wantoks. Their research does, however, offer important insights into problems that societies, with diverse ethnic social structures, can pose on the development of social capital.

In contemporary PNG society, there is an increasing number of children going through formal education, in addition to rural urban migration, the forming of political alliance groups and an increase in the mixture of people working in the private sector, the public sector and the informal sector, which means that relationships and social networks, between individuals and groups, are going beyond wantoks to include work mates, political affiliates, members of sports groups, school mates, and other civic organisations.
These different networks of civic engagement all have a significant bearing on the outcomes of development projects and programmes.

The objectives of this research, therefore, was to understand the social relations amongst two different ethnic communities in PNG and to examine, in particular, trust and cooperation issues amongst actors who could be identified as wantoks and non wantoks and to observe the extent to which these relations influenced the outcome of the two projects chosen for this study.

**Research question and strategy**

The key research question to be addressed was ‘To what extent does trust and cooperation, which are important values in wantokism and social capital, influence the outcome of development projects?’ At the beginning of this chapter, I mentioned that trust and cooperation are important factors that sustain the social relations which characterises wantokism and social capital. As Putnam (1995) described it ‘since trust is so central in the theory of social capital, it would be desirable to have strong behavioural indicators of trends in social trust...’ In this research I have attempted to analyse indicators that depict trust and cooperation within the communities chosen for this study.

Much social, political and economic activity, at the local level, is performed by different actors, who may or may not be wantoks. The degree of trust and cooperation amongst these different actors and the extent to which their social relations can impact on collective action is not well understood. There is a popular understanding in PNG that it is better to trust and work with your wantoks than with outsiders, since this will increase the chances of collective action and promote trust and cooperation. It would perhaps be useful if there had been more studies conducted which particularly investigated how wantokism impacted on collective action. This research will therefore attempt to establish the impact of wantokism on collective action. Previous research on this topic has been undertaken by Kavanamur and De Renzio(1999), Reily and Phillpot (2002) and Larmour
The research relating to this thesis intends to further develop this work and to replicate some of Putman's approaches in his study of democracy in Italy, but in this case it was conducted within a local context in the Oro Province of PNG.

Rationale for the research

PNG, with a population of approximately over five million people, represents an extreme case of ethnic fragmentation in which a large number of ethnic groups are included within the state "with no single group dominant" (May, 1996: 10). These groups are "both small and multiple" (Regan, 1995: 9) and "its people are fragmented into hundreds of often mutually antipathetic ethnic groupings" (Hegarty, 1979: 188). There are approximately "840 distinct languages spoken in PNG alone" (Reilly, 2000: 170) and this reflects enormous cultural differences. PNG is arguably a very heterogeneous society. At the root of these social structures are clans and tribal groupings (wantok), which sometimes form the primary unit of social and political loyalty. It is sometimes said that PNG is so ethnically fragmented that there is no sense of national unity (Anere, 1998).

As a result of such fragmentation, development initiatives, which require collective action, can sometimes be difficult to achieve. For development initiatives to progress successfully there needs to be a better understanding of the complex social relations and connections and the extent to which these social relations and connections can positively or negatively affect development initiatives. As the notion of wantokism is at the heart of these social relations and connections, a deeper understanding of the concept is therefore required. It is acknowledged that wantokism has a complexity of intertwined definitions and it can also be contextual (Larmour, 2000). An understanding of this situation can provide the platform for its usage as an effective form of social capital.

Frequently, in a country such as PNG, a smile and a handshake with a leader or leaders of a community, where development projects or programmes are implemented, does not imply a smooth and efficient flow of goods and services. Sometimes, desired outcomes
are not met, simply because of the poor understanding of the people themselves, who are supposed to be the primary beneficiaries of the project. People who are primary beneficiaries of a desired programme have to be involved from the beginning and this, amongst other factors, implies an understanding of their strengths, weaknesses and vulnerability factors, which are part of such social relationships. From the very beginning, trust has to be established amongst all stakeholders. Gambetta (2000: 216) defined trust as:

\[
a \text{a particular level of the subjective probability with which an agent assesses that an agent or a group of agents will perform a particular action, both before he can monitor such action and in a context in which it affects his own action. When we say we trust someone, or that someone is trustworthy, we implicitly mean that the probability that he will perform an action that is beneficial or at least not detrimental to us is high enough for us to consider engaging in some form of cooperation with him.}
\]

La Porta et al (1999: 311) shared similar views on trust and suggested that “higher trust between people in a population should be associated with greater cooperation”.

Development in various forms is stated to have been successfully or unsuccessfully implemented, depending on the manner in which the actors involved have interacted amongst themselves. Where there is a high level of trust and cooperation amongst the actors, the group can enjoy a greater degree of social cohesion (Woolcock and Narayan, 2002). Putnam (1993: 36) further suggested that “working together is easier in a community blessed with a substantial stock of social capital”. The social capital theory lies at the heart of understanding what Coleman (1999: 16) described as “the structure of relations between actors and among actors” that encourages productive activities. In PNG, wantokism is intertwined with all the day to day activities of people. It is for this reason that this research attempts to understand the extent to which these social relationships, amongst certain stakeholders and particularly board members and ordinary villagers, was able to affect the outcome of two separate development projects.
The research for this thesis was conducted in Oro Province, which is amongst the least developed provinces in PNG (Connell, 1997). Given that development projects have been few in this area, it is important that, when they are initiated, they should be completed successfully and also be sustainable. Being a local person, I have noticed some excellent development projects being started in the province but unfortunately they became unsustainable after a few years. One of the rationales behind the undertaking of this research is to shed light on a development issue in the province, which has not been significantly researched. Wantokism, as stated earlier, is an important part of PNG culture. The network of relations, which characterise it, could be used as a form of social capital, but only research into such areas can shed light on its contribution to development theory and practice. Research into the real contribution of social capital to development in Oro Province is very limited and although mentioned in other related research (Reilly and Phillpot, 2002; Barker, 1996) none of the research conducted has confined itself to the issue of wantokism and social capital in the province. This research, therefore, sets the foundation for further research.

**Defining the boundaries of the research**

Despite the diversity of definitions offered for social capital, the cross over ideas suggest that it is an aspect of social organisation that links together all spheres of life, which then influence each other. These definitions are further elaborated in Chapter Two. Distinct issues arise from this situation and they involve norms, values and traditions which promote cooperation and reciprocity and networks within relationships and organisations that bring people together to solve common problems (Portes and Sensenbrenner, 2001). Trust is central to the notion of social capital. “Trust is probably the main component of social capital and social capital is a necessary condition of social integration...”and it is trust that makes it possible to maintain peaceful and stable social relations that are the basis of collective behaviour and productive cooperation” (Newton, 2001: 202). Fukuyama (1995: 26) also suggested that “social capital arises from the prevalence of trust in a society”. Newton (2001: 204) defined trust as “the willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence” Gambetta (2000) suggested that actors in
society are willing engage in cooperative behaviour, when they are able to trust each other. This situation, as discussed previously, is central to the building up of social capital.

Wantokism could be seen as a form of social capital, since it provided an avenue for all of the above to take place. Actors were willing to engage in cooperative behaviour, on the basis that trust had been established between individuals or groups. The traditional definition of wantok was a group of people who shared the same geographic, linguistic, ethnic affiliation (Turnbull, 2002). PNG society has changed over the years, due to increased communication and exchanges, urged on by the process of urbanisation and nation building. This has meant that inter-community cultural barriers were being overcome (De Renzio, 2000; Reilly and Phillpot, 2002). Wantoks were no longer just those people who spoke the same language or came from the same geographical area or were related through kin networks, it also now included those outside of this network. Wantokism, in contemporary PNG society, could now be described as a system of relationships between individuals, who were characterised by either having “common linguistic backgrounds, a kinship group, geographical area, social associations or religious groups” (De Renzio, 2000: 42). This research was conducted in a village environment, where a great many people were wantoks in the traditional sense and therefore any reference to wantoks in the latter discussion chapters will refer to this fact.

In traditional PNG society, wantoks played a significant part in shaping the course of progress and development. In contemporary PNG society, development has taken on a whole new meaning. It no longer just involves the burning of bushes for gardening or the building of canoes for sailing. Development now implies access to health services, building schools, constructing factories, building dams and the list goes on. Often, when someone talks about a lack of development, s/he will be referring to the lack of accessing such services. In this research, it is the extent to which the people, in the communities concerned, have benefited from their respective projects that should give them a measure
of access to these services. They will have experienced development if they have adequately had access to these services.

Wantokism is closely associated with the issue of ethnicity and development, particularly in the Melanesian countries of the South Pacific. The results from this research were obtained from conducting research in two rural communities in PNG. However, they can also be safely applied to similar relationships in Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands.

Thesis outline

This chapter offers an introductory insight into the thesis. Chapter Two introduces the theoretical ideas related to social capital, development and ethnicity. This chapter provides a theoretical framework for the importance of ethnicity as a form of social capital. Primary ideas, put forward by Putnam, are discussed, particularly those relating to networks of civic engagement outside of ethnic circles. The arguments, debating the importance of ethnicity as a form of social in development, are reviewed and seen in relation to wantokism.

Chapter Three discusses the pioneering work on wantokism, which has been undertaken in the Pacific and Papua New Guinea. Recommendations for further research and the findings of similar research, which outline the relationship between wantokism as a form of social capital and development, are discussed. In addition, an analysis is provided of the proxy indicators of social capital used in the research for this thesis.

The fieldwork methodology used is discussed in Chapter Four. Societies in PNG are very ethnically fragmented as each province has its own cultural practices which may affect the type of field work methodology used. In Chapter Four the physical, cultural and cultural context of PNG and particularly Oro Province is introduced and the manner in
which these contexts challenge the theoretical and practical arguments put forward, in the preceding chapters, is discussed.

Since the field work consists of a comparison of two communities which had projects run by different donor agencies, Chapter Five introduces the two communities and furthermore Chapter Six presents the research findings, together with a comparative analysis. Chapters Five and Six offer the practical basis upon which this thesis addresses the research question. A summary of findings, together with recommendations for further research in the area, are presented in Chapter Seven.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Perspectives on Social Capital, Ethnicity and Development

Whereas economic capital is in people's bank accounts and human capital is inside their heads, social capital inheres in the structure of their relationships (Alejandro Portes, 1998: 4)

Introduction

This chapter presents various views on social capital and continues with a discussion relating to how social capital discourse intertwines with issues of ethnicity, family and kinship. The first part of this chapter introduces perspectives from various theorists on social capital discourse. In the next section of this chapter, the negative and positive connotations for the development of social capital, in social relations based on ethnicity, are discussed. Issues of ethnicity are closely related to wantokism and as such these discussions highlight issues which are somewhat similar. These discussions also set a theoretical basis which will be referred to in the following chapters. Amongst other factors, social capital and ethnicity also have a significant impact on development initiatives. Issues, such as productivity, governance, participation and social cohesion are important components of the social capital and development discourse. In the final section of this chapter, these will be discussed, in light of their influence on development projects.

Social Capital

Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. Bourdieu (1985: 248) defined social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition". Increasing evidence shows that social cohesion is critical, in order for societies to prosper economically and for development to be sustainable (Coleman, 1988). Coleman (1988: 98) identified social capital as having "a variety of entities with
two elements in common: They all consisted of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitated certain action of actors—whether persons or corporate actors—within the structure”. Baker (1990: 619) defined the concept as “a resource that actors derive from specific social structures and then use to pursue their interests; it is created by changes in the relationship among actors”. Burt (1992: 9) saw it as “friends, colleagues, and more general contacts through whom you receive opportunities to use your financial and human capital”. The general consensus from these various views is that “social capital stands for the ability of actors to secure benefits by virtue of membership in social networks or other social structures” (Portes, 1998: 2).

The approaches mentioned above focus on “the potential benefit accruing to actors because of their insertion into networks or broader social structures” (Portes, 1998: 18). Putnam (1993) provided a different approach to this thinking and associated social capital with the level of civicness in communities, such as towns, cities, or even entire countries. For Putnam, social capital included “features of social organizations, such as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit.” It was not just comprised of various institutions that made up a society but it was that which held them together. Putnam wrote further that “working together is easier in a community blessed with a substantial stock of social capital” (Putnam, 1993: 35–36).

The concept of social capital has attracted widespread interest amongst various development agencies around the world. The World Bank, amongst others, has taken a keen interest in social capital theory, in its bid to explain development. Similar to the earlier definitions of social capital, the world bank defined it as “the informal rules, norms and long-term relationships that facilitate co-ordinated action and enable people to undertake co-operative ventures for mutual advantage” (The World Bank, 1997: 14) It is sometimes described as the ‘missing link’ in development (Grootaert, 2001; Harris and De Renzio, 1997; World Bank, 1997).

When faced with development dilemmas, social capital refers to the norms and networks that enable collective action. Increasing evidence shows that social cohesion — social
capital — is critical for poverty alleviation and sustainable human and economic development. The World Bank has realised the importance of social capital in development work. The Social Capital Implementation Framework (SCIF) was developed by the World Bank, in order to incorporate the concept of social capital in its operations, particularly those operations that involved community action and it would also provide guidance to other development agencies when they incorporated social capital theory into practice (World Bank, 2008).

One view of social capital is that it is a set of horizontal relationship between people, social networks and the norms associated with these relationships, which then foster coordination and cooperation. This type of relationship is often closed and dense (Gambetta, 1993; Portes and Sensenbrenner, 1993). Coleman (1990) argued that dense social networks made enforcement of group cooperative behaviour more effective. “Closed networks allow sanctioning and monitoring to become powerful features to spread norms and guide people’s behaviour towards collectivity” Coleman (1990: 95). Beugelsdijk and Smulders (2004: 4) noted that “dense networks may provide useful resources such as improved quality of information, a means for control, influence and power and a closed network may encourage compliance with local, sometimes implicit rules and customs and reduce the need for formal monitoring”. This is also known as “localised social capital or bonding social capital” (McAslan, 2002: 141).

There is, however, some negativity associated with this type of relationships. Putnam (2000: 22) described bonding social capital as “occurring among homogenous populations. It is often parochial and only benefits those with internal access”. Portes and Landholt (1996) mentioned a “down side” to this type of relationships. They pointed out that this type of association could form communities and groups or networks which are isolated, parochial, or working at cross-purposes to society's collective interests (for example drug cartels, corruption rackets) and this could actually hinder economic and social development. Another negative aspect of bonding social capital is that “the very factors which promote its development such as tight bonds of solidarity may ultimately
prevent its entrepreneurial members from reaching their full potential” (Putnam, 2000: 23). This is because the members are held back by community and family demands and cannot access resources which would be available to them through the forging of ties with those in the wider society.

A much wider understanding of social capital encompasses both horizontal and vertical associations between people and includes ‘within’ and ‘amongst’ institutions in society. This view recognises that it is better to have bridging ties that transcend various social divides, such as religions and ethnicity that then facilitate access to outside assistance, which otherwise would not have been available, if people confined themselves to their horizontal associations alone. Vertical capital is also known as bridging social capital (McAslan, 2002: 141). Putnam (2000) defined bridging social capital as the bonds of connectedness that are formed across diverse social groups.

Putnam (2000) argued that when people are able to break away from their closed networks and the demands placed on them by their internal groups, they can become successful: In other words, they are forming bridging social capital. Bonding social capital is good for “getting by” but bridging social capital is good for “getting ahead” (Putnam, 2000: 23). This means that strong networks support immediate needs but, without bridging capital, participants miss out on the necessary resources to get ahead. This view is supported by a ‘structural holes’ theory mentioned by Burt (1992), where he argued that individuals, who are able to have connections and networks with those outside, are able to hold an advantage over others in their closed networks, who do not have a wider connection. A structural hole, which appears as a result of a closed network or a groups’ inability to have connections and access to outside resources, is filled by the individual who has these bridging networks. In Burt’s view, bridging social capital improves access to information and leads to improved outcomes for the group, even if the individual who fills the structural hole is the person most able to obtain this gain.
When adopting this view of "structural holes", I use the term local social capital in this thesis when referring to social relationships of trust and cooperation, based on extended family ties within a particular indigenous community. These have, to a greater extent, demonstrated traits of bonding social capital. There is bonded solidarity and norms of reciprocity and enforceable trust governing the relationships. Individuals within the group are able to access resources from outsiders, thus filling in the structural holes, referred to by Burt (1992,) but primary loyalty still remains with their ethnic group. The individual forms relationships and s/he accesses resources from outside, in order to enhance the status of the group and not him/her self. These networks formed outside are only temporary and not sustained and they only serve to access information and resources. This local social capital is a significant character of wantokism in PNG and it will be discussed further in the next chapter.

The broadest and most encompassing view of social capital includes the social and political environment that shapes social structure and enables norms to develop (North, 1990). This analysis extends the importance of social capital to the most formalised institutional relationships and structures, such as government, the political regime, the rule of law, the court system, and civil and political liberties. This view not only accounts for the virtues and vices of social capital, and the importance of forging ties within and across communities, but it also recognises that the capacity of various social groups, to act in their own interests, depends crucially on the support (or lack thereof) that they receive from the state, in addition to the private sector. For Robert Putnam, who is the most prominent advocate of this approach, social capital means "features of social organizations, such as networks, norms, and trust that facilitate action and cooperation for mutual benefit." (Putnam, 1993: 36).

Sobel (2002: 146) suggested that "when people decide how to behave, they take into account the social, economic and legal implications of their actions. These implications depend on the environment in which people make their choices". Similarly, the state depends on social stability and widespread popular support. In short, economic and social
development thrives when representatives of the state, the corporate sector and civil society create forums in and through which they can identify and pursue common goals.

Fukuyama (2000: 5) pointed out that “an area where governments probably have the greatest ability to generate social capital is in the education sector. Educational institutions do not simply transmit human capital; they also pass on social capital in the form of social rules and norms. This is true not just in primary and secondary education, but in higher and professional education as well.”

Trust and Cooperation as elements of Social Capital

Certain studies on social capital and trust (Gambetta, 1988; Coleman, 1990; Putnam, 1993 and Fukuyama, 1995) have argued that performance of societal institutions is determined by trust or social capital. Putnam (1993) examined social capital as determining the performance of local governments across Italy. He argued that there was a high tendency to trust and engage in cooperative behaviour in areas where there was greater participation in civic activities. Fukuyama (1995) argued likewise, that higher trusting relationships amongst citizens accounted for a higher performance of all institutions in society, including firms. La Porta et al (1999: 311) shared similar views on trust and suggested that “higher trust between people in a population should be associated with greater cooperation”. Trust is probably the main component of social capital and social capital is a necessary condition of social integration. Newton (2001: 202) went on to suggest that “it is trust that makes it possible to maintain peaceful and stable social relations that are the basis of collective behaviour and productive cooperation”.

Gambetta (2000) suggested that actors in society were willing to engage in cooperative behaviour, when they were able to trust each other. This situation, as previously discussed, is central to the build up of social capital. “Cooperation is meant in a broad sense of agents such as individuals, firms and governments, agreeing on any set of rules which is then to be observed in their course of action” (Gambetta, 2000: 213). When
people participated and engaged with each other, the more they learned to trust each other and this situation sustained cooperation. Trust and cooperation were important elements in social capital and they could be dependent on each other. Woolcock (1998: 1002) supported this view. He argued that “if cooperators expect other people to cooperate, they are more likely to engage in cooperative endeavours, setting in motion a ‘virtuous circle’ in which cooperation promotes trust and trust promotes cooperation”.

**Ethnicity**

Ethnic relations frequently arise in discussions relating to social capital. In all facets of a society’s social, political and economic interactions, ethnic ties form an excellent basis for actors to mobilise people, in order to pursue their shared goals and objectives. Ethnicity refers to “a group’s commonality of ancestry and history through which people have evolved shared values and customs over the centuries”. (McGoldrick & Garcia-Preto, 2005: 2) Usually, it is cultural background which is referred to here. Adrich and Waldinger, 1990: 112) explained that where an ethnic group was identified, “it implies that members of have some awareness of group membership and a common origin and culture, or that others think of them as having these attributes”. Ethnicity, as Fenton (2000: 24) stated, refers “to the way in which social and cultural difference, language and ancestry combine as a dimension of social action and social organisation, and form a socially reproduced system of classification”. It is the social mobilisation of ethnic ties and the social significance of ancestry, language and culture. Fenton (2000: 24) also stated that “we may speak of ethnic groups as identifiable groups whose ‘actual’ or ‘claimed’ shared ethnic attributes mark them off within a social system. However, we should not think of these groups concretely, since they are not discrete, permanent or fixed.

Ethnicity, as discussed below, evolves around a social context. Coleman (1999: 13) described how social action evolved in social context. He stated that the actor in society is “socialised” and his “actions are governed by social rules, norms and obligations”. The
actor's actions are "shaped, constrained and redirected by the social context". Narayan (1999: 209) explained, "All societies are built from social groups rather than individuals, and these groups determine attitudes, beliefs, identities and values as well as access to resources and opportunities".

As stated prior, ethnicity is greatly related to social capital. People having a shared culture or ethnic origin will have a greater tendency to engage in collective behaviour because of the way they identify themselves. Nagel (1994: 153) supported this view, when he referred to "ethnic mobilisation". Coleman (1999: 16) wrote that social capital was defined by its function. "It is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common; they all consist of some aspect of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of actors, within the structure." "Social capital inheres in the structure of relations between actors and among actors".

There are different types of ethnic groups, ranging from urban ethnic minorities to tribal groupings (Ericksen, 2002). Wantoks in PNG, which will be discussed further in this thesis, can be described as ethnic groups, since they are formed by groups of people who have a common cultural background. Actors in wantok relationships are governed by social norms, rules and obligations. Norms are the "unwritten rules of conduct of a certain group or community of people." Bourdieu (1985: 248). The existence of social obligations is a very important prerequisite, when talking about social capital and ethnicity. Social obligations refer to one's ability to perform roles and responsibilities out of fulfilment of one's duties and obligations toward one's group. For example, a member of an ethnic tribe would allow immigrant members of his tribe to live with him in the city, not necessarily because he wanted this to occur but because it would be his responsibility as a member of the group.

Reciprocity, enforceable trust and bounded solidarity all characterise ethnic relationships (Portes and Sensenbrenner 2001). Social relationships, based on reciprocity, occur when
donors are willing to provide privileged access to resources, in the expectation that they will be fully repaid in the future (Portes, 1998). Its significance lies in the fact that actors give and receive resources, based on norms of reciprocity. This is closely related to the notion of enforceable trust. Coleman (1988: 107) defined enforceable trust as “the trustworthiness of social structures that allows the proliferation of obligations and expectations”.

Bounded solidarity is the term used to describe relationships that are formed from groups or actors thrown together in a common situation. In these relationships, there is an element of obligation to serve the interests of the group out of loyalty. Due to their commonalities, actors feel bound to be loyal, when pursuing the group’s interests. As Portes and Sensebrenner (1993: 1332) pointed out, “individuals behave in certain ways because they must, either because they have been socialised in the appropriate values or because they enact emergent sentiments of loyalty towards others like themselves”. “Such behaviour can occur even in the absence of reward or punishment”.

Ethnicity, similar to class, is a social construct which impacts on how we are brought up to believe and behave. It serves simultaneously as a way to bind some people together, whilst keeping others apart. Social capital generated by bounded solidarity and trust, which is common in ethnic relations, are at the core of the group’s economic advance. However Waldinger (1995: 557) pointed out, “the same social relations that...enhance the ease and efficiency of economic exchanges among community members implicitly restrict outsiders.” Portes (1998) offered an example of the emergence of ethnic niches, when a group is able to dominate a particular sector of employment in such a way that members have privileged access to new job openings, whilst restricting that of outsiders. This brought benefit by way of allowing people in the same group to advance and obtain employment but it also led to free riding and lazy employees.
Ethnic Social Capital, Productivity and Governance

Putnam (1993: 2) referred to social capital as “features of social organisation, such as networks, norms and trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit.” Ethnic social capital refers to these features of social organisation, which are found amongst ethnic groups. In terms of business ventures, ethnic groups can provide a source of financial and human capital and this can encourage the obtaining of loans or grants for business ventures because of strong trusting relationships and also the provision of inexpensive labour. It also fosters a sharing of skills and knowledge and sometimes it minimises direct competition amongst individuals within the group. This occurs because, in ethnic groups such as tribal groupings, the success of the group is given consideration above the advancement of the individual. In such instances, success is owed and shared amongst family members and not outsiders. Weidenbaum and Hughes (1996) research exemplified how expatriate Chinese business empires have developed successful unique business structures, based upon their unique family and cultural heritage.

However, sometimes strong kinship networks may force budding investors to divert resources away from potential investments and advancement, because of the bounded solidarity. The “private protection” systems imposed by Mafias (Gambetta 1993, Portes and Sensenbrenner 1993) was an example of how individuals or groups could not move out of their networks to form bridging networks with outsiders, thus limiting their chances to obtain access to other investments and resources. Banfield (1958) and Putnam (1993,) in their studies of Southern Italy, gave further weight to the theory that dense family networks may hinder economic growth, by imposing barriers to association with external networks. Zhou (1997) described this as a ‘hindrance to assimilation’.

The form of governance, whether egalitarian or hierarchical, that develops in a society can be affected by culture and ethnicity, which in turn affects the type of private sector which develops (Fukuyama, 1995). The amount of trust and cooperation in an organisation can reflect the societal structures of the society. A research, relating to
Catholic societies, which are generally hierarchical, found that there were lower levels of societal trust, which led to fewer larger firms, since they required trust and coordination which were absent in this situation. (La Porta et al, 1997). According to Putnam (1993: 37), hierarchical religion discourages horizontal ties between people and hence the formation of trust.

**Ethnic Ties and Social Cohesion**

There is a greater chance of social cohesion when the population, in a particular society, shared similar socio cultural back grounds, beliefs and heritage (Lehning, 1998). In a diverse societal setting, people would often ‘funnel out’ those who did not share similarities with them and they would mobilise and stick together within groups with whom they identified well, whilst at the same time isolating others who did not belong to their group. In such a scenario, there was a need to have enforceable laws and strong governing institutions, to ensure cohesiveness. Otherwise, societal levels of social capital would be very low and this would in turn affect the ability of the public and private sector to function well. (Putnam 1993, Fukuyama 1995).

Occasionally, given such a scenario, the majority or empowered groups may have continued to reinforce their power position in society, by giving opportunities for advancement and other investments to their own kind, thus shutting out others who were considered outsiders (Waldinger, 1995). People who were related through ethnic ties tended to be favoured for jobs, business investments, the allocation of funds for projects and other opportunities. Saffu (1996) and Ketan (2000) pointed out how, in a highly diverse society such as Papua New Guinea, elections for parliament have become nothing more than a race for resource mobilisation, by different ethnic groups. This reinforces the dominant ethnic group’s power position in society. These factors all have a negative impact on social cohesion and as those people left out of a particular group do not wish to trust and cooperate well with the dominant group.
Whilst it may seem, in a highly diverse society, that ethnic mobilisation could hinder cohesiveness, the family of kinship relations were often the start of the building up of what was called social capital in society and nurturing it from that stage could ensure that it was utilised in the best possible way. Bubolz (2001: 130) noted;

\[ \text{Building trust is part of the attachment process that begins in infancy as parents (or other primary caregivers) care for and meet the needs of young children for food, warmth, comfort, love, security, and human response. If these needs are not met in early life, a sense of mistrust develops.} \]

He went on to say that “Along with the sense of trust, family relationships and behaviour help establish the principles of reciprocity and exchange”. The next section discusses this point further.

**Social Capital and Family**

The family was the first building block in the generation of social capital for the larger society (Bubolz, 2001). Their internal and external relationships could model their children’s behaviours as they progressed in life and it could impact on their future relationships. These relationships fostered the development of trust, which was essential for the formation of all outside relationships. The family’s ability to meet their children’s physical and emotional needs could influence their views on the trustworthiness of others, outside the family circle.

Extended family relations also acted as a social safety net, to provide support during difficult times (Hogg and Abrams, 1988). However, this type of closed network lacked connections into the outside world and hindered access to other information and resources, which could enable them to break out from this safety net and be economically independent. Free riding on others was encouraged in this type of relationship (Woolcock, 1998). This was also a characteristic of bonding social capital. Whilst the family was itself a source of social capital, it was also a “system in a network of mutually
interdependent systems” (Bubolz, 2001: 131). Through its interactions with political, economic, cultural, religious and legal systems, the family not only increased the resources available to its members but it also contributed to the social capital available to promote the public good. Social capital, generated through interactions between families and other actors within the community, increased resources for families and networks. In the latter part of this thesis, I will refer to this as ‘local social capital’.

A study of families transplanted to a rural area found that informal systems, such as family, friends and neighbours, and semi-formal systems such as cooperatives and clubs, were especially important sources of friendship, status, information and services. The families' particular needs motivated them to pursue certain relationships with others (Sontag and Bubolz, 1996).

**Implications of Social Capital for Development**

Development initiatives could be implemented successfully if there was an understanding of both the economic and social factors which impact on it. Gittell and Vidal (1998: 15) write, “The social and economic system as a whole functions better because of the ties among actors that make it up”. It is important, in development policy, to be able to understand that the nature of social interaction, between communities and institutions, has the ability to shape economic development. Economic development had for too long, been the focus of development policy (Woolcock and Narayan, 2002). Similarly, one of the substantial challenges of development was an understanding of how outside development agencies, particularly International donors, could bring development to indigenous rural communities, when they have little understanding of its diversity. In such communities, a social capital perspective was the necessity to have sound technical know how and abundant financial resources but this was not sufficient to be accepted by the local community (Woolcock, 1998).
As the quote at the beginning of this chapter suggests, social capital rests in the mind, thoughts and behaviours of people. Whilst the acquiring of human and economic capital is important for a particular development project, social capital, which is imbedded in the intended beneficiaries’ social relations, should be given equal consideration. The achievement of a wider development goal, such as the improvement of health services and literacy rates or better sanitation, occurs after ensuring that all prerequisites to a successful development initiative are met.

Only when all stakeholders involved in a development initiative were working in harmony, trust and cooperation could there be a greater chance for the utilisation and management of human and economic resources. A variety of studies have shown that when people are well organized in groups, and their knowledge is sought, incorporated and built upon during planning and implementation, then they are more likely to sustain activities after project completion (World Bank, 1994; Uphoff et al, 1998; Pretty and Frank, 2000). Trust and cooperation was very important during this time. Where there was trust in the other party, there was greater chance that it would generate cooperation. Woolcock (1998: 1002) described how a “virtuous circle” of trust promoting cooperation and cooperation promoting trust developed. This occurred because, as Jones and George (1998: 532) explained, “trust leads to a set of behavioural expectations among people, allowing them to assess the uncertainty or risk associated with their interaction so that they can jointly optimise the gains that will result from cooperative behaviour”.

Social institutional analysis was important to understand the interrelations between various stakeholders, their power relations and political interests (Woolcock and Narayan, 2002). These relationships often occurred within a social context and understanding this situation could place the development agencies in a better position to understand how a proposed development initiative would affect the communities concerned.
It had become increasingly evident, from analysing development theory and practice, that incorporation of the intended beneficiaries' of a development project, from its design stages to implementation, ensured that a project was better suited and appropriate to local needs (Woolcock and Narayan, 2002). Including the intended beneficiaries allowed them to be articulate in identifying their needs and it built confidence and loyalty to the project. This increased the likelihood of the projects sustainability. Uphoff (1999) in his work on participatory development in Sri Lanka showed evidence of this occurrence.

Social capital is defined by features of social organisation, such as networks, norms and trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam, 1993). This can be understood through an institutional analysis and the incorporation of the intended beneficiaries of a particular development initiative. This research focuses on understanding elements of social capital and in particular trust and cooperation. The research also highlights the social relationships between certain stakeholders in two development projects.

Development interventions in local communities, by the use of outside development agencies, should also take into consideration the potential impact of these interventions on local social capital. One study of 25 completed World Bank projects found that continued success was associated clearly with local institution building (Cernea, 1987). Issues of trust and cooperation, or other social issues which foster social capital at the local level, are very important and when this is not allowed to develop in its context it can pose a great many problems for development agencies. The existing social networks of local communities are their primary resource with which they are able to manage risk and vulnerability. Forrest and Kearns (2001: 2130) wrote:

*It is these social networks which perform an important function in the mundane routines of everyday life, and these routines are arguably the basic building blocks of social cohesion. Through them we learn tolerance, cooperation and acquire a sense of social order and belonging. Who and what we are surrounded by in a specific locality may also contribute in*
important ways to both choice and constraint and, less tangibly and more indirectly, to notions of wellbeing and social worth.

Outside agencies therefore should complement these networks, rather than replace them.

**Bridging Social Capital and Cross-sectoral Partnerships**

Bonding social capital, which characterises close knot communities such as ethnic groups, can be valuable, since it sets the foundation for trust and cooperation issues at the start of a project. Depending on the magnitude of the project and the demands posed by the expansion of the project, it will be necessary to access resources which are not available in the local community. Good bonding social capital can be developed through ethnic and kinship ties but, if it tends to be non bridging, then access to outside resources is not enhanced.

Certain development initiatives, such as micro finance schemes, have been successful, since they have drawn on the social capital inherent in close knit communities and groups. However, once they have become successful, the conditions that made it possible for their success may have slightly changed. The Grameen bank project in Bangladesh showed that, after the independent members became successful and economically well off, it was necessary for them to break away from their closed networks, in order to bridge with larger and wealthier networks and expand their businesses (Fuglesang et al, 1993).

The involvement of various influential stakeholders in the project is also a very important prerequisite to its success or failure. Tendler and Freedheim (1994) showed how combined public, private and civic sector interests fuelled success in a development project in Brazil. In this project, they found that there were cross-sectoral development partnerships, which allowed for access to greater political and financial resources, well trained staff and appropriate technical support and this ensured effectiveness and
sustainability. What started as a small community project was hugely successful because of the bridging networks set up in the course of the project.

Projects can draw on the social capital of various stakeholders, but they can also serve to enhance it. When various social divides, such as race, ethnicity, gender and religion, are transcended through partnerships and bridging, there is a greater chance of all these groups benefiting from engagement with each other. Bridges need to be built between local communities and other social groups, since the decisions they make independently can sometimes affect each other. Through adopting participatory processes, consensus building and social interaction, there is greater social cohesion amongst stakeholders with diverse interests and resources.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have shown that social capital not only involves horizontal relationships within isolated groups but it also involves horizontal and vertical relationships between and amongst people and institutions within society. A broader understanding of social capital includes the social and political environment that shapes social structure and enables norms to develop (North, 1990). This analysis extends the importance of social capital to the most formalised institutional relationships and structures, such as government, the political regime, the rule of law, the court system and civil and political liberties.

As discussed by several theorists (Nagel, 1994; Weidenbaum and Hughes, 1996; Lehning, 1998, Portes and Sensenbrenner, 2001), ethnic and kinship groups have very strong bonding social capital, which develops out of bonded solidarity, norms of reciprocity and enforceable trust. These notions facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit. There is, however, a need to look beyond these relationships, in order to form bridging networks with outsiders, which then allows for accessibility to greater resources, which can be used to enhance well being (Putnam, 1993; Fukuyama, 1995;
Waldinger, 1995; La Porta et al, 1997). Nevertheless, care should be taken to understand the social, political and cultural environment, which allows for this type of bridging social capital to develop.

Discussions on the implication of social capital on development have highlighted an important issue, which is the understanding of local social capital inherent in ethnic groups. Development agencies should take time to understand and complement these sources of social capital, in order to ensure that greater social cohesion and collectivity is encouraged, which in turn would allow development initiatives to be successfully completed. The next chapter discusses wantokism and the extent to which it is a form of local social capital in Papua New Guinea.
Chapter 3: Wantokism in relation to Social Capital

In a country where regional and tribal loyalties are highly prized, it is difficult to avoid the temptation of breaching the merit principle and doing favours for ones kinsmen. Helping friends, relatives or tribesmen is usually regarded as a social obligation (Payani, 2000: 141).

Introduction

Drawing on the theoretical discussion presented in Chapter Two, the overall purpose of this chapter is to explore the concept and practice of wantokism, in relation to social capital. Wantokism has been defined as a system of social relations between groups of people who share similar ethno linguistic affiliations and geographical boundaries (De Renzio and Kavanamur, 2000). Generally, it refers to social relations between people belonging to one clan or tribe. The social political and economic relationships that characterise wantokism set the platform that allows actors, who share common values, culture and ethnic ties, to band together to enable social cohesion. Thus, the notion of wantokism is closely related to ethnicity. As also shown in Chapter Two, ethnicity refers to “a group’s commonality of ancestry and history through which people have evolved shared values and customs over the centuries”. (McGoldrick & Garcia-Preto, 2005: 2). Fenton (2000) referred to ethnicity as a system of social relations between groups of people defined by shared social and cultural heritage, language and ancestry.

Having what has been mentioned above in mind, this chapter will be presented in three parts. Firstly, it provides an analysis of the broader social and political environment in Papua New Guinea and it highlights the extent to which this has affected or is being affected by wantokism. This section presents the differing ethnic structures of some countries in the Pacific and raises the idea that, similar to the PNG situation, ethnic diversity in each of these countries may be affecting state performance and development. Secondly, the concepts of ethnicity and social capital will be further analysed, with a
particular focus on wantokism in Papua New Guinea. This discussion will illustrate how social capital, which develops around clan and tribal affiliations, is being affected by the changing political and social structures of PNG society. The traditional definition of wantokism is slowly changing, as PNG society changes and this section will attempt to highlight this development. Thirdly, the idea that wantokism is a form of social capital will be presented and consideration will be given to not only the issue of bonding social capital verses bridging social capital but it will also demonstrate where wantokism fits into social capital discourse. The notion of local social capital, introduced in Chapter Two will be further elaborated upon.

This chapter is important for the wider thesis because it presents a theoretical understanding of the major concepts in this research and in particular wantokism, ethnicity and social capital. It shows, from a theoretical stand point, how wantokism can be seen as a form of social capital. The theoretical views, presented in this chapter, are then challenged by the findings presented in Chapter Six.

Ethnicity, Social cohesion and State performance in the Pacific

Relationships, based on commonalities in ethnicity, kinship and language could perhaps form the primary basis of group action in many of the Pacific Island societies (Chen, 2000). Hagel (1994: 153) referred to this as “ethnic mobilisation”. In highly diverse countries, such as PNG, ethnic mobilisation is possibly reflected more in what has come to be known as wantokism. In PNG, this connection between ethnicity, kinship and language is understood as wantok. The term wantok (English ‘one talk’) is derived from the Pidgin English language spoken by the Melanesian countries of the Pacific, in particular in PNG, Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands and it literally means ‘speaking the same language’. It is perhaps particularly useful in the highly heterogeneous societies of Melanesia, where there is high ethno linguistic diversity. In other countries, such as Samoa, the literal meaning of the word is not applicable, since the people speak only one language. However, in its practicality, the social relationships that characterise wantokism do not only apply to those speaking the same language but it includes kinship
and ethnic relations. A person who comes from Samoa could address his extended family member as his wantok. People who share the same identity and cultural history can be also called wantoks.

Papua New Guinea is arguably a very ethnically diverse society, which has a huge amount of ethnic fractionalisation. In a study conducted by Reilly and Philpot (2002), they argued that the reason for disparities, in provincial development in PNG, was the differences in ethnic diversity from province to province. It was found that “higher diversity levels in different regions of PNG created collective action problems and undermined the development of social capital, undermining development in heterogeneous areas”. They went on to argue that, “even when alternative explanations such as size, government performance and land resources were factored in, more diverse provinces had significantly lower development levels than homogenous ones” (Reilly and Philpot, 2002: 480). Similar arguments put forward by Regan (1995) suggested that PNG’s ethnic fragmentation presented an impediment to nation building because there were a great number of “politicised ethnic groups” with their own interests.

Despite this high level of ethnic fragmentation “PNG has been able to have more than thirty years of successful continuous democratic elections, all characterised by high participation and candidature, and numerous peaceful changes of government” (Reilly, 2000: 167). Reilly also stated “that the primary reason for PNG’s democratic success is the sheer diversity of its ethnic structure, which virtually guarantees that no one group is able to single-handedly monopolise political power”.

PNGs social structure is such that there are a large number of ethnic groups within the state, with no single dominant group. These ethnic groups are both “small and multiple” and “its people are fragmented into hundreds of little ethnic groupings”. At the root of all these social structures are clans, “ascriptive extended family networks that are the primary and sometimes, the only unit of political and social loyalty” (Reilly, 2000: 170).
Levine (1997: 479) noted “if ethnic communities are noted to be groups possessing a distinctive language, custom and memories, traits that give its members are sense of unity and cause them to distinguish themselves, and be distinguished by others, then PNG may have more than one thousand such ethnic groups within its borders”.

Polynesian and Micronesian countries in the Pacific are feasibly not as ethno linguistically diverse as their Melanesian neighbours but they still share certain similar cultural characteristics, in terms of how their tribal structures are organised to facilitate social cohesion. Not all Melanesian countries are so ethnically diverse as New Caledonia, which is divided between the Kanaki’s and French and Fiji, which is generally divided into two groups of people, the Indigenous Fijians and the Indo Fijians. Ethnic diversity, within each of these countries in the Pacific, may sometimes be an important factor that influenced variations in development and state performance (Reilly, 2004). In support of this, Ritzen et al (2000: 21) argued that “ethnic divisions make it difficult, although not impossible, to develop the social cohesion necessary to build good institutions”.

Polynesian countries, such as Samoa and Tuvalu, have been relatively successful post colonial states and they have had stable governments, with unspectacular but steady economic growths, notwithstanding an ongoing dependence on foreign aid (UNDP, 2006; World Bank, 2006). The Melanesian countries, on the other hand, appeared to have had poor state performance, negative economic growth, weak government and ethnic conflicts which plagued development initiatives (May, 2003). PNG has faced an armed conflict lasting over ten years, alongside a series of other armed conflicts; Fiji has faced four military coups, whilst the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu have faced army mutinies. Recent figures for Papua New Guinea showed that it had a better Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita than its other pacific neighbours (Economics @ANZ, 2006). However, in general, Melanesia has performed poorly over the years. Whilst other reasons may be given for these variations in stability, economic growths and state performance, it is arguably that ethnic diversity, within these countries should be given consideration as a possible factor for this poor performance. Several researchers (Easterly and Levine, 1997;
Rodrik, 1999; Mauro, 1995) supported the view that ethnic structure in a country could affect state performance.

In a World Bank study of Africa, it was found that ethnic diversity had a negative affect on economic growth, attainment at school, availability of infrastructure and sound government policies. The reasons given were that a few dominant ethno political units dictated government policy making and the allocation of financial resources (Easterly and Levine 1997). Similar research includes that of Mauro (1995), who found that fragmented societies had a strong tendency towards corruption, because members of certain ethnic groups tended to align themselves together and favour their own kin. This created collective action problems, since there was a distrust of outsiders. Those not considered kin were seen to be more likely to betray the reciprocated trust and cooperation within the group. Whilst this may suggest good bonding social capital it also undermined the development of bridging social capital, which was an important prerequisite for collective action in the wider community (Narayan, 1999).

In light of these points, Mauro’s research supported the notion that heterogeneous and ethnically diverse communities were unlikely to have a great social cohesion and therefore great social capital. In the ethnically diverse societies of the Pacific, identifying social capital is quite a daunting task, since there can be no clear yardstick with which to identify the type of social capital available in any particular community. However, proxy indicators of social capital, which are context specific, could be employed to show the presence of social capital. For example, the practice of sorcery, which is feared in PNG, is usually done with chewing betel nuts. Sharing betel nut freely during meetings indicates that there is no fear of sorcery and thus indicates trust and trust is an important element of social capital. As noted in the introductory chapter, this approach will be used during the research for this thesis.
Researchers, such as Reilly (2004), have attempted to draw a correlation between ethnic diversity and the economic performance (GDP per capita) of a state. An interesting discovery was that those countries that are homogenous perform better economically than the heterogeneous countries. This meant that countries, such as Tuvalu and Samoa, were better economic performers than their Melanesian neighbours. Finin (2002) argued that Tuvalu, one of the smallest countries in the Pacific, had been able to perform extremely well on an economic scale. One factor contributing to this situation was the income which came through remittances sent to these Polynesian countries by migrant family members. Brown (1994) explained how the GDP per capita of Western Samoa and Tonga was greatly enhanced through remittances received from family or kin living who worked particularly in the United States of America, Australia and New Zealand. However, he went on to explain that most of this money was spent on personnel consumption and it was not saved or invested.

The Melanesian countries are larger and more endowed with mineral and natural resources than their Polynesian neighbours and therefore they should be better performers on an economic scale. Easterly (2001) argued that, due to the competitive nature of small ethno political units in fragmented societies in the larger Melanesian countries, these divided units tended to give their primary loyalty to their own grouping and they also tended to mobilise, control and monopolise the public good for the benefit of members of their own group. Nation building initiatives had become monopolised for the benefit of a few ethno political units. Easterly (2001: 271) noted how national politicians in PNG, who held senior portfolios, dictated that generally national infrastructure projects were to be set up in their own provinces or districts. This type of behaviour does little to promote development and social cohesion in the nation as a whole. The problem of competing ethno political units for resources was also found in other Pacific countries too. In Nauru, which was arguably the most failed state in the Pacific, there was constant political competition for access to resources which, was reinforced by rivalry, based on twelve traditional clans and family and personal rivalries (Crocombe and Giese, 1988).
Leadership issues are also important to develop and understanding of ethnicity, state performance and social cohesion issues in the Pacific. Where there was good leadership, there was greater chance of social cohesion. In countries, such as Samoa and Tonga, there was little or no likelihood of an overthrow of the government, due to the sustainability of leadership, since participation in the executive governments was mostly confined to members of the country's traditional aristocracy (Lamour 2000). However, the modern day system of government in Samoa was changing because, although there was still recognition of traditional leadership structures, this was not entirely restricted to the traditional aristocracy (Meleisea, 2005). Although there was a greater chance of sustainability if there was strong leadership, it could also paint a false sense of stability, since the wider society was isolated from decision making and their ability to rise to that level, to be able to make decisions, so was hindered. The recent public rioting, experienced in Tonga in 2006, is such an example of years of frustration amongst people not being able to be involved in making decisions for their own benefit (Morgan and Mcleod, 2006). This demonstrates that, even in homogenous societies, social cohesion is problematic, although one might argue that both groups had bonding social capital but there was no bridging capital, for example, between nobles and commoners, in the case of Tonga.

Another issue of importance, in the understanding of development and the lack of social cohesion in the Pacific, is the relationship between mineral resource endowments and ethnicity. Ross (2004) explained what he called the 'resource curse', which was the tendency for mineral resource endowed countries to fall prey to internal conflicts. In highly heterogeneous countries, where land areas were tied up with tribal and clan groups, there was often conflict between parties who were concerned over resource ownership. The strong bonding relationship, based on loyalty between clans and tribal groupings, made it difficult to compromise with other clans that laid claim to the resources. This could lead to conflicts, such as that experienced in Bougainville, Fiji, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Resource development would need a communal consensus, which would sometimes be hard to come by when there was competition. There were, however, advantages to this type of situation, since it minimised the
exploitation of resources by the powerful few. Decisions regarding resource extraction were not easily bulldozed but instead careful consideration had to be given to the advantages and disadvantages, prior to development projects undertaken. This was simply because scrutiny was provided by a great many tribal groups. Social cohesion, in this case, would be reached if bridges and better networking was established with the other competing ethno political group or clans.

Ethnicity and the manner in which it is structured have affected social cohesion and state performance at the broader level. The Pacific region is, however, very diverse and what may seem to be an explanation for a lack of social cohesion or state performance in one country may not be the same in another country. Using the variation in ethnic structures, as a possible explanation, what has been presented is a generalised reflection on state performance and social cohesion in Polynesia, Micronesia and Melanesia. The next section of this chapter focuses particularly on wantokism, which defines PNG social relations.

**Social structures in PNG: Wantokism**

As stated previously, the ethno linguistic structure of PNG is very diverse. There are 20 Provinces in Papua New Guinea, divided between two regions, Papua to the south and New Guinea in the north. The New Guinea mainland is further divided into three regions, Momase, consisting of Morobe, Madang, East Sepik and Sandaun Provinces. The remaining part of the New Guinea mainland consists of the highlands provinces of Eastern Highlands, Simbu, Western Highlands, Enga and Southern Highlands. The New Guinea Islands consist of East New Britain, West New Britain, Manus, New Ireland and Bougainville. Quite recently, Bougainville, which has been a subject of an armed conflict, has assumed status as an Autonomous territory, following peace keeping negotiations. The Papuan region consists of Central, Oro, Milne Bay, Gulf and Western Provinces. The capital City is Port Moresby (Dorney, 2000). In each of these provinces, people speak different languages. This language diversity is not just limited to provinces,
since within each province there are also different languages spoken. People who speak a particular language are generally related through kinship ties and each tribal and groupings have their own distinctive language (Levine, 1995).

The level of heterogeneity also varied if someone travels from province to province in PNG. Societies, such as those found in the highlands of PNG, were perhaps more heterogeneous, whilst people from other provinces on the coast were more homogenous (Phillpot, 2002). There was considerable regional variation in ethnic fragmentation and (as discussed in the previous section) this could have negative as well as positive impacts on social cohesion and social functioning. The following discussions will now introduce the social and political structures of PNG society, with particular emphasis being placed on the traits of wantokism. A further discussion will note how certain wantok traits have changed over time and how this has impacted on social capital arrangements and development.

Relationships, based on kinship ties and clan and tribal lineage, form the bases of traditional social structures in PNG. These ties are much stronger than ties established through other social relationships. The saying “blood is thicker than water” is a popular sentimental expression echoed by many people in PNG, when referring to the loyalty and dedication that a person has towards his/her wantok.

The family, clan and tribal bond was a common element of social relationships in PNG, regardless of the ethnic grouping, whether it was in the Highlands, the Islands or the Southern region. The social structures in PNG are such that there was no distinct division of rank, status and wealth (De Renzio, 2000). There was however a clear distinction of rank and status, where traditional gender issues were concerned, since men played the role of decision makers and women were expected to play a lesser role. Zimmer-Tamakoshi (1993: 61) noted that Papua New Guineans tended to “look back to a ‘respected past’ in which, supposedly, men were superior to women and women’s
primary role was to support men’s interests’. Brouwer et al (1998) argued that, although the PNG constitution ensured equality in participation for both men and women in PNG society, it also placed priority on the maintenance of traditional cultural norms. It was a cultural norm for women to play a lesser role in decision making and other aspects of social, political and economic life. However, in contemporary PNG society, this situation was slowly changing as women were becoming active partners in social, political and economic life through education and employment (Zimmer-Tamakoshi, 1993; Brouwer et al, 1998; Heward and Bunwaree, 1999).

In the traditional setting there was no real centralised authority. Chiefs and elders were advocates or mausman (English-mouth man) and they were the main facilitators of decision making and law and good order: they did not have a very distinctly high status. Although there were certain areas in PNG, such as the Highlands, where society was more or less vertically structured, due to the high degree of respect accorded to chiefs and ‘big’ men (De Renzio, 2000), in general most of PNG society was structured horizontally. Consensual agreements were highly desirable in decision making and the chief did not act as the sole decision maker. It is a common understanding that the big man status in most societies in PNG is not inherited. Land is inherited but other aspects of wealth, such as accumulation of traditional shell monies, the number of pigs and hunting and fishing skills were acquired traits. This implied that chieftainship was not an inherited status, since other acquired factors also came into play. (Lederman, 1990).

In traditional structures, those people with whom you have close social networks are those directly related to you by blood. The clans and tribal groupings are the most important and they often form the highest degree of trust, cooperation and reciprocity. The further you move away from these networks, the lower the degree of trust and reciprocal obligations. These traditional cultural groups, tribes or wantoks involve a high level of bonding social capital.
Critiques of Wantokism

Virtually all these forms of traditional culture-social groups, such as tribes, clans and village associations are based on shared norms and use these norms to achieve cooperative ends. The literature on development did not, as a general rule, find social capital in this form to be an asset and it was much more typically regarded as a liability (Putnam, 1993; Waldinger, 1995; Zhou, 1997; Portes, 1998) Fukuyama (2000) described these types of relationships as having a very narrow “radius of trust”. The group was surrounded by a radius of trust amongst themselves, which did not overlap with the other groups’ radius of trust and thus their cooperation and trust with others was reduced and this often imposed negative externalities, such as weak ties with important resource people on the outside.

Although wantokism could be seen as a liability, there are other authors of social capital theory who thought these bonded relationships were an asset to social cohesion. Wantok relationships were part and partial of PNG culture and it was embedded in all social groups in PNG society, whether traditional or contemporary. Narayan (1999: 209) wrote “all societies are built from social groups...and these groups determine attitudes, beliefs, identities and values as well as access to resources and opportunities”. Wantokism could foster social cohesion and it did not become a liability if its cultural significance was understood.

Wantokism is also effective because of its strong cultural norms or unwritten rules of conduct governing reciprocity. For example, wantoks who had come from my village to the city would arrive at my house and expect stay. I understood that it was my cultural obligation to house them and they also understood that I was obliged to house them. I did not ask for any compensation or any form of payment for this act. As Portes and Sensenbrenner (1993: 1332) pointed out, “individuals behave in certain ways because they must, either because they have been socialised in the appropriate values or because they enact emergent sentiments of loyalty towards others like themselves”. Weidenbaum and Huges (1996) showed examples of how expatriate Chinese business empires have
sprung up, through the utilisation of their strong bonded traditional family structures. Another example is the “private protection systems” imposed by the Mafia which, despite criticisms, have been very successful (Gambetta, 1993). Similar to wantokism, these systems are based on loyalty and bonded solidarity around family ties.

Wantokism also provided a type of social welfare net to help other family members. However, this was sometimes a deterrent to progress because of certain individuals' free riding on others’ successes (Phillpot, 2002). Nevertheless, it was an accepted norm in society that, even if there was an uneven balance in reciprocity, this would eventually even itself out as the obligations continued on for the rest of a person’s life and was intergenerational. Personal debts would be repaid by an individual’s children or other members of the immediate family. A person was always connected to their kin members up to an after their death. Funeral rites and burial would be conducted by the person’s tribal, clan and family members and not by any people from outside this network. There was no rule of law governing these reciprocities; it was just seen as a social obligation to do so (Martin, 2007).

**Wantokism as an Evolving Concept and Practice**

However, this situation was slowly changing slowly, due to factors such as rural-urban migration and the increased number of children going through the formal education system and onto formal employment. New relationships were being formed along other lines, such as sports groups, religious groups and other civic organisations. The traditional form of social capital now took shape through these new relationships. A whole new set of wantoks has started to develop and these people are not related to each other by blood or any kinship relationship (De Renzio and Kavanamur, 1999).

Nowadays, there are also improved transportation and communication networks, than before which means that people are able to move easily from one place to another and communicate more effectively. Intermarriages between people from different ethno-
linguistic back grounds are now more common than in the past. A new set of wantok relationships has emerged and these reinforce the type of social capital referred to by Putnam (1993) as bridging social capital.

The use of a common language in everyday communication is also a factor influencing the change in social relations from bonding to bridging networks. There are now a growing number of speakers of Pidgin English, which is a local trade language. Children born into families in towns and cities are more familiar with Pidgin English than their traditional languages and they converse daily with their associates using this Pidgin English. This new generation identify and interact well with the people around them, who are generally not related to them through kinship networks. The development of a common language can also encourage cohesiveness, which is important for society. Ritzen et al (2000: 24) suggests that;

A nation state that has developed a common language among its citizens is more cohesive than one that is linguistically fragmented. This is not to say that linguistic homogeneity is good or bad, all nations started out as very diverse linguistically. Linguistic homogeneity may simply be an indicator of how much a group of nationals have developed a common identity over the decades or centuries that national identity forms.

Thus, we began to see a shift in the social relationships, from that which identified a person with their kin members, to those formed with outsiders. (De Renzio, 2000). Although in saying this, these new relationships or networks still reflect the type of bondage and obligations reflected in wantokism. It is normal in PNG for someone to refer to his classmates as his wantoks or a team member of a soccer team to refer to his team mates in the same way, although the literal translation of the word is now different.

**Political structures and relationships in PNG**

Larmour (1995: 42) described traditional PNG political structures as “small and stateless...Order within them was maintained by a mixture of self help, reciprocity,
gossip, shaming and supernatural sanctions”. They could be described as being egalitarian, since they had very few social divisions, where one individual or group could be considered superior or inferior to the other.

It is true, from my knowledge and experience as an indigenous person from PNG, that there are really no clear demarcation lines that separate the ‘big man’ from the ‘little man’ in society. However, there is an understanding, built up amongst the people living in the community, that there are individuals or persons who are regarded as elders or ‘big men’. It was only perhaps during the intrusion of colonial powers and the introduction of the democratic system of government, which was currently practiced, that a clear demarcation between who was the authority came to be seen (Turner, 1990). The chief or elders conducted activities just like any other person in the community. They had to go hunting, fishing, gardening, collecting wood and raising pigs, just like any other person. It was only during feasting or meetings in the community that the big men would be expected to play a different role (De Renzio, 2000).

Communal and consensual decision making was highly desirable in such political structures and relationships. People were expected to know how the political structures operated and it was more a sense of behaving and conducting oneself in accepted norms that shaped, reinforced and sustained these political structures. The reciprocal obligations and strong trust built around a particular community was what held the political structures together. Elections in PNG provided a good example of these types of relations. As Standish (2002: 3) explained “the clan and kinship groupings that fostered these norms is the primary unit for mobilising support in the contemporary form of competition for prestige and resources known as elections”.

The norms that held traditional political structures were still a significant part of contemporary PNG society, although imposed administrative and political changes, introduced during the colonial days, had drastically changed the political structure. There
was however, a growing realisation of the importance of traditional egalitarian structures, in order to facilitate collective action (May, 2004). The Provincial and Local Level Government (LLG) reforms of the 1990s allowed for greater decision making at local level. Frequently, such decisions were reached through a communal consensus coming from the community (Edmiston 2002). This was possibly a reflection of the introduced political institutions failing to provide for a ‘consistency’ in institutional performance, from the traditional institutions that governed society (Lamour, 1995).

Local level councillors or members were elected by people living in the particular council wards of LLG assemblies. The councillors, through a secret ballot, nominated a member (who was referred to as the LLG president) and this nominated person represented the LLG in the Provincial Assembly. The Provincial assembly comprised the LLG presidents and appointed members of the civil society appointed by the Governor and the National Parliamentarians or Members of Parliament (MP). The amount of trust and cooperation given to local level councillors was greater than that accorded to National elected members, since generally these councillors were respected elders and community leaders, although the latter seemed to enjoy a greater degree of political and financial resources, in order to influence the tide in decision making. The high level of trust accorded to local leaders by the community could also be attributed to the manner in which decisions were made and the traditional processes of acquiring status (De Renzio, 2000). Decisions reached at the local level were often implemented through a lot of group consensus, with less intense political lobbying or bribing (Standish, 2002).

Many local level government councillors are, as Papua New Guineans like to call it, *papa graun* (English-Father Ground) or land owners. These are people who hold clan or tribal leadership status. The bulk of their voters are their kin member or wantok. However, not all councillors are necessarily *papa graun*, since many of the Urban LLG members in PNG are a mixture of people and they do not necessarily belong to the same ethnic or language community.
This situation could create tensions, when meetings occurred in Provincial or LLG assemblies, where people from different ethnic and other affiliations were brought together to make decisions regarding the distribution of district support grants and other resources and benefits (Edmiston, 2002). Often consensual agreements were not forthcoming and decisions tended to get bulldozed through a majority vote. In such a scenario there was heavy lobbying amongst assembly members, to pass a particular executive decision. This resulted in inequitable resource distribution in favour of the majority (Standish, 2002).

In Provincial assemblies, the regional MP, who was the chairman of the Provincial Budget Priority committee, would tend to channel resources towards those who voted him into power. They were his political power base and he would also take into account those people who voted with him to pass executive decisions. This reinforced his power and status and served as a reminder to people in his electorate to vote him back into power in the next election. As Kurer (2001) observed this was not always the case and sometimes very few were re-elected, for a number of reasons only known to the voters, since in a democratic election system power belongs to the people. However, the fact that the elected representative was able to deliver goods and services reinforced the legitimacy of his leadership role and build trust in him as a leader. This situation would apply to wantoks and non wantoks.

The elected members of provincial, district or local level governments, who are not affiliated through kinship or wantoks, were generally in a better position to break this ethnic barrier, since they were not obliged to serve just one ethnic group. Their power base was spread out and included various social networks (May, 2004). The number of non-indigenous people or foreigners in the National Political arena has increased over the past few years and similarly the same trend can be observed in the local political arena. This situation was an indication of a shift in social relationships and political affiliations.
Political structures in PNG have changed extensively from traditional times to what can now be observed in contemporary society. Whilst society was largely small and stateless, with very few social divisions, the introduction of the formal democratic system and other administrative changes has in some ways altered the previous strong horizontal relationships. Society was now a mixture of horizontal and vertical relationship. For example, people in an electorate looked towards their political leader as the supplier of resources from the government and disappointments arose when this was not forthcoming. The strong horizontal relationships have placed people in a position of power to dictate terms to their local political leader, in order to channel resources or they would not re-elect him in the next election. Therefore, the political leader felt he must meet these demands or face elimination in the next election and a type of patron-client relationship was formed. Patronage politics was now arguably the type of politics practiced in PNG today (Standish, 2004).

There was however, very little shift in the degree of trust placed on National leaders, since more often than not people trusted and willingly cooperated with the Local Level Government leaders (May, 2005) The fact that more than 75 percent of the population still resided in rural villages meant that political processes which conformed to traditional rules and sanctions were more likely to be successful. (Standish, 2004)

Nevertheless, there is a slow shift in this relationship as modernisation slowly seeps into societal structures. Social and political structures and relationships have experienced many changes because there is now greater social mobilisation, improved infrastructure and access to education and formal employment. The following section highlights how wantokism can be seen as a form of social capital, in the light of these changes in society.

_Wantokism as a form of Social Capital_

The wantok (one talk) system could best be seen as a form of social capital as it embodied and provided a system of social relations which provided opportunities for
cooperation and trust. Most commonly, people referred to their wantoks as those people who were related to them through kinship relationships. The base units of this social network were clans and tribal groupings. From hunting, gathering and trading expeditions, feasting and tribal fighting, to political elections, an individual's wantok relationship provided the first step to mobilisation for collective work. Wantoks sometimes formed the primary unit of political and social loyalty (Reilley and Philbot, 2002).

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, increasingly in contemporary PNG society, the term now tended to incorporate those outside of these traditional relationships. However, when someone referred to his wantoks, in the first instance he would more often be referring to those related to him through kinship ties. Relationships were also changing, due to the fact that people were no longer confined to their traditional communal ideologies, based on reciprocity. Increasingly the modernity associated with the influx of modern technologies, education and health systems, the increased cost of living and reliance on the monetary economy meant that people were increasingly being pressured to be more concerned about the welfare of their own families and the advancement of their own networks, even if that meant the breaking out of the bonded solidarity that was more or less the characteristic of wantokism (Reilley and Philpot, 2002). In a study of ethnic social capital in Malawi, Rohregger (2006) explained how social capital was increasingly becoming a scarce resource in many developing countries, as issues of trust, solidarity and reciprocity became jeopardised by the worsening of social and economic conditions.

Revisiting the ideas mentioned in Chapter Two, Putnam (1993: 35) described social capital as a “set of horizontal associations between people” and it consisted of social networks that had either a positive or negative impact on the way society progressed. Coleman (1988: 98) defined social capital as “a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structure, and they facilitate certain actions of actors-whether personal or corporate actors-within the structure” This implied a vertical relationship, as well as a horizontal relationship,
between actors. Another important definition of social capital, described by North (1990), is that which encompasses the social and political environment, which then shapes the social structures and enables norms to develop. Institutional relationships, such as tribal taboos, customs, government, the judicial system and civil and political liberties were important components of social capital.

Papua New Guinea had a high level of ethnic and linguistic diversity with more than 800 known languages, making it one of the most diverse in the world. About one fifth of the world's languages were found in PNG (Dorney, 1990). Its people were fragmented into many ethnic groups, who generally identify with their respective social groupings. The popular slogan of 'unity in diversity', which had become a national motto, was sometimes argued to be merely rhetoric preached at the elite level, in order to offer a sense of security in a very ethnically fragmented society (Ancre, 1998). Although fragmented, as I have discussed earlier, over the years improved communication networks, transportation, establishing of trading networks, access to formal education and employment meant that these inter-community cultural barriers were gradually being overcome. PNG society had always functioned communally and group needs were generally given priority over individual needs. There was also a high degree of respect accorded to leaders in society and this reinforced some of the vertical relationships that had more or less always existed from traditional times, but in varying degrees in different parts of PNG. The degree of social capital in wantokism was so strong that there had been incidences of people being involved in tribal fights, in order to protect the interest of their respective groups. The type of ethnic diversity, represented in PNG, could also be a problem, since serious conflicts between competing groups could be harmful to growth and development (Annett, 2001).

However, whilst a great many inter-community cultural barriers were being overcome, as contemporary PNG society succumbed to the forces of modernisation, ethnic affiliations still represented the strongest form of trust, cooperation and loyalty to a course of action. In PNG, wantokism was a very important form of social relationship and all social,
political, economic and cultural activities functioned with some degree of influence from an individual’s wantok relationship. People tended to offer a higher degree of trust and cooperation to others with whom they identified as their wantoks (Monsell, 1993).

When mobilising for communal activities, trust among all parties is very important and this often begins with a person’s wantok. The success or failure of businesses, sporting organisations, government departments and community projects are dependent on the manner in which their social relationships and networks function. The research for this thesis explores these relationships, through a comparative study of two communities. The next section outlines the research methodologies used in this research.

Conclusion

It is not easy to state for certain if wantokism, as a form of social capital, has been influenced by the social and political environment or vice versa. The debate on whether shared values and trust create organisations or organisations create shared values is ongoing and discussion in this chapter has pointed out that, in PNG, it is a mixture of both. The changing social and political environment has had a drastic impact on the way wantokism is understood. From those people related through kinship ties, wantokism has now moved to new wantoks, which have been established through bridging networks. It is therefore safe to say that the notion of wantokism encompasses both traits of bonding social capital and bridging social capital.

Whilst there have been suggestions that the highly heterogeneous ethnic structures in PNG do not foster state performance, it could be argued that there is a form of local social capital, which has proven to be successful in mobilising and sustaining collective action in the past and continues to do so. Wantokism could therefore be a form of local social capital that needs to be understood in its socio cultural context.

The research for this thesis attempts to establish the importance of understanding this local social capital in Papua New Guinea, through comparing two communities that
experienced the setting up of development projects in their respective areas. The following chapter outlines the methodologies used in this research.
Chapter 4: Methodology

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, a contextual understanding of the social, cultural and political context of Papua New Guinea was provided. There was also a discussion relating to the contextual challenges facing wantokism, social capital and development. This chapter addresses the research methodologies adopted when gathering data and during research within prescribed context.

The first few sections of this chapter introduce the study areas and the various practical issues that were faced prior to and during the research. These sections cover areas such as my personal motivation, positionality and subjectivity and funding, the establishment of contacts and an understanding of local customs. This research was conducted during the national general election in Papua New Guinea and therefore the following sections discuss related ethical issues and limitations to this study which are related to the election event. The final sections point out the study methods and data collection techniques chosen for this study.

Geographical locations of Buna School project and Kokoda Hospital project

The research involved two development projects, located in two different districts of Oro Province of PNG. These were a community school project in Buna, which was in Ijivitari District and the Kokoda Hospital project in Sohe District. The Province was divided into two districts, comprising nine Local Level Government (LLG) areas. The Buna community school project was located in the Oro Bay LLG area and it was funded by JICA and located in the heart of Buna village. Buna is located on the northern coast of Oro Province, approximately 100 kilometres from the main provincial capital. Travel to the village was either by road, which took about two hours on very rocky unsealed road or by a small boat from the nearest village, which would take about three hours or more, depending on the weather at sea.
With regard to the school project, this community school accepted students from neighbouring villages, as it was the largest in the area. For this part of the research, a sample of research participants included mostly people from the Buna community. Research participants from the neighbouring villages, who I had initially anticipated interviewing, could not be reached because of the geographical location and the sensitivity of the national election campaigns, at the time. People were not able to freely move around, since voter mobilisation was being intensified by certain candidates and their supporters.

The second project was the hospital funded jointly by Rotary Australia and the Oro Provincial Government and this was located in the Kokoda local level government area in Sohe district. This hospital project was located in the highlands of Oro Province, about 150 kilometres north east of the Popondetta, the Provincial capital. It was located in the Kokoda Government station and travel to the location was only by road. The road was sealed and as such travel was comfortable but accessibility was hindered by the unavailability of vehicles.

The Kokoda local level government area was one of the largest and most populated areas in Oro Province and as such this health centre served great many people. Travel from villages on the outskirts to the health centre was sometimes hindered because it was located in a mountainous area and the main road, used by public motor vehicles, only stopped at the Government station. Research participants included samples from these villages. Due to the political situation and the geography of the area making it difficult for me to access participants, those participants used for this part of the research included people who lived close to the Kokoda government station.

**Personal Issues/Subjectivity**

My personal motivation for undertaking this research is that I live in one of the least developed provinces in PNG. I have observed many successful development projects
being initiated in the inland part of the province which is called Sohe. The Ijivitari district (which is where I come from) can be described as the least developed area because very few many development projects are initiated. My initial thoughts were that possibly the people in Sohe are more trusting and have a higher degree of social cohesion than the people who live in Ijivitari and thus it is conducive for development agencies to take an interest in that particular area. On the other hand, I thought that perhaps the type of local networks and relationships that people in Ijivitari share and the extent to which these could affect development outcomes were not being sufficiently understood by the development agencies.

Ethnic affiliations and social capital, as a strong research issue, did not surface in my mind until I started reading research undertaken by people such as Robert Putnam and the more recent works in PNG by Paolo de Renzio and David Kavanamur. This fuelled my enthusiasm to pursue this issue, which had previously arisen in my mind. In the course of my reading, I also found that it is not an easy task attempting to measure the type of social capital inherent in wantokism, as it is embedded in culture and various social factors also influence trust and cooperation (De Renzio and Kavanamur, 1999). In this research, I have therefore sought to focus on proxy indicators of trust and cooperation that are significant to the local context, since these are important elements in terms of the type of social capital found in Oro Province.

Whilst I had this motivation to conduct my research, I was also mindful of how I would explain the significance of this research to the research participants, since this would contribute to the amount of cooperation I would receive from them. Creating a very good first impression was very important (Scheyvens and Storey, 2003). For example, a research participant in Buna asked me if I was going to help rebuild the school project, which had, at that time, been halted for nearly two years. I had to explain that my research would help allow and encourage donors (or other development agencies) to seriously consider social capital from a cultural context, prior to embarking on any development initiatives. It was not my intention to bring about drastic policy changes or
miracles in the way things were done and I carefully explained this situation to people prior to and during the course of my research. Since I am very articulate in the local language, I was able to make myself clearly understood on this issue.

**Positionality**

I am well known in the area because I was working with the government before coming to New Zealand for study. I took time to explain, face to face with the research participants, that I was not conducting this research under the banner of the government but as a student. I had also, prior to conducting the interviews, provided information sheets to all the research participants and I had explained in person what I was doing. I found that this action helped substantially when I informed them of my position and their position, with regard to the research.

Another factor, of which I was mindful, was the lack of trust in government workers, by the wider community. I found this was reflected in the way certain responses were given, in both research areas. For example, a research participant in Kokoda made a comment about government officers conducting ward profiles but nothing really happened as a result. Being a former government officer, I felt the comment was directed at me but I had to swallow the anger building up inside me and explain, in the most diplomatic manner, that he was right in some ways but my research was not intended to directly influence government spending but it would provide insights into certain social factors that are often not well understood, when development initiatives are brought to an area. I also had to make it known that I was not there as a government officer, but only as a student. Although I felt he reluctantly gave me the information, the most important factor that helped him to have a change of heart was me explaining my position and how this research could be used to understand development in our local context. Merriam et al (2001) showed the importance of stating your position, prior to conducting research, since it allowed people to know their place in regard to the research and the researcher.
Whilst in both these communities I noticed that people were slightly suspicious of my activities in the area, I did not confine my activities in the research community to only interviews and research. As much as possible, I became involved in community activities, since active involvement in community activities by the researcher allows respondents to ‘open up’. In a research conducted on women’s participation in the Australian sugar industry, the author showed how she was able to freely participate in community activities as a country girl and at the same time maintain her status as an academic feminist (Pini, 2004).

I was actively involved in funeral arrangements for the paramount chief’s son at Buna, which happens to be my mother’s village. I actually contributed half of the expenses for the purchase of the coffin for the deceased. This was one way I felt I could make it easier to prove the genuineness of my involvement in the community. At the Kokoda community, being a popular figure in the soccer fraternity in the Province, I was involved with a meeting, where the upcoming Provincial soccer tournament was being discussed and I offered some suggestions on how to develop youth potential in the area.

Although being a local and an insider, I was also aware of my dress code, since I was still an outsider coming from an overseas institution. However, as I started to involve myself in community activities, I realised that by placing too much emphasis on self awareness, I had put pressure on myself to always dress appropriately. Whilst I felt a suitable dress code was important, I was accepted in the community following my participation in their activities and I did not feel that people saw my clothes as a factor that differentiated me from them.

As much as possible, I conducted my dressing in a simple but respectful way. It was difficult to camouflage myself within the crowd, as I stood out in the small communities where people generally know everyone and what they are doing. I was very aware that my presence in the community was attracting some degree of attention and as such I tried
not to spending large sums of money when going to the local markets and I kept away from crowds.

The first few days in the community were spent associating within informal gatherings. I put familiarisation first on my agenda before I even started on the interviews. A community member at Kokoda commented, during my stay there, that he was humbled by my ability to come from a big university overseas and to bring myself down to their level and have a few hot beers with grass roots with them in a remote village. Scheyvens and Storey (2003) described two levels of power differences associated with research. Firstly, those that existed in the minds of research participants as they looked at the 'superior' researcher with academic merits and secondly, the power differences which arose as a result of access to material processions. In this locality, I found this to be a very important guide for my behaviour when conducting the fieldwork.

Reciprocity and local customs

My initial contacts with the Provincial authorities, especially the Provincial Administrator, and the health and education advisors, were accompanied by gift giving but this was not the traditional betel nut sharing or food sharing as these practices are not allowed by law in a government office. I gave out shirts and key tags, with logos depicting New Zealand on them and these served very well as gifts, which allowed me to speak easily with the people about what I was doing in their area. Whilst the value in monetary terms of these gifts was small, the value it served, by giving me an audience with these authorities, was very high.

However, at Buna, I did not exercise gift giving prior to interviewing the community leaders, since I had made a contribution towards the funeral arrangements for the chief's son and this was considered a significant enough gift to allow me to have an audience with the village leaders. I was going to prepare gifts to be given to the Project Board members, before talking to them, but I was advised against it by my uncles as the
community was aware of my contribution regarding the coffin. This was evident when the community leaders willingly made themselves available for an audience with me after the funeral. Gift giving, by way of food offerings or artefacts is also reciprocated by locals as a sign of welcome and saying goodbye or to thank visitors and I was given some food and pork meat during the funeral feast, in return for my contribution to the funeral arrangements.

The Kokoda project was quite different as I had to involve myself in gift giving, prior to talking with certain community leaders. These gifts were in the form of betel nuts given in bunches. However, one of the leaders I interviewed was not a betel nut chewer, since he was a Seventh Day Adventist, so I gave some money to the women of the house to organise the lunch for after the interview and this served very well as a form of gift giving. In this area, I interviewed two leaders and I took care that I gave enough time for idle chat before and after the meeting and I was also mindful to ensure that the interview looked like a courtesy visit to the leaders’ house, rather than a straight forward interview because I felt this showed respect for the leader. Therefore, in this case, I did not move out from the leader’s house onto another research participant, since I felt this would make my visit appear too ‘ordinary’.

Being a local person, I did not need to be taught these customs but in this situation I was an educated elite, albeit from the area, who was coming from an overseas institution to conduct research and certain locals, especially those in the Kokoda area to whom I am not related by kin would tend to see me as an outsider and I was quite aware of this situation. My active involvement in other community activities, especially sports, helped tarnish any ideas that I was unfamiliar with the local customs and traditions.

In local customs, there are rules of engagement with regard to talking to certain categories of females, such as married women or young girls. There was a female research participant, who I interviewed in the presence of her husband and she kept
turning to her husband, as if to get approval for her answers. For some of the questions she and her husband agreed to the responses but I felt her husband’s presence may have influenced her responses. I accepted that I had to adhere to local customs and traditions with regard to talking to married women.

In the Oro Province, one of the important cultural traits that are held in high regard is the notion of *kotopu* which in the local vernacular means respect: Respect for yourself, your family, your trading partners, your enemies, the land and your ancestors. Whilst other traits are considered important, respect is given a very high regard and as such, whilst conducting my field research, I took care that the utmost respect for the local traditions and customs was given, where it was owed.

**Practical Issues**

One of the main issues of concern was whether I would have sufficient funds to cover the cost of my research. In this research, I was privileged to be a student on a New Zealand Agency for International Development (NZAID) scholarship, which meant that the cost of travel to and from the closest capital city, to where I would conduct research, was funded by my scholarship. NZAID also provided some additional funding for the purchase of equipments and for photocopying and printing at the end of the research. As a result, I only had to seek additional funding for the cost of domestic travel to the research sites.

Whilst this additional funding appeared sufficient at the beginning, I discovered that it was quite different in the field, since as my research coincided with election period and local public motor vehicle (PMV) owners were charging much higher rates for their vehicles than I had expected. I was told by the locals that this was because in this election most candidates were endorsed by political parties and as such there were huge sums of money being spent to entice supporters. I got caught up in this wave of higher prices and
I had to spend an unexpectedly large amount of money on vehicle hire and board and lodging, since the cost of using public facilities were standardised by local business men.

I visited two research locations and for the Buna community school project I used a vehicle hired by the provincial authorities. However, I still had to buy fuel for its use and pay some local boys who got onto the vehicle to help me out when it got stuck in the mud. These boys requested payment in the form of beer and 'coins' as they called it, referring to cash for their cigarettes and I found that this was sufficient enough to satisfy them.

Establishing Contacts

When establishing contacts, I used my own contacts and the networks of trust I had established, prior to coming to New Zealand for study. Prior to the field work, I had difficulty trying to establish contact with the relevant authorities and others in the field to make an appointment, due to communication difficulties. I was also a local person from the area and I understood that telephone calls to make appointments to meet in person were not the best way to arrange a meeting and often the best way was to physically visit the office to make appointments.

My first two days at Kokoda was spent paying courtesy visits to the local councillor and the assistant district administrator, who is in charge of the Government station at Kokoda and also the officer in charge of the Health Centre. My first contact with locals at the other research location was quite different. Whilst I was in Brisbane, transiting to PNG, I was informed that the son of the paramount chief at Buna had died. He was also a close relative, since my mother is from Buna and she was adopted into the Paramount chief's family as the eldest daughter. Upon arrival I involved myself in all the funeral arrangements as the 'haus krai' (English 'House Cry') which is a place where mourners gather together and this was established at my father’s house in town.
Whilst it was a family obligation for me to be involved in such an important gathering, this event also served as a very important way of establishing initial contact with the leaders? the participants? Instead of introducing myself in a formal way, I got involved in a community activity that was a concern for the whole community. I met most of the research participants and during the course of the gathering and the funeral arrangements I also informed them that I would be doing some work after the funeral, by way of visiting and talking to the local community.

**Gatekeepers**

Since the two research locations were situated in different districts, I had to make the first contact with their respective LLG councillors, in order to inform them about what I was doing and in the process I could make my neutrality known and understood at the beginning of my research. Even though I was a local person in the research locality, it was still very important that I sought some permission from the local authorities, such as the project board chairmen and the local level government councillors, who are highly respected elders in the community. As I mentioned previously, respect is highly regarded in PNG society. Below are extracts from my field journal at Buna showing how I very nearly blundered on my initial contact with a gatekeeper;

"...the headmistress of Buna community school thought that I knew who the chairman of the school was so she did not introduce me to him and I thought he was a relative who had got on the vehicle on our drive to the school grounds. During my conversation I kept referring to the chairman Mr X who was now the former chairman, Mr X without realising that there had been a change and the new chairman, Mr S was standing beside me. After a while I decided to interview the head mistress of the school in one of the classrooms. It was during the interview that she told me there had been a change in the school board and the new chairman was Mr S. I was so embarrassed I had to stop the interview for a
while to go out and sincerely apologise to the chairman for my ignorance.” (Field
journal Monday 18th June, 2007, Buna village)

Other people, who I categorised as ‘gatekeepers’ in Kokoda, were the local political
candidate’s committees, who were working to ensure that other candidates did not send in
their committees to campaign in the area. It was, however, important that I gave this
group of gatekeepers the same respect I had accorded to other authorities. The following
is an extract from my field journal:

“This afternoon I walked over to the market to buy some peanuts and along
the way met the committee for Candidate N drinking beer at a cowboys store
so I decided to join them for a few beers. During the drinking one of the
committee members walked up to me and shook my hands and told me how
humbled he was that a person of my stature could be mingling with them at
the grassroots. He told me that I could freely move around and that my safety
is guaranteed while doing my research at Kokoda” (Field Journal Friday
30th June, 2007, Kokoda Station)

During the research, I was cautious about whom I was in contact with especially, since it
was the eve of the National election and people were expected to be suspicious of other
people during this time of intense political voter mobilisation. As much as possible, I
tried to maintain a position of neutrality and kept away from political gatherings. I was
also mindful that there was some tension in the area between two rival candidates, prior
to my arrival, so I had to ensure my neutrality was completely understood.

**Boarding and Lodging**

During the first week at Buna, I had board and lodgings with the villagers. It is customary
for young men of the village to stay awake all night and work in shifts when there is a
funeral going on. In this instance, however, I was accorded a ‘big man’ status and as such I sat with the elders. Although I was asked by the other elders to go home and sleep, I felt it would be disrespectful to go home, so I stayed most nights with the elders. The following is an extract from my field journal:

"Today we buried Uncle Sylvester (Chief’s son) after a long procession accompanied by traditional singing and dancing. Youths were also involved singing gospel hymns at the burial site. I am tired after having spent three sleepless nights in town and again here at Buna. The smell of strong tobacco is unbearable at nights. The food is good but my eyes are heavy. However I cannot go home yet as the funeral feast is yet to be done and I must show my respects as a man of the tribe to be with the elders until everything is completed. Most likely the feast will be in three days time as sago is still being beaten up and garden food is still being piled up close to the funeral place. Contributions are coming from community members for the feast." (Field Journal, Saturday 16th June, 2007, Buna Village).

After the funeral feasting, I was able to sleep in a house that was built for my family by my mother’s brothers. This was where I kept all my research papers and interview records. It is customary that visitors to the village are fed by the whole community so I was invited to almost every family dinner during my two weeks of stay, after the funeral feast at Buna village. I found I was well accepted and did not meet any hostility from anyone within the community.

As I had anticipated, board and lodging at the other research location in Kokoda proved to be somewhat difficult to organise. I had made prior arrangements with the Officer in charge (OIC) at the health centre to use the guest house, located within the Health centre area, but upon arrival I found out that it was fully occupied. Fortunately, I was able to find accommodation with some youths from a nearby village, who were at the Kokoda
station for a political rally. Although I felt this might jeopardise my neutrality, I was quick to approach the local councillor that same evening I had arrived and I informed him about what I was doing and therefore I felt relieved of this pressure of not appearing neutral. I slept in a house made from bush materials and since there were only three rooms in the house I was given the honour of using one room, whilst the other leaders of the group shared the other rooms. The building was very simple but it served my purpose well and it cost me only K25.00 (NZ$12.00) a night, including meals. This also gave me an opportunity to converse and get to know other people who were in the area too. I also chose this venue for accommodation, as it was located in the centre of the community and travellers from other neighbouring communities use this venue to rest and therefore, it was an opportunity to meet different people.

Although, being a local, I was continuously mindful of being seen as a class above them because of my university credentials, I thought that by eating the same type of food and sleeping in similar accommodation I would ‘bring myself down’ to their level and they could then interact with me on level terms. I felt that my gesture, regarding my accommodation, minimised any social divisions that they had previously envisioned.

**Ethical Concerns**

Ethical approval for field research was a result of adhering to guidelines set out by Massey University. Since this research involved interviews involving human subjects, areas that might prove to be of ethical consideration were discussed at the ethics committee meeting, which involved my two supervisors and me. Other requirements, such as the low risk notification were as per the Massey University Code of ethical conduct. This was submitted to the Massey University Ethics committee for consideration and approval was given. The basic issues that were of concern in this research are outlined below.
It is quite normal in PNG culture to give consent verbally and as such this approach was used to obtain consent from a great many the research participants. In most encounters in this research, a simple hand shake and the sharing of betel nut or a cup of tea was considered a sufficient consent to conduct interviews. There were, however, signed consents taken from the other literate members of the community I visited.

The use of appropriate language was considered very important in this research. Being a very fluent speaker of both languages spoken in the area, assistants were not required. Most responses to questions, especially those from illiterate respondents, were interpreted on the spot and written down in English. It was also noted during this research that certain responses, given in the local ‘Ewage’ dialect in Buna and the ‘Oro Kaiva’ dialect in Kokoda, when translated into English had different meanings to what was intended. Being articulate in both languages, I wrote their responses in English and ‘carried’ the meaning of what was intended.

Research sample participants, chosen for this study, were not all cooperative, as the following extracts from my field journal show. Any signs of negativity, or refusal to participate, were observed through body language and amends were made to approaches, in order to suit the situation.

"...two interviewees when asked to be interviewed separately today decided that they should sit together as they felt they had no secrets and wanted to give their thoughts together. Although I had explained that it was to be individual’s views they sat together so I understood that to be comfortable for them so I used only one questionnaire" (Field Journal, Thursday 20th June 2007, Buna Community School)
"An interviewee this morning looked me straight in the eye when I asked a question regarding trust among board members so I took it that he didn’t want to answer the question. I explained that if he didn’t feel comfortable he could skip the question which he agreed to" (Field Journal, Thursday 20th June 2007, Buna Community School)

"An important board member went to the garden this morning although I informed him last night that I would be paying him a visit today." (Field Journal Friday 28th June, 2007, Kokoda)

Anonymity and confidentiality issues were explained to the research participants prior to their participation in interviews, through information sheets. I understood that my presence in the community asking questions would arouse suspicion, particularly during the election period. On several occasions in both localities, I was asked a great many questions about what I was doing and as much as possible my explanation of the research avoided any involvement with any political groups or persons.

I also anticipated that people in this research locality, especially the leaders, would want publicity for their participation, particularly if it was known that this research was being conducted by someone from an overseas institution. However, most people I contacted did not wish their names to be used and some research participants did not answer all the questions I asked, as they felt the question/topic was too sensitive. One community leader, however, thought my research was very interesting and asked to see a copy of my findings and research. I explained that I would provide brief findings for him at a later date.

Although this research was conducted as a student, I am still a government officer employed by the provincial government and I have my own views, regarding trust and cooperation issues between wantoks and non wantoks within the community. These...
views were largely influenced by my personnel experiences working in the province and the associations I had before coming to New Zealand. To minimise any conflict of interest and bias through my opinions, responses and recordings of observations were restricted to what I found in the field, although I did feel that the responses could have been different, given further time in which to conduct the research. I was also quite aware of how people conducted themselves in both localities and as such there were constant re-evaluations of the researcher-researched relationships during the course of this study, to ensure that I did not lose sight of my aims and objectives.

Acts of reciprocity in gift giving are a part of the PNG way of doing things and as such this cultural practice was used in this research, in order to thank those who had participated in the research. In both research locations, acts of gift giving, as a gesture of appreciation, was done quite differently. At the Buna community, which was comprised mostly of people who were related to me through kinship ties, a dinner was organised by the family that was hosting me. I invited other family members who had assisted me, including school board members and others who were not interviewed. This served well as a gesture of appreciation from me. I did not feel this would disclose the identities of the people involved in the research, since all of them were relatives gathering to bid me farewell.

In the other research location, this act of reciprocity had to be undertaken differently. In this location, my visits to research participants were informal and therefore I purchased sugar and tea with biscuits or simply gave food to the mother of the house for her to cook for lunch or dinner, depending on the time of my visit. After the interviews, I sat for a meal with the research participants. This was sufficient enough as a gift. It was not considered proper to attempt to have a dinner and invite everyone, as they were all people not related to me and any attempt to bring them all together would have drawn attention to individuals, thus making it easy to identify who had taken part in the research.
Limitations

One key limitation in this research was conducting it during the month of June and July, which was coincidentally the same time the National Elections were being held in Papua New Guinea. I had expectations that I might receive certain responses, which had been being influenced by the elections. Nevertheless, as much as possible, I cross checked information from various sources, to ensure that information was not distorted to suit a particular political idea.

An election in Papua New Guinea is a very sensitive time because of intense political mobilisation. This is also, perhaps, a time when issues of trust, solidarity and cooperation towards a person or group will not be expressed openly, for fear of inciting hostility from an opposing political camp. This meant that I had to very carefully choose strategies for the interviews and data collection and as I expected there was a certain degree of hesitation when participants responded to certain questions and I fully understood that this was because of people’s reluctance to say such things during the sensitive period of elections.

I had intended to interview sample participants from all the stake holders involved in the project but due to communication problems, prior to arriving in the research area and difficulty in locating contacts upon arrival, I did not have enough time to contact any donor agency personnel from the Japanese International cooperation Agency (JICA) and Rotary Australia. This research, therefore, does not have secondary data from these agencies and any views presented are those of the provincial authorities only. However, some background information relating these projects was obtained through accessing the official JICA and Rotary Australia web sites.

Establishing contacts and rekindling old networks, with relevant people at the research location, proved to be a limitation in this study. This was largely due to the fact that the communication network at the location, I was visiting, was very poor. The first few days
and weeks of the research were spent establishing contacts. This proved to be quite daunting, given that it was election season. There was also the week spent with the Buna community, attending the funeral proceedings and this took up a whole five days of the allotted research time.

During these times it is normal election culture in PNG for people to gather together in political camps. This situation made contact with certain desired research participants, especially board members of the projects concerned, very difficult, since they were heavily involved in these gatherings. I tried to maintain a neutral stand during such proceedings and I had to practice patience if I wanted to talk with such interviewees. However, given the short time I had to conduct this research, this proved to be a limitation in this study.

Study Methods

The field research was undertaken over six weeks, from June 9th to July 15th 2007, in PNG and it included the collection of primary and secondary data. Data collection methods used for this thesis was confined to measuring the outcomes of social capital, as indicators of social capital or ‘proximal’ indicators of social capital (Stone, 2001). In this case, trust and cooperation were used an indicators and the outcomes measured were those which were specific to the local context. Primary data collection was undertaken using semi-structured questionnaires, unstructured informal interviews, participatory observation and a field journal. Secondary data was obtained from interviews conducted with Provincial Planning, Education and Health offices and official information from JICA and Rotary Australia web sites.

My research was an attempt to interpret the manner in which people acted in their natural setting. In this sense, my research was mostly qualitative. Denzin and Lincoln (2000: 3) wrote that “qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of meanings people bring to them.”
Bryman (1988: 8) also noted, "The way in which people being studied understand and interpret their social reality is one of the central motifs of qualitative research." In this research, I have employed data collection methods which allowed close contact between me and the research participants. "Qualitative research Data collection methods usually involve close contact between the researcher and research participant, which are interactive and developmental and allow for emergent issues to be explored" (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003: 5). My research also included some aspects of quantitative methods, as I also used data analysis of responses from questionnaires to arrive at my conclusions. Strauss and Corbin (1998: 11) explained that quantitative research was "research that produces findings arrived at by statistical methods or other means of quantification".

Due to the limitations I have mentioned in the preceding section, a large amount of cross checking of data from various sources were done, to ensure that the data I collected was well supported. For example, responses to questions about who participants would entrust to take care of their personal property, if they were away from the area, were cross checked during informal conversations with others in the community. Since it was election time, there was increased movement of people from different but neighbouring villages and community travelling to and from the area, as the political candidates attempted to mobilise political support. I was able to mingle with travellers and engage in other informal gatherings and I used this time to gather information which was recorded in my field journal and this enabled me to cross check information given during the formal interviews.

Purposeful sampling techniques were employed in this research, since it was a comparative study, where the research sample was determined by the participants' involvement with the community and the project in question. The first group of interviewees were programme board members involved in the projects. These were people who were directly responsible for the management of the projects. The second group of interviewees were ordinary members of the community. This resulted in the obtaining of information that the participants may have deliberately omitted or forgot to
mention. The next section highlights the practical methods I used to collect this information and the challenges this methods posed in the field.

Sampling

As mentioned in the preceding section, I purposefully chose the research sample but the choice of who to interview in this sample done was random. Marshall (2006: 523) explained “Purposeful or judgemental sampling techniques are useful if the researcher has practical knowledge of the research area as this allows the researcher to select the most productive sample to answer the research question.” In both locations the research sample was undertaken by drawing a sketch map of the area and dividing it into different residential areas, in order to make it easier to identify the houses of the chosen research participants.

In the Buna area, a rough sketch map of the area was made during the second week and divided into the three main clan groupings, the Junga, Sebaga and Andere clans. Residents belonging to one clan reside close together in one area and so this group’s character and geographical location was used as a means to easily map out the area. Fifteen people were randomly chosen and I ensured that five participants were randomly chosen from each area. The reason for this was to obtain a fair representation of views. Residents in these three locations were not restricted to clan members only, since there were mixed marriages and therefore these residents came from another village, province or clan. All houses in each clan area were given random numbers from one to wherever the numbering stopped and they were not necessarily in the order that they were physically located.

The sampling of research participants in Kokoda was also done on location, during the fourth week of the research. A sketch map of the area was drawn, with the help of a map provided by local level government officers and it was divided into three areas: The market, Primary School and community centre areas. The same procedure, as the one used at Buna to randomly choose research participants, was also used at this location.
The selection of research participants in Buna was done by giving an allocation to each person with a clan, house number and designation, either as female youth, male youth and adult male or adult female. In Kokoda, each person was allocated his place of residence instead of his clan. This meant that for house 1, there were four pieces of paper cut and placed in a box to be randomly picked. The same procedure was done for all the other houses. The following two examples illustrate this procedure: BS-1-f-y meant Buna Sebaga clan house 1, female youth and BA-1-a-m meant Buna Andere house 1, adult male. The same method was applied in Kokoda, for example KM-1-a-f meant Kokoda Market area, house 1 and adult female.

It is normal in this locality to have more than one adult or youth living under the same roof so, in order to avoid having to interview everyone, I only interviewed one person who was available at a location and who was willing to be interviewed at the time of visit. For this research, youths were categorised as those unmarried young people between the ages of 18 and 25. Those that were married or unmarried, above the age of 25, were placed in the category of adults. In addition, for this research, young men or women between the ages of 18 and 25, who were married, were classed as adults. The reason for such categorisation was because, in both these localities, a young man or woman acquires the status of adult when s/he is married.

The procedure described above was used in sampling those research participants that were part of the community. The first group of interviewees were board members from the projects concerned. As there had been changes in board membership in both projects, old and new board members were interviewed. All the individuals were given pseudonyms and these were placed in a box from which six ‘names’ were randomly chosen, from both locations. As the number of people on the board was not as large as the size of the entire community, the inclusion of categories, such as age group and gender, was not considered. Six interviewees from the board were considered a significant enough number to represent the board’s views.
Questionnaires and Interviews

Questionnaires used for the research were generally closed ended with few open ended questions allowing for the stating of reasons for certain responses. Frequently, people in this locality do not give a straight yes or no answer. They rather tend to give reasons for acting in a particular way, whilst allowing the researcher to ‘read between the lines’. Also, it is sometimes not considered polite to say yes or no. I used my local knowledge to understand this situation but I also sought clarification from the interviewees before recording a response. The following abstract from my field journal illustrates one way I was able to cross check information and record responses;

"...I noticed that one of the responses to a question asked today was that board members relay information across the other but “not in a right way”...I understood it to be that leaders bulldoze decisions without proper consultation but wasn’t sure so I asked what the interviewee meant by “not right way” when he came around to visit me this afternoon for dinner. He told me he meant board leaders pass on information through others whom they trust most and do not front up with others on sensitive matters....I had nearly recorded my own thoughts so thought I should cross check all other responses too" (Field Journal, Saturday, 22nd June, 2007, Buna village)

The questionnaire used in this research was also given to an articulate person in the community to read and give me feed back. He felt that my questions were not too sensitive but he also felt I should take care when handling the information collected, since it could be considered as a breach of trust and confidentiality if the information was ‘leaked’, particularly during the election period, when rival candidates seek to score political points by using certain confidential information to bring disrepute upon another candidate in order to mobilise his/her support. This was considered a good assurance to go ahead with the use of the questionnaires.
Primary data collected was from the Questionnaire and Participant observation schedule, which will be explained in the next section. As the questionnaires were all in English, only a few people taking part this research opted to answer the questions themselves. Most interviewees were interviewed personally in the local vernacular and their answers interpreted on the spot, since I am very articulate in the dialects spoken in both localities. Any clarification of questions in the questionnaires was undertaken prior to the interviews and the responses were cross checked again with the interviewees at the end of each session, to ensure that I had understood what the participant had intended.

The questionnaire designed for this research was adopted from the Integrated Questionnaire for the measurement of social capital (SC-IQ), which was developed by several researchers for the World Bank (Grootaert et al, 2004). The purpose of the SC-IQ was “to provide a core set of survey questions for those interested in generating quantitative data on various dimensions of social capital.” (Grootaert et al, 2004: 2). I had, however, integrated open ended questions, in order to collect qualitative data. The reason why I chose to adopt this social capital assessment tool was that, as the authors explained, “there is much interest in social capital information in the context of the design and implementation of development projects, and the SC-IQ is useful for this purpose as well”.

The SC-IQ is designed to collect data from six different elements of social capital? in particular, groups and networks, trust and solidarity, collective action and cooperation, information and communication, social cohesion and inclusion and empowerment and political action. I chose that this research would concentrate on two of these areas: trust and cooperation. The other elements are interrelated with trust and cooperation so therefore I asked questions relating to this aspect but the main focus was on trust and cooperation, since these were central to social capital and wantokism.

Since indicators of trust and cooperation influence each other and it was difficult to separate the two issues. Woolcock (1998: 1002) explained where both of these elements were available in a community and believed that it starts a “virtuous circle where trust
promotes cooperation and cooperation promotes trust”. Although an attempt was made to separate the two, some of the questions were asked, in order to understand that the presence of cooperation could also indicate the presence of trust. Trust issues were investigated by asking questions on honesty, property custodianship, leadership, generalised trust, information sharing, trust in political institutions and insider-outsider relationships. Cooperation issues were investigated by asking questions about the duration of residency, ethno-linguistic networks, church affiliations, participation and engagement, levels of acceptance and benefits from projects. The questionnaire used and the summary of responses is found in Appendix numbers, 1, 2, 3.

Whilst these formal interviews involving a questionnaire were the primary method of data collection, there were also informal interviews or conversations, which I had with other members of both communities I visited, where I took notes in my field journals and this notes served me well when I cross checked information given during the formal interviews. Field journals were recorded almost everyday but I sometimes took time off to be involved in community activities, so that I did not appear too formal. Generally, during the duration of this research, I spent the afternoons involved in informal gatherings.

Interviews conducted in both localities were undertaken at random as they were picked out from a box. This meant that visits to the chosen houses did not follow a particular order, according to their physical location. I felt this was a better method, since it did not arouse suspicion and the anonymity of the interviewees was protected. In between these interviews, I also made informal visits to homes, particularly those in the Buna community where I had relatives. It would therefore appear that I was just visiting these relatives and this was an important way to maintain the anonymity of the research participants. The Kokoda community was slightly different, since I did not relatives within that community, but the same method of visitation was used. However, the community was scattered in three separate locations and, therefore, I did not feel that any visits in the evenings, for formal interviews, would arouse any suspicions.
All the houses I visited were randomly sampled, as explained in the preceding section, and I recorded when we had set the interview time and date. All the interviews were conducted, in accordance to my schedule. However I allowed for flexibility during the actual interview dates and therefore interviews set for a future day were brought forward, if the sample participant picked was not available. Given that this was a society where respect is given a high regard, if my interview sample participant was unavailable, I did not interview another person but instead I spent the evening conversing with the household. Although this was time consuming, I found this did not deter my schedules.

The following is an abstract from one such incidence at Kokoda:

"I visited sample KS-4-m-y this evening but find that there was none in this household which fits in the category. I've opted not to interview anyone here but took note and will pick another sample. I spent the evening with the family and learnt a lot about the desires of the locals to have their own local MP in Parliament" (Field Journal, Thursday 27th June, Kokoda).

Two interviews per day were conducted, depending on the availability of the research participant. The most convenient time to locate individuals, in both localities, was in the evenings, when everybody was at home. Most interviews were conducted in the participants' homes, except for a few board members, who were interviewed at their place of work.

Participant Observation

Becker (1958: 652) wrote, "Researchers use this method of data collection when they are especially interested in understanding a particular organisation or substantive problem rather than demonstrating relations between abstractly defined variables". The researcher does this by "participating in the daily lives of people". "The researcher comes to a local situation with two purposes, firstly to engage in activities appropriate to the situation and
secondly, to observe the activities, people and physical aspects of the situation” (Spradley, 1980: 54). In this method of data collection, the research participant did not have full knowledge that they were being observed. Even if they knew that they were being observed, the actual nature and purpose of the observation was not known (Sarantakos, 1998). This method of data collection was used, in order to observe particularly meetings conducted in the area. A participant observation scheme (Annex two) was drawn up, whereby three separate stages in the meeting were observed: the pre meeting gathering time, the period of the meeting, and the time after the meeting. Proxy indicators, which were context specific, were used to observe the presence of trust and cooperation.

Indicators observed before the start of the meeting were people’s punctuality and the manner in which people greeted each other. In Oro custom, it is proper to welcome people to a meeting or gathering or to your home by shouting out “Oro” repeatedly, until the person has settled into the house or gathering place and this all occurs before the visitors and locals shake hands. This welcome gesture was used as a unit of observation, in this participant observation scheme. The reason being that where people have a harmonious trusting relationship they will greet each other upon sight and if there is lack of trust, the shouting will only be done by a few people and only when the visitor is close to the meeting place. The manner in which people were mixing together before the start of the meeting was also an important observation. It is also customary for people to share betel nuts, which are chewed together with lime and they are made from sea shells or corals and mustard during gatherings. The sharing of betel nut freely depicts an air of trust and harmonious relations between the meeting participants and this was another unit of observation used in this scheme.

During the meeting, three particular points were observed: the group composition, the time taken to talk during the meetings and the decision making. The number of meeting attendees, in the categories of men, women and youths, were observed. From these people the number of people who were project members and ordinary villagers was also
noted and the proportion of these to the total number of people at the meeting was recorded. People’s attendance at meetings alone was important, since both the communities observed are communal societies, where people’s degree of trust and cooperation could be observed merely from their attendance. Just attending a meeting showed that they trusted others who were there and they were willing to cooperate with others the communal cause. Therefore it was important to also record the categories of people in attendance.

The group compositions of insiders and outsiders was also observed and recorded. This category was chosen, since it would show, during the meeting, how much cooperation and trust people were willing to give outsiders and/or insiders. The insider-outsider issue was crucial to understanding the degree of social capital within wantoks, who were often insiders and non wantoks who were outsiders. It was therefore important to observe the interaction between these categories of people.

The time taken by each of these categories of people to speak was used as a unit of observation. Although this was an important unit of observation, I could only observe this during one meeting, which was conducted at Kokoda. However, at the meeting observed in the Buna community, where the purpose was to arrange the funeral for the son of the village chief, it would be disrespectful to keep a watch on the time taken by each individual speaker. The Kokoda meeting I, observed, was a more formal meeting set up by the local soccer association and in this case it was possible and not disrespectful to time the individual speakers.

The degree of influence each member of the group had, in determining the final outcome of the meeting, was another unit of observation used in this scheme. It was not easy to measure the degree of influence based on just observations, so in this situation I used my understanding of local customs to establish this measurement. For example, when a meeting attendee’s comment was agreed to by the majority of the other attendees, I took
this as a measure of influence. Another indicator was any constant reference to what this person had said initially. I also took this as a measure of influence. Different ratings, ranging from 1 being very influential, 2 influential, 3 not very influential and 4 having no influence, were used and the number recorded beside each attendee, in order to indicate their degree of influence. The categories of each group I observed were again, men, women, youth, insider and outsider. This was important, since the influence a person has, in determining an outcome of a meeting held in a communal society such as Oro, is a safe indicator of the trust and cooperation people are willing to give to that particular person.

In setting out my observations, during the meetings, I devised a simple system of note taking through the use of symbols and short notes to represent certain categories of people, the time taken and the degree of influence. One of the two meetings I observed in the Buna community was for the purpose of making funeral arrangements for the son of the paramount chief and since he was a very important member of the community, all the leaders and close relatives of the deceased were involved. Since it was disrespectful to time every individual speaker, ticks were placed beside the names of speakers at the meeting. Each person who spoke was given a tick for every 5 minutes and the number of ticks depended on the amount of time they had spoken. To represent a person's influence on decision making, I used asterisks in the same manner and I created acronyms specifically for the purpose of this research, to represent the category of the speaker and dots were used to represent a female speaker. The category, 'members', meant any person who was a member of the project board and 'non members' indicated ordinary villagers. In the following example •NMY meant female non member youth and MA meant adult male member. At this particular meeting, all the people involved were insiders so, therefore, there was no need to devise a system of identification for this category.

The Kokoda meeting involved members of the local soccer association. I chose this meeting, since it represented an excellent cross section of the community and it also included people who were board members of the Health Centre project. This meeting was
more formal than the meeting conducted at Buna but I still used the same system of categorising attendees and I also timed each speaker.

Whilst my preference was to observe some more meetings, the political situation did not allow for formal gatherings, where issues of trust and cooperation could be successfully observed well, since most gatherings were political rallies for the purpose of mobilising support. I did not feel this situation would be appropriate for the cause of this research.

Secondary Data

Secondary or documentary data often comes in the form of documents or data produced by writers and researchers, other than those studying the documents. They were called secondary because they were not primarily developed for the study in which they were used (Stergios, 1991). Sources of data for secondary analysis included public documents, archival records, mass media outputs, personal documents, administrative documents and formal studies or reports (Sarantakos, 2005). Gaining access to such documents could be through informal channels such as personal contacts, personnel solicitation and the World Wide Web (Cooper, 1998).

Secondary data for this research was taken from interviews conducted with the local planning, health and Education offices. Since I was not allowed to take hard copies of reports from the offices concerned, I was only able to glance through reports of both projects and interview the respective programme managers on issues such as administrative changes, funding for the projects, project board functions and their respective roles and responsibilities, as the monitoring agencies for the projects. Other information background information was accessed from the official websites of JICA and Rotary Australia.
Since hard copies of project reports were not provided or were not readily available, all secondary information collected was largely gathered from opinions sought from the project managers, which I recorded in my field journals and I also gathered information from the previous year's reports, which I glanced through but I was not allowed to remove from the office. Previously, I was working with this department, so I was able to gain access to annual departmental reports and I managed to extract information regarding the funding sources and other performance management reports. Prior permission had to be sought from the department head to undertake these tasks.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have shown the complexities of conducting research in a traditional society in Papua New Guinea. A researcher needs to conform to various social, cultural and political practices. Most importantly, the notion of *kotopu* or 'respect', which is given high regard in these communities, must be adhered to at all levels of society, from the traditional villagers to the bureaucrats in the local and provincial governments.

My advantage, in this field work, was that I was a local person from the area, returning to conduct research. I was in a position to better understand the social, cultural and political issues that were current in the area. This allowed me to accommodate or isolate myself from those issues that had the potential enhance or disrupt my fieldwork. It is possible that the results may have been different had I been an outsider. The fact that it was the period of a national general election in PNG meant that a local person could more easily blend into the community.

The use of four primary data collection methods; questionnaires, open interviews, participant observations and a field journal, proved to be quite successful. Nevertheless, I felt that issues, such as social capital, cannot be established with studies that have been handicapped by lack of time. I felt that, given more time, I could have established more concrete results. Similar to any other social science research, this research has its
limitations and this case it included the PNG elections, communication problems affecting access to key project resource personnel, lack of funding, problems with transportation and lack of available time, which I believe have affected the outcome of this research.

The research was mostly qualitative but quantitative data was also collected, through various provincial reports and projects reports from the provincial health, education and planning offices. Primary data consisted of information from the interviews and the devised participant observation schemes. The collection of data, such as that involving trust and cooperation, in a society such as PNG, is not an easy task and a great many changes had to be made in my approach when I took cultural issues into consideration. Furthermore, given the sensitivity of trust issues, especially during election time, the collection of data proved to be strenuous at times, when research participants did not always feel open enough to talk or sometimes they could not be easily located for an interview. As much as possible I allowed for flexibility and I was constantly re-evaluating my techniques and the researcher-researched relationship and I ensured that I did not lose sight of achieving my goals and objectives.
Introduction

This chapter introduces the two communities used in this research. Both communities chosen for this study were from the same area, the Oro Province in Papua New Guinea (see Figure 1 for Map of PNG). The first part of this chapter presents an overview of the Province’s political and administrative structure. The latter part of this discussion looks at both communities and their respective development projects and it details the background and objectives of the projects, the stakeholders and the intended research communities. The field work for this thesis required a ‘compare and contrast’ study of the levels of trust and cooperation in both communities and the extent to which these indicated the presence of social capital within both communities. This section also provides a background on the communities, their social relationships and their networks with the project members of the two development projects chosen for this study.

As the quote provided at the beginning of this chapter suggests, this research focused its attention on trust and cooperation issues in both development projects and on the communities living around both project areas. Whilst this was the primary focus there were also other factors that were important as determinants in the success of the projects. However, it was not the intention of this research to identify all elements that may have led to the success or failure of these projects but instead the intention was to point out an area that should be given some consideration in future, similar development work in the PNG context.
The review of the projects is based on the project reports, development plans and first hand interviews with the respective project chairmen, the Buna and Kokoda communities, provincial health, education and planning programme managers, in addition to the provincial administrator. Prior to conducting this research as a student, I was working in the province and thus I have acquired some knowledge of both projects. Some of the information offered in this thesis is taken from my work experiences in PNG.

*Administrative and Political structure of Oro Province*

Oro Province is divided into two districts: Sohe, which comprises the inland part of the Province and Ijivitari which is the coastal region of the Province (see Figure 2). Both these districts have a political and administrative structure. The head of the political structure is the National Member of Parliament for Sohe (MP) and Ijivitari respectively, who is voted into power every five years. Under this head figure, there are the local level government (LLG) presidents, who are voted in from the four LLGs that comprise the Sohe district and five LLGs that comprise the Ijivitari District. In each respective LLG, there are ward councillors, who are also elected by the community. The LLG presidents are elected by the councillors. The administrative head of the districts are called District Administrators, who come under the umbrella of the public Service of PNG. The head of the Public Service in the Province is the Provincial Administrator.
Figure. 1: Map of PNG
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Figure. 2: Map of Oro Province

Map of Oro Province
Kokoda Memorial Hospital Project

The Kokoda memorial hospital (see Figure 4) is located in the Kokoda local level government in Sohe district. It was first opened in September 1995. Rotary volunteers from Australia, with Australian government funding, provided through the Office of Australian War Graves, constructed the Kokoda Memorial Hospital as part of a joint government project. The hospital was part of the Kokoda Memorial project, which included other projects in the surrounding area, such as guest houses, a war museum, airport facility and roads and water supply projects.

The day to day operations and administration of the hospital, including staffing, maintenance, and equipment has been the responsibility of the PNG government authorities and the health division of Oro Province. The facilities at Kokoda were financed by the Australian government. The PNG government provided staff and support and Rotary, and others, provided the labour. Over 300 Rotarians and others have volunteered and worked on the project (see Figure 3). Both governments agreed on the construction of complex, which is comprised of the hospital, guesthouses, a war museum, an airport facility, roads and a water supply. It was intended to recognise and be a tribute to those who suffered and died in the Kokoda Campaign in 1942.

The Kokoda Memorial Project began with a visit to Papua New Guinea in 1992 by the then Australian Prime Minister, the Hon Paul Keating MP. The Government of Papua New Guinea, the Rotary Australia World Community Service and the local authorities at Kokoda subsequently agreed to build a memorial complex. The Australian Government provided funding for the whole project. The Kokoda Memorial Complex was ceremonially commissioned in September 1995 by the Prime Ministers of Australia and Papua New Guinea.

At that commissioning, Prime Minister Keating committed the Australian Government to a second stage of the project, in order to improve infrastructure facilities for the benefit of
the people of Kokoda, many of whom had assisted the Allied forces. Using the services
of Rotary Australia World Community Service, the water supply and reticulation were
renovated, the roads between the airport terminal and the village adjacent to the hospital
were upgraded, and the hospital precincts landscaped and fenced. All recurrent activities
for the Kokoda Memorial hospital project, since that time, have been managed by the Oro
Provincial Government, but Rotarians still provide assistance from time to time. The
hospital is now fully operational and serves the nearly 3000 plus population in the
Kokoda area.

Figure 3 Board Members with an Australian Rotary volunteer at Kokoda Memorial
Hospital
Project Objectives

The overall goal of the hospital project was to contribute to the improvement of the health of the people of Oro Province, especially those living around the Kokoda area, by enhancing their access to health services. This goal was to be measured against outputs stipulated in the Sohe District development plans and the Provincial Health plan. The completion of Kokoda hospital was one of the important targeted areas. The field work for this thesis included asking respondents about their feelings regarding this project and whether or not they felt the goals of this project were being achieved.

Research Community

The community used for this research were those people living around the Kokoda station, where the Kokoda memorial hospital is situated. This included the population around the Kokoda government station and the surrounding villages. The Kokoda government station is home to a mixture of people, who could be termed as wantoks and non wantoks. The community includes local landowners, workers at the Kokoda local
level government, hospital staff, labourers at the nearby Mamba Oil Palm estates and tour operators, who organise trekking for tourists along the Kokoda war trek.

The research was particularly targeted at the Kokoda government station community and hospital project board members, since they were considered important stakeholders in this project. There were other stakeholders, such as the Australian Rotarians and the Provincial Government but they were not the focus of this research. This research was more interested in trust and cooperation issues between locals and board members, who were wantoks and non wantoks in the hospital.

The Kokoda hospital board was comprised of the Officer in Charge (OIC) of the hospital and other senior staff selected by the Provincial administration, the local councillor and other ordinary members of the community elected to the board by the community, through a secret ballot. This board was responsible for managing the recurrent activities of the hospital. It was also instrumental when there were joint negotiations with the Australian government and the Provincial Government, prior to commencement of the Project.

For this research, I particularly targeted members of the hospital board, both past and present, as I had been informed that the board had changed leaders over the past few years. Whilst other stakeholders, such as the Australian Rotarians and Oro Provincial Government were considered important, the targeted audience was the local community and board members and their social relationships.

**Buna Community School Project**

The Buna community school project was located in Oro Bay LLG in Ijivitari District of Oro Province. The Project was initiated in 2000 by the then MP for Ijivitari District Hon. Simon Kaumi, MP and the Buna community, with financial backing for the project given
by the Japanese Government, through JICA. The project was part of its Grass Roots programme, targeted at improving school infrastructure around the country. The scope of works included the building of three double classrooms, a library, four teachers’ houses (see Figures 5, 6 and 7), and a water supply and reticulation.

Work started on the site in 2001, through contracting the work to local building contractors. A school board was set up, comprised of local villagers and school teachers, who were nominated by the community as agents to liaise with JICA. Provincial and district authorities, although being aware of the project, were not part of the board. Work began well with materials ordered and the first phase of the project completed in February 2001. However, the work began to slow down and it was finally abandoned in 2002 after conflicts between board members and the education authorities in the Province, regarding the management of project funds. An audit investigation was ordered by the Provincial Administration into the use of funds in the project. I was not able to access the findings of this audit investigation because of its sensitivity and confidentiality issues. Funding from JICA has since stopped coming through because of this community intervention and all operations have stopped and the project has remained unfinished.

Figure 5 Buna Community School Classrooms
Figure 6 Buna Teachers Houses

Figure 7 Buna Community School Library
Project Objectives

The objective of the Buna Community school project was to improve the delivery of education services to school age children, by building classrooms and teachers’ houses. This project was also part of the Ijivitari District development plans and the Oro Provincial Education Plan. The project was amongst a number of school projects targeted by the education division as priority projects. Two other schools, targeted as priority projects, were completed on time and the facilities are currently being used. They were, however funded by different agencies. The first was a secondary school project, jointly funded by European Union and the Asian Development Bank and the second was a community school project funded by the National Government.

The intention of this study was to measure the amount of trust and cooperation between the local community and the project board members. The Buna Community School Project is located in a very rural community and it was the first large project ever implemented in the community. Prior to establishing the project, there were many discussions held amongst the local villagers as to who should be managing the projects and who should be given contracts to do the actual building. This was done through a series of meetings organised and held in the community by the community leaders and the local MP.

These discussions led to the building contract being awarded to a local builder. Often in PNG, there has to be a high level trust and cooperation between stakeholders for such an important project to be operated smoothly from start to finish (Payani, 2000). The community, in most cases, becomes involved in the decision making, before the start of a project. During this time, trust is built up and it becomes an important prerequisite for such development projects. Warner (2000) explained how it is important to ensure stakeholder cooperation, since this minimises the risk of conflict, especially in a country such as PNG, where property and particularly land is communally owned. It was therefore the intention of this research to explore these issues, most notably those between wantoks and non wantoks in the community and on the project board.
Research Community

The important stakeholders in this project were the local villagers, the local contractors and the local education authorities, the Oro Provincial Government and the Japanese Government. In this research, I targeted the primary project beneficiaries and I was particularly interested in the composition of wantoks, that is those people living in the Buna community, who were related through kinship ties and those who were non wantoks, that is those people not related through kinship ties but who lived in the village, either as teachers or workers on the project or people who had married locals.

School board members were those locals who were responsible for overseeing the project work. Buna village was a very large village with a population of close to five hundred people. This population was comprised mostly of locals speaking the same language, but they were not necessarily from the same village. The objective of this research was to understand the social relationships between the locals who were directly working on and benefiting from the project. Other stakeholders and their social relationships with the locals were considered important but it was not the intention of this research to understand this aspect. The target audience, used for this research, were those locals who resided and interacted daily with each other in the community and through their interactions they had the potential to make an impact on the project.

The Buna community school board members were mostly comprised of locals, who were elected to the board by the community, through a secret ballot. This board was comprised of senior teachers, who were automatic members, local leaders, parents of students and other ordinary members of the Buna community. The board was responsible for the management of the school and its facilities. The Community school project, funded by JICA, was handed over to the school board to oversee. The local contractor, who was given the task of building the facilities, was officially recommended by the school board.
The community I targeted were mostly those locals residing in Buna village, which is where the project was situated. These included all permanent and temporary residents of Buna village. The community exercised a vast amount of influence over the school board and they had the ability to remove any or all board members, should they have feel they were not performing their roles well. The former chairman of the school board was removed by the villagers and a new chairman was elected after the Buna community school project was not completed as everyone had anticipated. Some members of the board were also removed and replaced with new ones. For this research, both old and new board members were interviewed.

In PNG, people tended to place trust and cooperate well with those whom they identified as wantoks (Phillpot, 2002). In the Buna project, much of the project’s initial work was carried out by people who were more or less wantoks but the project, as I observed, was still uncompleted and whether or not social capital was given significance, prior to and during the work being conducted at the project, was an issue that I believed would be interesting to discover. In a community, such as Buna, where there were wantoks supposedly working in harmony, I thought it would be interesting to find out if, amongst other factors, the work was not completed because of a lack of trust and cooperation between board members and the wider community.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has provided a background to both the communities studied in this research. Since both communities were in the same province of PNG, they shared similarities in their cultural values and customs. Other similarities included the manner in which project board members were selected. These were voted into their positions by a secret ballot and this is perhaps a reflection of the community’s trust in the board. There was a large amount of involvement by the community at the start of the project, in both localities. This could also have been an indication of the degree of trust and cooperation at the
beginning of the project. Another similarity was that both projects were considered priority projects by the district and provincial authorities.

There were differences between both communities. In comparison to the Kokoda hospital board, which included members of the District and Provincial Administration, Buna school board members included only members of the local community. This could be an indication of strong bonding social capital amongst locals in Buna and better bridging social capital with outsiders at the Kokoda project. Another difference was that, in Buna, the building contract was given to a local building contractor and the community had little involvement in the building phase of the project. On the other hand, in Kokoda the construction of the hospital was awarded to an outside agency, Rotary Australia, with help from the local community. This tends to indicate a higher degree of social cohesion amongst people at Kokoda, than at Buna. The projects were funded by different development agencies, the Buna community school being funded by JICA and the Kokoda Hospital being funded by the Australian Government. However, I do not anticipate that to be a significant factor affecting trust and cooperation, since both agencies have had other very successful projects in the province.

Judging from the similarities and differences between both communities, some conclusions can start to be drawn, with regard to the extent of the degree of trust and cooperation in both communities. However, there are also other factors also that need consideration, such as ethno-linguistic networks, leadership, insider-outsider issues and generalised trust and theses need to be evaluated together. These issues were investigated in this research and the findings, presented in the next chapter, highlight these matters. It should be noted that this research was intended to establish the trust and cooperation issues only in regards to certain stakeholders in both communities. Other stakeholders, such as the donor agencies and the provincial and district authorities were not the subject of this research. The conclusions reached in this thesis are based on evaluating the relationships between board members and their communities. This chapter has provided a
background to the understanding of both projects, separately. A detailed comparative analysis, based on findings from the field work, is provided in Chapter Six.
Chapter 6: Research Findings and Discussion

Introduction

In the preceding chapter, a contextual understanding of the two communities, chosen for this study, were presented. In this chapter, the respective findings from the research are presented. These findings are drawn from the questionnaires, participant observations, informal interviews and field journals. Other secondary information was drawn from project reports, interviews with the Oro Provincial Administration divisional advisors and through access to the JICA and Rotary Australia web sites. The questionnaire used can be found in Appendix 1. It should be noted that the questions related to trust and cooperation, in the questionnaires, were asked in no particular order, since trust and cooperation are inter-related elements of social capital. Although, in the analysis of the findings, the trust and cooperation findings are presented separately, it should be noted that the answers to the questions asked relating to understanding the presence of cooperation, could also indicate a presence of trust.

The findings are presented in three sections. The first section examines cooperation issues and discusses the duration of residency, ethno-linguistic networks, church affiliations, participation and engagement in community activities, levels of acceptance in community, access to formal education and community benefits from the projects. The second section examines trust and discusses honesty, property custodianship, leadership, generalised trust, information sharing, trust relating to political institutions and insider/outside relationships. The final section discusses the findings, based on observation of the participants. The findings from this section are used to cross check the responses given in the two previous sections.

The focus of this chapter is on the presentation of information that tries to answer the main research question of whether wantokism is a form of social capital and it includes the question of the degree of trust and cooperation between board members and the
community, in the communities chosen for this study. Summarised responses from questionnaires completed by both communities can be found in Appendix 3 and 4 of this thesis.

**Indicators of Cooperation**

The following indicators are used as yardsticks to determine the extent to which cooperative endeavours are encouraged between board members and the local community.

*Duration of residency*

There were twenty eight respondents interviewed in Kokoda and nearly 80% of the respondents interviewed have lived there for more than two years and more than half are permanent residents in the area. This indicates that most views, captured in this research, are from those people who had been present in the community since the start of the project. Almost all the residents have some knowledge of the project but they are simple ordinary villagers who contributed to the project by way of manual labour on the smaller jobs, during the construction of the Hospital. The recurrent activities of the project are all now carried out by the Project board. In Buna, all respondents interviewed for this research are permanent residents or they have lived in the area for more than two years. This means that their responses are generally representative of those people who were around when the community school project was initiated, until its completion.

These results indicate that all the people interviewed in this research and the majority of people living in the community are long time residents and therefore they are well versed with both projects and they also have, over the years, established firm networks and relationships. People develop trust with others with whom they have had a long association. (Lorenz, 1992). Lorenz went on to point out that "actors behave cooperatively because the anticipated benefits of mutual cooperation are valued highly". (Lorenz, 1992: 197). These results appear to indicate that the residents' duration of residency in the community has no influence on the outcome of the projects.
Ethno-linguistic networks

Upon investigating the shared group characteristics of the community in Kokoda (see Table 1) it was found that almost all the people living in the Kokoda community have similar ethno linguistic ties. The results are, however, not the same for the project board members, where the majority are found to speak the same language and a few of them are related through kinship or family ties.

In the Buna community, almost all respondents state that people in the community are related by kinship ties and share the same linguistic background. Almost all community school board members have similar ethno linguistic ties and there are only a few, mostly teachers, who speak a different language.

Table 1: Group characteristics of Kokoda Community and Kokoda Hospital Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Characteristic</th>
<th>Almost all %</th>
<th>Between half and almost all %</th>
<th>Less than half %</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Extended family members</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Always lived in this community</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Same level of education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td>Same linguistic background</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Board Member</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Group characteristics of Buna community and Buna community school Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Characteristics</th>
<th>Almost all %</th>
<th>Between half and almost all %</th>
<th>Less than half %</th>
<th>Almost nobody %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended family members</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived in this community</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same level of education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same linguistic background</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that both communities have very strong kinship networks within the community. The difference between the two communities is that, unlike the Buna school board members, hospital board members in Kokoda do not have strong kinship connections, which could allow for bonding social capital. The assumption from these findings is that, since there is greater kinship and linguistic connections, amongst the community and board members investigated in Buna, than in Kokoda, there is greater bonding social capital in Buna. Kinship connections are an important factor in building bonds and trust amongst a community. It provides a social safety net to lean back on (Hoggs and Abrams, 1998) and it can allow for the development of mutually interdependent systems based on these kinship networks (Bubolz, 2001).
Church affiliations

Affiliations to church groups were also investigated, in order to establish the degree of involvement in other community organisations. This type of affiliation was particularly chosen, since the church is considered very important in Papua New Guinea and a great many informal networks are established through associations at church gatherings. In Kokoda, it was found that a fraction over half of the community members attend the same church and the results are again different with board members, with just below half attending the same church. In Buna, the majority of the people in the community have the same church affiliation but the responses to the same question, to identify board members’ church affiliations, show nearly half of them do not go to the same church.

The results indicate that the almost half of the community is involved in church groups, which increases their chances of expanding their existing social networks and establishing bridging networks. However, the community in Buna generally belong to one church group and with the results indicating that most are kin members it does not enhance their potential to form bridging networks with outsiders, since their associations are confined to those they already know. Although it is generally assumed that church associations foster bridging networks, this does not appear to happen in this locality, because church associations are also family gatherings. Bonding networks amongst kin are important to maintain solidarity and they enforce trust through sanctions (Weidenbaum and Hughes, 1996). However, bridging networks allow for greater access to resources and opportunities that are not available to the group (Putnam, 1993)

Participation and Engagement in community

Brehm and Rahn (1997) observed that the more citizens participate in their communities, the more they learn to trust each other and the greater the trust citizens hold for each other the more likely they are to participate. Responses to questions, regarding concerns for the welfare of others, indicate that, in Kokoda, 26 out of 28 respondents feel people in the community are concerned about the welfare of their own families, rather than the
welfare of others. The responses in Buna indicate 22 out of 24 respondents give family welfare priority over community welfare. This is a further indication of bonded solidarity, within closed family networks.

When asked if there would be free help provided when maintaining their house, none of the respondents at Kokoda feel they could get free help. The same response was recorded when asked if help would be given to a project member to maintaining his/her house. Similar responses were recorded at Buna, when participants were asked if they could get free help when maintaining a house. This view was shared by both project board members and the community. An interesting finding was that, when the question asking if project members would get free help was answered, half of the respondents say they would get help, whereas the other half disagrees. Informal interviews with respondents and other ordinary members reveal that the answer was given more out of respect to the board members. These results tend to indicate that the community in Buna are more bonded and their collective participation and engagement is to a greater degree fuelled by cultural obligations. The Kokoda community, on the other hand, is comprised of a mixture of people from various ethnic communities and therefore other factors other than cultural obligations, such as church membership, encourages collective action.

Levels of Acceptance in community

In Kokoda, respondents agree to a certain degree that they feel accepted in the community and they are conscious of how others in the community view them. When asked to give a rating along a Likert scale, if they felt accepted in the community, 26 out of 28 respond that they strongly agree and 2 agreed. When the same questions are asked to find out if board members were accepted in the community 20 respondents strongly agree and 8 agree. This is a good indication of trust in the community.

When the same questions are asked, in order to seek opinions relating to acceptance in the community, 20 respondents strongly agree that they feel accepted, 2 agree and 2
respondents disagree. When asked if project members feel accepted, 10 respondents strongly agree, 12 agree and 2 strongly disagree. The responses from Buna indicate that certain people still do not feel accepted in the community and therefore this depicts that the level of acceptance could be lower than in Kokoda.

When asked questions about being taken advantage of, more than 20 out of 28 respondents interviewed in Kokoda, particularly the community members, believe that people are unlikely to be taken advantage of. The response from board members to this question is mixed. When asked if project board members would take advantage of others, 18 out of 28 respondents disagree. Most of the answers that disagree come from board members, whilst a great many of the responses that agree come from the villagers. One reasons for this line of response, which was established in earlier findings, is that some community members are generally ignorant of or have had fewer associations with hospital staff and this situation generates feelings of insecurity.

In Buna, when asked the question about the chances of being taken advantage of by villagers, 18 out of 24 respondents disagree. However, about 6 respondents, mostly board members, feel they could be taken advantage of. When opinions were sought on the project board members taking advantage of others, 6 strongly agree, 10 agree, 6 disagree and 2 strongly disagree. Most respondents that disagree were board members. The responses from this line of questioning depict a situation where there is a lack of cooperation and trust between the community and board members.

When comparing the two communities, it can be assumed that people in Kokoda have a higher level of acceptance in the community, since there is less fear amongst people that they may be taken advantage of. In Buna, on the other hand, the community, in general, do not feel threatened by each other but there is a fear of being taken advantage of by board members. This situation, therefore, depicts less trust of board members by the community. People with a high degree of trust do not fear that they will be taken
advantage of, by conforming to rules in society, because they expect others to also follow them (Brehm and Rahn, 1997). Narayan and Cassidy (2001) also pointed out that amongst other factors, which generate social capital, are feelings of trust, acceptance and safety.

Access to formal Education

Of the 28 respondents interviewed in Kokoda, 16 believe that less than half of the community have the same level of formal education and 12 believe nobody shares the same level of education. A similar trend was recorded when participants were asked the same question about the project board members. In comparison, 20 of the 24 people interviewed in Buna are of the opinion that less than half of the people in the community have the same level of education. When the same question was asked, it was established that over half of the board members did had the same level of education. It has been established, through informal conversations, that most project members have reached primary level education. This suggests that the board members in Buna were chosen from the educated sector of the community.

The level of formal education that a person has acquired suggests the ability of that person to be knowledgeable and it increases his/her knowledge relating to the potential benefits and threats of associating with outsiders and forming networks beyond the bonded kinship networks. Sullivan et al (1982) suggested that education increases exposure to cosmopolitan culture, which resulted in individuals who were more tolerant and less suspicious of differences when building wider social networks.

The results from the fieldwork indicate that nearly half of the people in the community and the hospital board, in the Kokoda community share the same level of education. This means that nearly half of the community are educated enough to be able to assess potential threats and opportunities, through their outside associations. The Buna community school has less people in the community sharing the same level of education but more than half of the school board is educated. This situation sometimes lessens
people’s ability to foster social cohesion, since the community becomes suspicious of the actions of the board members, when attempts are made to mobilise resources outside the community.

Benefits from Projects

Questions were asked regarding the benefits derive from the projects in both communities and responses were placed on a Likert scale. Most respondents in Kokoda agree that benefits were equally shared amongst project board members and the community. From the responses gathered, it was established that, out of 28 respondents interviewed, 20 strongly agree that the community has benefited more from the project and only 8 agreed. When the same question was asked, in order to ascertain if project members had benefited more from the project, it was found that 12 respondents strongly agree, 12 agree and 2 disagree. Both community members and project board members give similar responses. These responses are presented in table form below (Tables 3 and 4).

Table: 3 Responses to trust questions about the Kokoda community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Totally Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people in this community are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village, people are more likely to take advantage of you</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are maintaining your house you will get free help from</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you are conscious of what other people think about how you</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behave in the community.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This community has benefited from this project</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in this community</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If your pig got lost someone would safely return it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree %</th>
<th>Agree %</th>
<th>Disagree %</th>
<th>Totally Disagree %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When people see a crime being committed they will stop it</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 Responses to trust questions about Kokoda hospital board members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Totally Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people working in this project are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People working in this project are more likely to take advantage of you than people in other villages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If project committee members are maintaining their houses they will get free help from villages.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project members are conscious of what villages think about their behaviour in the community.</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project members have benefited more from this project than villagers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project committee members are accepted in this community</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a project committee member’s pig got lost someone in the village would safely return it</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When committee members see a crime being committed they will react the same as other villagers</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Buna, with regard to opinions about benefits derived from the project, most respondents believe that project board members benefited more from the project, than the villagers. When asked if community members benefited from the project, 16 out of the 24 respondents interviewed disagree strongly (see Table 4). In fact, all respondents, both board members and the community, overwhelmingly agree on this view. When the same question was asked, in order to ascertain if project members had benefited more than villages, all respondents strongly agree. From the responses gathered, this agreement was perhaps the result of community members feeling that a great deal of money for the project had been spent by board leaders for their own benefit. When asked if the community had benefited, mixed responses are given, with a few holding the opinion that there is some benefit to the community, but there is still a large contingent which believe the benefits derived are minimal.

The results collected generally indicate that the community in Kokoda are typically of the opinion that the community and project members all received benefits which had derived from the project. Their reasons for this opinion may be largely because of the successful completion of the project. The results from Buna, however, indicate that the community members see the project members as benefiting far more from the project? These opinions, as my records from journals and observations show, contribute to a lack of trust in the board members, by the community.

**Indicators of Trust**

The following indicators are used as yard sticks with which to gauge the extent to which trust is observed to exist between board members and the local community.

**Honesty**

There are mixed responses when the participants are asked whether people in the community are honest and trustworthy. Whilst most disagree, there are nearly an equal number of respondents who agree. The responses are also mixed from respondents who are board members and those who are community members. Most community members'
responses, however, support the view that most people in the community can not be trusted. Similar questions are asked to seek opinions on the project board members. Respondents have mixed feelings about whether project members can be considered honest and trustworthy. An equal number of respondents agree and disagree.

Tables 5 and 6 present a series of questions, which are asked of both the ordinary community and the project board members in Buna. The results show 14 respondents out of 28 disagree that people in the community are honest and trustworthy. The other 10 respondents thought people are generally honest and trustworthy. Responses from both board members and community members are mixed and therefore no clear group opinion has been established. When the same question is asked about board members a clear line is drawn, since most villagers and board members interviewed share the view that project board members are not considered honest and trustworthy.

A local proxy indicator is devised to cross check the responses relating to honesty. In Kokoda, a question is asked about whether a community member’s pig would be returned safely if it was lost. The responses in Kokoda show 24 out of 28 people do not think it would be returned. When the same question is asked about a project member’s pigs, 26 out of 28 feel it would not be returned. In the Buna community, very similar responses were recorded. Pigs are considered very valuable in PNG society and the responses indicate that there is a very small degree of honesty amongst people in both communities. This reinforces the previous findings, where respondents are asked to give their opinion on the honesty and trustworthiness of the community.

Fukuyama (1995) presented a general argument about the importance of cultural factors in economic growth. He concentrated on the specific factor of trust, which he defined as “the expectation ... of regular, honest, and cooperative behaviour, based on commonly shared norms.” Social capital, which is the ability of people to work together for common purposes, "arises from the prevalence of trust in a society,"
Property Custodianship

When respondents are asked the question of entrusting someone to take custodianship over their personal property during their absence, a great many respondents in Kokoda say they would place more trust in relatives than in other non-relatives? The responses indicate that 22 out of 28 respondents agree that they would place their trust in relatives, in this regard. It is observed that both board members and the community agree on this point.

In Buna, all 24 respondents say they would entrust care of their properties only to relatives. In Papua New Guinea, private cultural property holds more value than those owned by the community (Leach, 2003). The fact that both communities feel inclined to allow their most valuable property to be taken care of by relatives, whilst they were absent, indicates that the degree of trust placed in wantoks or kin members is much higher than that bestowed on non-wantoks.

Leadership

When respondents were asked about leadership issues, most community respondents in Kokoda believe that leadership in the project is effective, with consultations constantly undertaken before decisions are made. They feel that the project is successfully completed and no large problems have been faced by the project since its inception and they also paint an excellent picture of the type of leadership in this particular project. Generally, most board members who were interviewed agree that leadership was effective. However, there are some disagreements over whether there has been proper consultation, since decisions are being made by the leaders themselves without any formal consultation with other parties. Both parties also strongly agree that leaders in the project respect the cultural values in the community.

A great many of the responses collected also indicate the lack of effective leadership in the project and this was generally due to a lack of proper consultation between leaders
and followers. Another reason, expressed by most respondents, is that they could tell there was ineffectiveness of leadership from the fact that the project did not get completed as anticipated. Many of the board members interviewed feel consultation was undertaken but decisions were bulldozed through by the leaders, which meant that their leadership was poor. It is agreed, by both villagers and board members, that leaders respect the people's cultural values, since these leaders are all locals and as such they know how to conduct themselves in the community, and adhere to local customs but, in this case, they were not doing so.

These results indicate that there was a great deal of trust accorded to leaders in the Kokoda project and there is good indication of cooperation, since many consultations were made prior to decisions being made. It was, however, evident from data collected at Buna that there is lack of trust in the ability of leaders to be effective, due to fewer consultations and the completion failure of the project. Leaders must be able to engage meaningfully with those inside the community and as community representatives they should able to engage in the same way with those outside the community, since this builds bridging networks and improves accessibility to outside resources (Purdue, 2001). When this type of leadership is available, trusting relationships develop and collective action is easier to mobilise.

**Generalised Trust**

In Kokoda, responses to the question on whether or not the degree of trust and cooperation had got better or worse, since the start of the project, were evenly spread out on the Likert scale. Of the 28 respondents, 10 feel it has become worse, 6 feel it remains the same and 12 feel it has become better. These responses are generally the same from both villagers and board members.

Cross checking of data, through informal meetings, show that those respondents who have had associations with board members and/or with people working in the hospital
feel their relationships had been enhanced over the years, through their informal associations. Trust is reinforced when people have successful relationships (Childs, 2001). Those people who feel their relationship has got worse have had a limited association with the hospital project. Ignorance on issues affecting social relationships in the community can hinder the actor’s ability to accommodate new changes, establish networks and nurture trust (Abrams et al, 2001).

The majority of the respondents in Buna think that the level of trust amongst the project members, since its inception, has got worse or much worse. All respondents interviewed mention the incompletion of the project as an indicator of lack of trust and project board members blame each other for the failure.

In contrast, when respondents are asked if the level of trust in the community had got better or worse over the last three years, 20 out of the 28 respondents at Kokoda feel it has got worse. It was interesting to note that most board members, who were staff in the hospital and who had been in the community for a little over two years, agree with the community on this question. The influx of outsiders into the community was a reason, expressed by many of the respondents, for the cause of decline in trust.

When respondents are asked the same questions in Buna, it was found that 10 of the 24 respondents feel it has got worse, 8 feel it has remained the same and 6 feel it has become better. I felt the data is not significant enough to determine if the degree of trust had improved or not and therefore I look towards the reasons given for their responses and my own observations of the people’s activities, to give me insights into an understanding of responses offered. I find that most activities are governed by traditional sanctions. Acts of reciprocity, for example, are conducted out of cultural obligation and not because they necessarily trust the other person. It would then be safe to conclude that trust has remained relatively the same over the years.
When respondents are asked if the level of trust in the project could be compared to that of the village, more than half of the respondents in Kokoda think the level of trust in the project is better than in the village. There are some responses, generally from board members, who think it was the same. There are 6 respondents who think it was worse than the level of trust in the community. Again, it was observed that these responses are from respondents who have little knowledge or association with the project.

The responses from Buna, in relation to this question, show 18 out of the 24 respondents believe that the level of trust amongst board members is worse than in the village. These responses reinforce the data previously collected on trust amongst board members. From these responses, it cannot be confidently established if the amount of trust and cooperation over the years, amongst the community in both localities, has changed. An important factor, which was discovered, is that it was not trust that was governing collective action but rather cultural obligations. De Renzio (2000) showed evidence of such relationships amongst the highlands societies of Papua New Guinea. This situation was quite evident from observations in both communities.

Information sharing

Responses to questions, regarding level of trust between board members in terms of information sharing, produced some interesting results. Of the 28 people interviewed, 14 think there is some degree of weakness. The other 14, however, think that there is a strong degree of trust, with regard to information sharing. Following cross checking of data collected through informal conversations with the respondents and the reasons given for their responses, I find that those who agree that information sharing is weak are generally staff at the hospital or people who are involved in informal networks with people working in the hospital. The respondents who think trust, in terms of information sharing, is strong are locals who have little association with hospital staff or board members. This is perhaps an indication that the community are ignorant of what goes on.
inside the hospital management. Networking is found to be a significant factor in enhancing a person's ability to access information.

In Buna it is found that the degree of trust between board members, in terms of information sharing, is very weak. Of the 24 people interviewed, 14 feel that it is very weak and 4 feel it is weak. The other 6 respondents feel the level of trust is strong. These results indicate that a great many respondents feel there is very little trust amongst board members. When assessing the reasons given for their line of response, many respondents feel that, since the project is not completed and leaders are working in isolation, it means that they are not communicating and sharing information freely. Unlike the Kokoda responses, both community members and project members share similar views.

Where there is reciprocity involved in giving and receiving resources, such as information between actors, it increases the degree of trust and enhances the chances of collective action (Robinson and Williams, 2001). The data collected from both communities suggests that information sharing is weak in both communities. A significant find, however, is that networking, through informal associations, increases people's access to information.

**Trust in Political institutions**

When respondents are asked if the community in Kokoda supports the same political party, 79 percent of the respondents respond that most people do not support the same political party. This same question is asked about board members and the responses show that 93 percent feel the board members do not support the same political party. The responses to the same questions in Buna produce mixed responses. In terms of support for a political party, it is found that the community do not throw their support behind one particular political party. Out of the 24 people interviewed, 18 people feel that people do not support the same political party. The results are a little different from the board members, since 10 out of the 24 people interviewed feel the board members support one
political party. The summary of shared group characteristics is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

The lack of support for political institutions in society can sometimes lead to declining trust and social cohesion in that society (Putnam, 1993). The results in this fieldwork tend to indicate a lack of trust in the political institutions in both communities. A few of the board members in the Buna project, however, tend to align with a political party. Records of informal conversations, recorded in my journals, show that this may occur because of their educated status, which makes them aware of outside matters and also that the project is in some ways politically motivated and their selection to the board was influenced by political leaders in the community.

Insiders Vs Outsiders

Most ordinary community members in Kokoda are permanent residents of the area. Board members, however, are not all permanent, since nearly half of them are temporary residents. Upon interviewing board members, it is found that this is because most of the board members are staff at the hospital and thus they are constantly reshuffled to other localities by the provincial health office.

The results in Buna are a little different to those in Kokoda, in that most of the community and board members, involved in the school project, live permanently in the community. This reinforces the earlier findings that most people in Buna are related through kinship networks. Again, the results show a tendency for people in Buna to have stronger bonding relationships because of their strong kinship networks. The people in Kokoda seem to enjoy associating with people who are non wantoks and this increases their chances of networking outside their own area.
Trust and cooperation issues in this community are investigated through asking questions about information sharing, consultation and decision making, leadership, respect towards cultural values and property custodianship over periods of time and respondents are asked to give a rating, which is measured along a Likert scale. Certain proxy indicators are also developed, to suit the cultural context and questions are asked along these lines.

Table 5 Responses to trust questions about the Buna community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people in this community are honest and trust worthy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village, people are more likely to take advantage than people in other villages</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are maintaining your house you will get free help from others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are conscious of what other people think about how you behave in the community</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This community has benefited from this project</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in this community</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your pig got lost someone would return it safely</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people see a crime being committed they will stop it</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Response to trust questions about Buna Community School Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Most people working in this project are honest and trustworthy
People working in this project are more likely to take advantage of you rather than people other villages
If project committee members are maintaining their house they will get free help from villages.
Project members are conscious of what villages think about their behavior in the community.
Project members have benefited more from this project than villagers
Project committee members are accepted in this community
If a project committee members pig got lost someone in the village would return it safely
When committee members see a crime being committed they will react the same as other villagers

| Most people working in this project are honest and trustworthy | 0 | 25 | 25 | 50 |
| People working in this project are more likely to take advantage of you rather than people other villages | 25 | 42 | 25 | 8 |
| If project committee members are maintaining their house they will get free help from villages. | 0 | 50 | 42 | 8 |
| Project members are conscious of what villages think about their behavior in the community. | 17 | 50 | 25 | 8 |
| Project members have benefited more from this project than villagers | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Project committee members are accepted in this community | 42 | 50 | 0 | 8 |
| If a project committee members pig got lost someone in the village would return it safely | 0 | 42 | 33 | 25 |
| When committee members see a crime being committed they will react the same as other villagers | 50 | 50 | 0 | 0 |

Observations

Observations in this research are made on meeting attendance at both localities. Certain units of observation, depicting trust and cooperation, are devised to suit the local context. These form the basis of establishing if there is trust and cooperation amongst people present at the meeting. Details of these units of observations are mentioned in Chapter Four.
Meeting Attendance

Observance of meetings is made before, during and after meetings. In Kokoda it is noticed that punctuality is poor. An attendee at one of the meetings, when asked the reason for this poor punctuality said it is quite normal for meeting attendees to be late. He calls it “PNG time”, when referring to how people perceive time. Similar observations are conducted in the Buna community. Attendances at meetings are observed in two separate meetings. Punctuality at meetings is again observed to be poor and when asked if this is normal, the same response is given, as in Kokoda.

From these observations, it can be concluded that punctuality is not a factor affecting the outcome of both projects. It cannot be established clearly if people trust or show cooperative behaviour, through punctuality, as it is perceived normal to arrive late for meetings.

Oro Traditional welcome gestures

The customary manner to welcome visitors to meetings is carried out by calling out ‘oro’ repeatedly, until the person is seated. This is used as a unit of observation, since it is a sign of respect or “kotopu”, which is considered very important in Oro society. When people are welcomed in this way, the visitor coming to the meeting feels welcome and accepted. Being accepted is an important factor in generating social capital (Narayan and Cassidy, 2001). It also reinforces and builds confidence in the person coming to the meeting to engage in meaningful conversations with other people in attendance at the meeting. Appropriate greeting is an important part of PNG culture and society.

In Kokoda it is observed that not all meeting attendees were greeted this way. Only female participants and elders are greeted, whilst the others are unceremoniously welcomed. In Buna, almost all meeting attendees are greeted by shouting ‘oro,’ which indicates a good degree of social harmony. Hugging and shaking hands is also observed at these meetings.
This observation seems to indicate that there is a great deal of bonding social capital amongst local people in Buna, since most meeting attendees are local people and (as the data on ethno-linguistic networks suggests) they are related through family ties. This observation also indicates that people in Buna are well versed and willing to follow their cultural norm to greet people. This type of relationship seems to be lacking in Kokoda. Some meeting attendees in Kokoda are not greeted at all and that diminishes their feelings of being accepted and thus diminishes their engagement in cooperative behaviour at the meetings.

*Betel nut sharing*

The sharing of ‘betel nut’ openly in meetings depicts an air of trust. In PNG society a great deal of sorcery is practiced by casting spells on peels from the betel nut or from lime used to chew the betel nut with. This casting of magic spells on people is a feared practice. If it is observed that people are openly sharing these things, then it is safe to say that people trust each other and they are willing to cooperate. This is used as another unit of observation in this meeting.

The sharing of betel nuts also indicates that a person is accepted into the meeting and that they are expected to have their say at the meeting. It would be quite normal for a person, who is well versed with PNG culture, to feel unacceptable in a traditional setting, if he or she is not offered betel nut at a meeting or gathering.

The sharing of betel nuts is done openly with others at the Buna meetings, although it is observed that outsiders, especially board members, are careful not to throw away betel nut peels. This is an indication that there is not enough trust between outsiders and locals at the meeting. Being a local person, it is easy for me to tell who is a local, from the language being spoken.
In Kokoda it is found that meeting attendees are freely sharing betel nuts. It is noticed that those who came late miss out on betel nuts, but this is because betel nuts have run out and therefore it is not in any way an indication of distrust. A similar observation of sharing of betel nuts, between locals and outsiders or non wantoks, is recorded, as in Buna. However, in Kokoda betel nut peels are carelessly thrown away.

No concrete conclusion can be reached from these observations in both communities, since, being a local, I understand that it is normal for betel nuts to be shared at meetings and people are greeted by calling out. However, in Buna, certain meeting attendees are not discarding betel nut peels on the ground, which indicates to me that there is some degree of mistrust amongst the people present at this meeting. This reinforces some earlier observations, where there is lack of trusting and cooperative behaviour between board members and the community in Buna.

Group composition

Most meeting attendees in Kokoda are attended elderly men, who are ordinary villagers and generally considered insiders in the community, meaning people who are permanent residents in the community and who are considered wantoks. The observations at Buna are different, since the number of men comprises only half of the group composition. There are more women present at the Buna meetings, than at Kokoda.

The ratio of youths to women is generally equal in both locations, although in actual numbers there are more youths and women at the Buna meetings than at the Kokoda one. One factor that may contribute is the nature of the meeting. The Buna meeting is for a funeral, which means the older women and youths are expected to be present at the meetings but they will not have much to say. The soccer meeting is mostly for the purpose of discussing the upcoming provincial soccer tournament and women and youths are expected to be present.
Observations in both locations show members of the project board present are less in comparison to the locals that are present. In terms of the comparison between wantoks and non wantoks, there are less non wantoks at the Kokoda meeting than at Buna one. In Kokoda, it is also observed that, since attendees are a mixture of people, ‘Tok-Pisin,’ which is a common language used across PNG, is used instead of the local dialect. In contrast, at Buna the language of communication is the local dialect, since most meeting attendees are locals sharing who share similar ethno linguistic backgrounds.

These observations tend to indicate that there is more bridging and interaction amongst people from various social and cultural groups in Kokoda. In Buna the meetings are comprised mostly of locals. Whilst this indicates an opportunity for the community in Kokoda to have access to wider networks, than those at Buna, they are still not sufficient enough to draw a conclusion, based on only a few observations.

*Time taken to talk and influence*

The meetings observed in the Buna community are informal. There are two meetings observed and in general 90% of discussions at the meetings are dominated by men. Women are allowed to talk but they spend less time talking than men. Generally it is the older men who speak and they are ordinary members of the community. Contributions from men, who are also members of the project board, are insignificant. Women and youths have little time to speak at either meeting.

In Kokoda it is found that men do most of the talking. In fact, over 80% of the talking in the meetings is done by the men. However, the time spent talking is almost equally shared between those men who are project board members and the ordinary villagers. Given that more than 80% of the meeting attendees are ordinary village men, it is quite clear that the project board members dominate discussions. In total, wantoks are observed to do a great amount of talking but the average time spent by each person talking is lower
than that of the average non wantok. This shows that non wantoks have a longer time to speak than wantoks or insiders.

Another interesting aspect observed is the amount of influence each group of people has in determining the final outcome of the meetings. This is measured on a Likert scale of 1 to 4, one being very influential to four being no influence. The explanations for this unit of observation are covered in Chapter Four. In both Kokoda and Buna, it is observed that elderly men are influential in determining the outcome of meetings. Male board members of the project are observed to be very influential. Unlike the Buna school board that has no women, there are female board members on the Kokoda hospital board. However, there are none present at the meetings observed and therefore the degree of influence by female board members cannot be determined. Local women and youths in attendance at meetings are observed to be not very influential.

Judging from these observations, it would be safe to say that men, who are leaders on the board, are trusted more and given more cooperation, than those who are ordinary villagers. It also seems that outsiders are respected, in that they are allowed to say a great deal but nevertheless, decision making generally falls back to the insiders or wantoks.

Discussion of outcomes after meetings

After the meetings, two units of observations are used. The first is spending time after the meeting (about ten minutes) discussing the outcomes. It is quite normal for people to show they are happy with outcomes and are willing to work in harmony to achieve outcomes, by staying a little longer after the meeting to share betel nuts or refreshments. Saying farewell can be through a hug and shaking hands and this is another unit of observation. It is customary to do this for a person to show they are happy with the other party and they are happy to work with them. At the Kokoda meeting, it is observed that most people are doing these actions, regardless of whether they are wantoks, non
wantoks, board members or ordinary villagers. The same can be observed at the Buna meetings.

Nothing concrete can be established from this unit of observation, since people tend to behave according to accepted norms after the meetings or gatherings. The fact that people, observed in both locations, behave the same way shows that people are generally happy with the outcomes of the meetings. These observations cannot be used as a good indicator of trust and cooperation.

**Conclusion**

The findings presented in this chapter show certain similarities in the social relationships and networks of both these two communities, but they also highlight differences and shed light on certain interesting issues.

The results show that most people interviewed in this research who live in the community are long time residents and therefore they are well versed with both projects and they have also established firm networks and relationships. These results show that Buna has very strong kinship networks in the community. This is an important factor in building bonds and trust amongst the community.

The results also indicate that nearly half of the community in Kokoda are involved in other church groups, which increases their chances of expanding their existing social networks and establishing bridging networks. The community in Buna generally belong to one church group and with other results indicating that most are kin members this does not enhance their potential to form bridging networks with those outside their existing networks.
The results from the field work indicate that half of the Kokoda community and half the hospital board have the same level of education. This means they there are nearly half of them are educated enough to be able to assess potential threats and opportunities, through their outside associations. The Buna community school has less people in the community with the same level of education. However, on the school board most people have attained a similar level of formal education. This indicates that the school board in Buna are able to form bridging networks easier than local villagers.

The lack of support for political institutions in society can sometimes lead to declining trust and social cohesion in that society (Putnam, 1993). The results in this field work tend to indicate a lack of trust in the political institutions in both communities. Trust, in terms of information sharing, is weak in both communities. A significant find, however, is that networking, through informal associations, increases people’s access to information. The lack of trust between the board and the local villagers, in both locations, may be because of a lack of awareness of the board’s activities.

These results indicate that there is a great deal of trust accorded to leaders in the Kokoda project and there is also good indications of cooperation, since many consultations occur before decisions are made. It is, however, evident from the data collected at Buna that there is a lack of trust in the abilities of the leaders to perform their roles and responsibilities.

These results tend to indicate that the community in Buna are more bonded and their collective participation and engagement is to a greater degree fuelled by cultural obligations. The Kokoda community, on the other hand, is comprised of a mixture of people, from various ethnic communities. These outsiders have lived for longer periods in the community and therefore they are aware of cultural obligations, which are a significant factor influencing collective action.
The community in Kokoda generally have less bonding and better bridging networks, which allow for the development of higher levels of social cohesion with outsiders. The Buna community, however, have a large amount of bonding relationships, due to their strong kinship networks but they have less bridging networks. This shows that wantokism can be seen as a form of bonding social capital. The discussions in the concluding chapter of this thesis will shed more light on this situation.
Chapter 7: Conclusions

This thesis has illustrated the social relationships of trust and cooperation between two groups of stakeholders: the community members and board members of two separate development projects, located in different communities. In doing so, it was intended to establish if the social relationships between wantoks was concrete enough to be used as a form of social capital. This final chapter draws conclusions about the use of wantokism, as a form of social capital.

Prior to undertaking the fieldwork I had anticipated that my conclusions would support the view that the Kokoda project was successful because of a higher degree of trust and cooperation based on wantokism amongst board members and the community and that the Buna project was unsuccessful because of a lesser degree of trust and cooperation based on wantokism amongst board members and the local community. In other words, I envisaged that the type of bond characteristic of wantokism was significant as a factor which influenced the outcomes of both projects.

The findings provided in the previous chapter however provide information that does not support this line of thought. This research showed that for the Kokoda Project which was successfully completed, there was better trust and cooperation amongst board members and villagers but this was not because of wantokism but rather because of associations fostered outside of closed wantok relations. In contrast, at Buna, although there was a higher degree of trust and cooperation amongst local villagers due to wantokism, this radius of trust did not spread further to include board members. The data collected in this research indicated very little trust and cooperation between board members and local villagers in Buna. There is, however, a great deal of trust bestowed upon board members by villagers at the start of both projects, since membership of the respective boards was decided through a secret ballot. From research findings, there is an indication that this trust may have deteriorated over time, especially in the Buna community.
Reviews of relevant literatures and research on ethnicity and social capital revealed that bonding social capital very much characterises ethnic relationships in Papua New Guinea and other Pacific countries with similar cultural backgrounds. The works of Coleman, (1988) and Putnam (1993) appeared to suggest that these bonding relationships were not supportive of sustainable collective action and they have pointed out that bridging social capital is better suited for social cohesion.

This research shows that the chances of forming bridging networks are greater in the Kokoda area, due to: a large number of people from different ethno-linguistic groups on the board; greater civic engagement, due to a great many churches in the area; outsiders in Kokoda feeling more accepted than those in Buna; and greater levels of information sharing and better leader-follower relationships from the hospital board. Suggestions by Putnam (1993) that bridging networks fostered collective action are particularly true for Kokoda.

The research shows that there are fewer outsiders in the Buna community and the board is comprised of mostly locals. There are lower levels of civic engagement through churches, outsiders feel less accepted by the community and there is poor leader-follower relationship from the school board. This may have led to fewer chances of forming bridging networks. The school board members are, however, better educated and have greater chances of forming bridging networks. These bridging networks, formed by Buna school board members, could have been used to fill "structural holes" as suggested by Burt (1992) to enhance the resources available to the community but this did not appear to be the case.

Perhaps the leaders - follower relationship may have been a factor affecting social cohesion in Buna, as suggested by (Turner and Haslam, 2001) but this factor is not included in the purpose of this research. There are, however, indications from the findings in Buna that those leaders who are considered outsiders, but also conform to
local customs and traditions, are accorded respect and this increases the chances of locals engaging in cooperative endeavours with them. This means that bonding social capital is more important for Buna, since those outsiders, who adhere to the cultural rules and norms of the community and identify with them, are accorded trust. The findings indicate that almost all board members and local villagers had similar ethno-linguistic ties, which means that a large amount of their collective action is fuelled by cultural obligations towards each other. Bonded relationships are observed to be more characteristic within the Buna community.

Wantokism could perhaps be useful to mobilise social cohesion, when applied to traditional activities such as feasting, burial ceremonies, fishing and other village matters, but it would not be useful for development work, such as those investigated in this research. This type of project work requires better skilled people and financing, which can be easily accumulated if people form bridging networks with those outside of their traditional kinship networks.

It could then be concluded that, in support of the studies presented by De Renzio and Kavanamur (2000), wantokism is indeed a form of social capital, but it would be better categorised as a form of bonding social capital. To enable it to be used to foster development initiatives would mean individuals would need to break out and form bridging networks and thus fill in the structural holes, as suggested by Burt (1992).

Social capital is not easily measurable and therefore obtaining an accurate measure is not anticipated in this research. Nevertheless, the research has pinpointed certain socio cultural factors that should be given significance, when deciding to measure social capital. In this research, trust and cooperation are used as indicators of social capital. Proxy indicators of trust and cooperation, which were devised for this research, are specific to the contexts of the society and community researched.
It should be noted, however, that there are a great many indicators of social capital. This research uses trust and cooperation as indicators of social capital. The conclusions drawn are from units of observation, which depict these indicators and they were devised to suit the cultural contexts. There are other proxy indicators of social capital which, if they had been used, may have produced other results.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Questionnaire

Length of Interview
Interviewer: ______
Interviewee: ______

(I am going to ask you a few questions about this community and this Project)

Trust and Cooperation

1. How long have you been living in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What is your role in this community project?

Leader
Executive/Board member
Community member

3. What can you say about the characteristics of people in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Character</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here in this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Linguistic Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What can you say about the characteristics of members of this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Character</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent residents in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Linguistic Background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How do you rate the degree of trust in general between people in this project in terms of information sharing? Why do you think this way?

Very weak
Weak
Strong
Very strong

Reason:

6. Do you think that the level of trust in this project has gotten better or gotten worse since the start of the project? and why?

Much Better
Better
Same
Worse
Much Worse

Reason:

7. Do you think that the level of trust in this community has gotten better or gotten worse over the last three years? and why?

Much Better
Better
Same
Worse
Much Worse

Reason:
8. How much is the level of trust within this project as compared to the general community/village?

Much better than village
Better than village
Same as Village
Worse than village
Much worse than village

9. If some decision regarding this project needed to be made, how is consultation done?

Leaders make the decision themselves
Group members consulted
Whole community consulted

10. What do you think of the effectiveness of leadership in this Project? Why do you think so?

Excellent
Good
Not good
Poor
Reason:

11. Do you agree or disagree that leaders in this project are respectful of cultural values in this community?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree
Reason:

12. If you were going away for a short trip who would be most likely entrusted to take care of your properties?

Extended Family member
Work mate
Members of a community group you are a member
Any body in the community
No one

13. Do you agree or disagree that people in this community generally are more or less concerned about the welfare of their own families than that of the whole community?

Strongly Agree
Agree
14. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people in this community are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village people are more likely to take advantage of you more than other villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were maintaining your house you will get free help from others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are conscious of what other people think about how you behave in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This community has benefited from this project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your Pig got lost someone would return it safely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people working in this Project are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People working in this project are more likely to take advantage of you more than other villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Project committee members were maintaining their house they will get free help from villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project members are conscious of what villages think about their behaviour in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project members have benefited more from this project than villages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project committee members are accepted in this community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a project committee members Pig got lost someone in the village would return it safely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2: Questionnaire Results Buna

QUESTIONNAIRE [BUNA COMMUNITY SCHOOL PROJECT]

For this research 24 participants were interviewed, below are the results of the Interview summarised

Length of Interview

Time initiated: _______
Time terminated: _______

District: _______
Village: _______

Interviewer: _______
Interviewee: _______

(I am going to ask you a few questions about this community and this Project)

Trust and Cooperation

16. How long have you been living in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. What is your role in this community project?

Leader- 2
Executive/Board member- 10
Community member- 12

18. What can you say about the characteristics of people in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Character</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family members</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here in this community</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Linguistic Background</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. What can you say about the characteristics of members of this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Character</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family members</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent residents in the community</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level of education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Linguistic Background</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. How do you rate the degree of trust in general between people in this project in terms of information sharing? Why do you think this way?

Very weak- 14
Weak- 4
Strong- 6
Very strong

Reason:
- Project not completed on time
- Information kept secret during official Audit investigations into Project funds
- Information shared secretly amongst contractors and leaders
- Usage of funds not discussed openly to all members by chairman
- Ordinary members freely discuss ideas
- Decision bulldozed by leader.
- Information on decisions relayed late to others
- Leaders acting independently
- A lot of back chatting/ gossiping

21. Do you think that the level of trust in this project has gotten better or gotten worse since the start of the project? and why?

Much Better
Better
Same
Worse -10
Much Worse -14

Reason:
- Project not completed
- Leaders working in isolation
- Misuse of Funds
d. Drunkenness in public

e. Unnecessary expenses

f. Frequent travels to Port Moresby

g. Materials not bought

h. Members not informed of expenditures

i. A lot of blaming on each other

j. A lot of money being used so people suspicious of each other

k. Unwise spending witnessed by community

l. Underestimation of capabilities

22. Do you think that the level of trust in this community has gotten better or gotten worse over the last three years? and why?

Much Better
Better -6
Same -8
Worse -8
Much Worse -2

Reason:

a. Community does not trust elected leaders

b. Community do not think they can run development initiatives themselves

c. Mistrust on people who come up wit new initiatives( they think it is politically motivated)

d. No trust at all levels in community( grass roots to leaders)

e. People conduct themselves in the same manner(no change)

f. No real conflicts, cooperation still found in village activities

g. Trust only in immediate family

h. Lot of stealing in gardens

i. Old school board members voted out by community

23. How much is the level of trust within this project as compared to the general community/village?

Much better than village
Better than village -4
Same as Village -2
Worse than village -18
Much worse than village

24. If some decision regarding this project needed to be made, how is consultation done?

Leaders make the decision themselves -10
Group members consulted -8
Whole community consulted -6

25. What do you think of the effectiveness of leadership in this Project? Why do you think so?

Excellent
Good -2
Not good -8
Poor -14

Reason:

a. Project not completed

b. No cooperation between village and Project members
c. Decisions done in isolation by leader
d. Community elders not respected
e. Community leaders views not considered
f. Lack of coordination with government agency
g. JICA refused to provide further funding
h. Decisions made not by full body/ no quorum reached when decisions made
i. Poor management of project

26. Do you agree or disagree that leaders in this project are respectful of cultural values in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason:
a. Committee members getting intoxicated and disturbing community frequently
b. No respect for elders and community leaders
c. All committee members are from Buna
d. All are permanent residents in Buna

27. If you were going away for a short trip who would be most likely entrusted to take care of your properties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extended Family member</th>
<th>Work mate</th>
<th>Members of a community group you are a member</th>
<th>Any body in the community</th>
<th>No one</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Do you agree or disagree that people in this community generally are more or less concerned about the welfare of their own families than that of the whole community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-14</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people in this community are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village people are more likely to take advantage of you more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
than other villages
If you were maintaining your house you will get free help from others.
You are conscious of what other people think about how you behave in the community.
This community has benefited from this project
I feel accepted in this community
If your pig got lost someone would return it safely
When people see a crime being committed they will stop it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you were maintaining your house you will get free help from others.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are conscious of what other people think about how you behave in the community.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This community has benefited from this project</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in this community</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your pig got lost someone would return it safely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people see a crime being committed they will stop it</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people working in this Project are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People working in this project are more likely to take advantage of you more than other villages</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Project committee members were maintaining their house</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they will get free help from villages.

| Project members are conscious of what villages think about their behaviour in the community. | 4 | 12 | 6 | 2 |
| Project members have benefited more from this project than villages | 24 |
| Project committee members are accepted in this community | 10 | 12 | 2 |
| If a project committee members Pig got lost someone in the village would return it safely | 10 | 8 | 6 |
| When committee members see a crime being committed they will react as other villagers would | 12 | 12 |
APPENDIX 3: Questionnaire Results Kokoda

QUESTIONNAIRE [KOKODA HEALTH CENTRE PROJECT]

For this research 14 participants were interviewed, below are the results of the interview summarised

Length of Interview

Time initiated: ____
Time terminated: ____

District: ______
Village: ______

Interviewer: ______
Interviewee: ______

(i am going to ask you a few questions about this community and this Project)

Trust and Cooperation

31. How long have you been living in this area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months-1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-5 years</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32. What is your role in this community project?

Leader -6
Executive/Board member -4
Community member -18

33. What can you say about the characteristics of people in this community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Character</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family members</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always lived here in this community</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Linguistic Background</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. What can you say about the characteristics of members of this project?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Group Character</th>
<th>Almost all</th>
<th>Between half and almost all</th>
<th>Less than half</th>
<th>Almost nobody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extended Family members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the same church</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent residents in the community</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the same political party</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Level of education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same Linguistic Background</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. How do you rate the degree of trust in general between people in this project in terms of information sharing? Why do you think this way?

Very weak -4
Weak -10
Strong 14
Very strong

Reason:
- Good communication
- Very few meetings
- No conflict
- Good working relationship
- Leaders do not confide with lower ranked staff, only with themselves
- Project running well
- Few contribute in meetings/meetings dictated by few
- Problems discussed only informal meetings
- Staff gossiping about each other
- Suspicion of each other/infighting for positions
- Project staff live in same compound
- Frequent leadership reshuffles
- Efficient service provision from hospital
- Staff freely talk but reserved when about confidential matters

36. Do you think that the level of trust in this project has gotten better or gotten worse since the start of the project? and why?

Much Better -4
Better -8
Same -6
Worse -10
Much Worse
Reason:

a. Conflicts over board membership settled, new members appointed by community
b. Leadership changes
c. New OIC does not understand old issues, not working well with staff
d. A lot of government support and Rotarians
e. Consistent flow of services
f. Most staff have been here for a while
g. Community don’t involve a lot now, left to government to run
h. Inconsistency in leadership
i. Staff work very well, no problem noticed by community
j. Staff have good relationship with community

37. Do you think that the level of trust in this community has gotten better or gotten worse over the last three years? and why?

Much Better
Better
Same -8
Worse -20
Much Worse

Reason:

- Others are suspicious of new initiatives.
- Underestimation of capabilities
- Families keep to themselves
- Attendance to community and church gatherings is poor, only old people
- Community work done by few
- Influx of outsiders
- Competition in business
- A lot Drunk and disorderly youths
- No respect for elders
- People do their own things no real change in attitudes
- Increased use of marijuana

38. How much is the level of trust within this project as compared to the general community/village?

Much better than village -6
Better than village -10
Same as Village -6
Worse than village -6
Much worse than village

39. If some decision regarding this project needed to be made, how is consultation done?

Leaders make the decision themselves -12
Group members consulted -16
Whole community consulted

40. What do you think of the effectiveness of leadership in this Project? Why do you think so?
Excellent -8
Good -10
Not good -8
Poor -2

Reason:
• No big conflict in Project
• Project serving community very well
• Not many meetings conducted for staff
• Leaders involved in community activities, respect village protocol
• New Board doing well so far
• Leader has political affiliations, using project funds for own benefit
• Staff meeting attendance is poor
• Project serving a bigger population now
• constant reshuffles of staff, some staff not happy
• no proper reports of funds usage
• staff relations not good
• New leader, needs to prove his worth

41. Do you agree or disagree that leaders in this project are respectful of cultural values in this community?

Strongly Agree -18
Agree -8
Disagree -2
Strongly Disagree

Reason:
• They are involved in local community activities, sports, feasting etc..
• They’re are locals and understand and respect local values
• They are locals and they know but do not strictly adhere
• They show respect for community elders
• They follow community protocols

42. If you were going away for a short trip who would be most likely entrusted to take care of your properties?

Extended Family member -22
Work mate -2
Members of a community group you are a member -2
Any body in the community
No one -2

43. Do you agree or disagree that people in this community generally are more or less concerned about the welfare of their own families than that of the whole community?

Strongly Agree -10
Agree -16
Disagree -2
Strongly Disagree

44. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people in this community are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this village people are more likely to take advantage of you more than other villages</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you were maintaining your house you will get free help from others.</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You are conscious of what other people think about how you behave in the community.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This community has benefited from this project</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel accepted in this community</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If your Pig got lost someone would return it safely</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When people see a crime being committed they will stop it</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. Do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people working in this Project are honest and trustworthy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People working</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in this project are more likely to take advantage of you more than other villages

| If Project committee members were maintaining their house they will get free help from villages. | 2 | 26 |
| Project members are conscious of what villages think about their behaviour in the community. | 18 | 10 |
| Project members have benefited more from this project than villages | 12 | 12 | 4 |
| Project committee members are accepted in this community | 20 | 8 |
| If a project committee members Pig got lost someone in the village would return it safely |  | 28 |
| When committee members see a crime being committed they will react as other villagers would | 16 | 12 |
APPENDIX 4: Participant Observation Scheme

Participant Observation Scheme

There is the possibility that there may be numerous community meetings. For this research I will conduct observation on two separate meetings in both communities that I will be visiting.

1. Community meetings

Before the meeting.

Observe the following:
- Are people arriving on time for meeting.
  - Is it the same for other meetings too?
- How are people meeting each other?
  - Unit of observation (calling "Oro" when others come in for meetings)
  - Is it the same for other meetings too?
- Are people mixing around well before the meeting?
  - Unit of observation (sharing betel nut)
  - Is it the same for other meetings too?

During the meeting.

Observe the following three things;
- Group composition
- Time taken to talk in meeting
- Decision Making

Group composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group composition</th>
<th>Project Members</th>
<th>Ordinary villagers</th>
<th>Total number of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group composition</td>
<td>Insiders</td>
<td>Outsiders</td>
<td>Total number of people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Time taken to talk in meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group composition</th>
<th>Project Members</th>
<th>Ordinary villagers</th>
<th>Total time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group composition</th>
<th>Insiders</th>
<th>Outsiders</th>
<th>Total time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision Making: (from your observations give a rating according to degree of influence exerted on the final outcome of meeting)

1- very influential
2- influential
3- not very influential
4- no influence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group composition</th>
<th>Project Members</th>
<th>Ordinary villagers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group composition</td>
<td>Insiders</td>
<td>Outsiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After the Meeting:

Observe the following things;

- Are people moving away from the meeting venue as soon as meeting is completed?
- Do people discuss outcomes of meetings with each other after meeting?
- How are people being farewell after meetings?