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INTRODUCTION

VISITING THE CROSSROADS OF MODERNIZATION AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

Weakened social capital is manifest in the things that have vanished almost unnoticed—neighborhood parties and get-togethers with friends, the unreflective kindness of strangers, the shared pursuit of the public good rather than a solitary quest for private goods.

—Robert D. Putnam
Bowling Alone

I had never known until that night, that the uncontrollable darkness was bearable when my soul realized the existence of a tight network, made up of individuals mutually sharing the same experience. It was a typical night in Shirazi; the girls gathered on the porch, around a single flame lit on a tiny tin-lamp. Mwanasha, Ashura, and Mwanaisha—the three primary-school girls ritualistically danced and sang before going to bed. It was as if not doing so was against a rule: “Custom is like law,” as a Swahili proverb puts it. The nights were supposed to exacerbate the inconvenience of the complete absence of constant lighting—other than that it proved to me how one could literally dance “in the moonlight.” The lamp was only meaningful when villagers gathered around it and shared stories of the day. Yet, the lack of electricity did not occur to me as a limitation; it rather reinforced the sense of interpersonal connection. So I faced a dilemma. Knowing that the villagers longed for development, I personally (and secretly) resented when a villager excitedly announced, “We’re getting electricity here soon!”

*   *   *
African culture has long been seated at the heart of debates surrounding Africa’s (under)development.¹ Going back to the colonial-era, Africa’s “primitivism” was deemed an impediment to modernity, motivating European colonialists to “civilize” the African continent in the name of humanitarian assistance. The sociopolitical issues that Kenya faces today are deeply rooted in its colonial legacies.

That said, it is not my intention here to attribute all issues related to Africa’s development to colonial history. I do, however, intend to make the point throughout this thesis that cultural practices deserve as much scrutiny as economic growth and legitimate governance, especially in societies where the overarching social structure is shaped by long-standing social norms. Yet this thesis is not about exploring the means of workable or adequate African development per se. Rather, it aims to examine whether modernization, in general terms, leads to the decline of traditional social networks in rural Kenyan villages. It aims to accomplish the objective by taking two villages—Shirazi and Takaungu—with varying levels of socioeconomic advancement as a test case, and uncovering the different ways in which the communities engage in interpersonal social relationships.

I disliked the intermingling of Shirazi with an aspect of modernity, because they signaled “change” in Shirazi. In abstract terms, they denoted a crossroads between preserving the long-standing village culture, and undergoing change in social structures. Modernization has long been understood as a progressive and homogenizing process (So 1990). It is, above all, a process whereby “economic growth becomes the dominant societal goal, and achievement motivation becomes the

¹ When I say “culture,” I include generationally-transmitted knowledge, customs, beliefs, and morals that shape one’s living in a community.
dominant individual-level goal” (Inglehart 1997, 5). Often involving industrialization, commercialization, and bureaucratization, it necessarily entails a shift from “traditional” to Weberian “rational-legal” values in the economic, political, and social spheres of life. Robert D. Putnam (1995; 2000) observes that social capital—the trustworthiness generated based on connectedness with other members of the society—diminished among American citizens in the last couple of decades, due to a combination of multiple factors pertinent to social change. While social capital is often treated as an engine of development, the discussion of whether this development in turn undermines the very social capital is, as far as I know, never a point of inquiry. If modernization occurs along coherent predetermined patterns, then Shirazi village, by all measures, will likely experience social change, potentially causing a decline in its social capital rooted deeply in culture.

This thesis is a quest that originates from my wish to find a remedy for Shirazi to preserve its strong communal ties as it undergoes modernization. It provides a platform for exploring the possibilities of reconciliation between structural changes that occur as a result of socioeconomic advancement and long-standing social values that have hitherto maintained communal solidarity. Due to the delimited time and space, this study offers a first step to this extensive inquiry. By comparing two Kenyan villages that exhibit uneven levels of modern characteristics, I examine

---

2 Putnam suggests that the possible reasons behind diminishing civil engagement and association in America are generational change in values; women’s greater mobility; technological advancement; and demographic transformations. Putnam’s observation of American civic engagements in the late 20th century might be more relevant in the context of post-modern societies instead of rural village settings. Taking this into consideration, I draw upon Putnam’s general theory of social change and social capital, but exclude factors that are historically and culturally irrelevant in African villages. Chapter One deals with particular components of Putnam’s frameworks in greater depth.
whether Shirazi, the less modern community, depicts greater levels of social capital compared to Takaungu, the more developed counterpart. In doing this, I intend to discover the theoretical explanation by which modernization might be justified in a rural village context.

This thesis is comprised of four parts: The delineation of the theoretical framework on which I base my analyses; the portrayal of my two village cases; notes on methodology and shortcomings of my surveys; and lastly, an empirical analysis of quantitative data in the light of my theoretical framework. The bulk of this thesis focuses on presenting my findings through both quantitative and qualitative research in the two villages. Basic statistical summary and analysis make up my quantitative research; the information relevant to this portion of the study comes from the household surveys I conducted in Shirazi and Takaungu. In spite of my dilemma of quantifying organic voices into statistical data, I have chosen this method as one central instrument, so as to help establish a more solid ground for the comprehension of my case studies in a social science discourse. In the meantime, I have strenuously attempted to balance the findings with qualitative information obtained through observations and interviews with the local communities.

Chapter One conceptualizes “social capital” and the mechanisms of modernization in the light of rural Kenyan villages. I draw upon Putnam’s general observation that civic associations and social trust have declined in America in the late 20th century. Applying the Confucian understanding of “self” in relation to society, I first define social capital as the community’s capacity to ensure solidarity based on traditional, interpersonal social relationships, which utilize the means of
trust and reciprocity. I refer to Alexis de Tocqueville and explore the foundation of Putnam’s arguments. In the next section, I spell out Émile Durkheim and sociologist Neil Smelser’s mechanisms of structural change in society, in order to present the overall framework that I follow throughout this thesis. My particular focus is on Durkheimean division of labor and Smelser’s differentiation-integration models.

While these thinkers mainly argue that modernization can replace the traditional foundations with alternative bases of solidarity—namely extensive interdependency and institutional coordination—my study limits its scope to examining whether or not structural changes due to modernization undermine the traditional forms of social solidarity, as presumed. The final section delineates village transformation from economic, political, and social perspectives. Taking a holistic approach, each perspective (when relevant) touches on structural changes at the societal, household, and individual levels.

Chapter Two provides thorough descriptions of Shirazi and Takaungu along various dimensions, which are crucial background information as we move on to empirical discussions in later chapters. I have drawn comparisons between the two villages for every category, in order to clarify that they are different from the socioeconomic standpoint, thus making them applicable as my case studies. I cover the following categories: Geographic location (settlement patterns and administrative units); demographics; physical infrastructure; production and economic activities including agriculture, industry, and tourism; finance; health care; education; telecommunication and technology; and community administration. I rely on government published statistical data to illustrate a larger picture of where and who
these communities are. However, since there is virtually no written record that
addresses the specific Shirazi and Takaungu communities that correspond to my case
studies, much of the information I provide here is based on my observations and the
verbal accounts of the local residents.

Chapter Three provides a synopsis of my overall research methodology.
Alongside descriptions, I also account for limitations as well as potential biases in the
results. The purpose of this chapter is to first provide the background information of
my actual study in the field, and second, to acknowledge that my findings are
contingent upon the ways I conducted the study. The first part of the chapter
discusses the process by which Shirazi and Takaungu villages were chosen as my
case studies. I explain that Shirazi has always been the core of my inquiry into the
subject of “social capital” due to its observed interpersonal social ties. Takaungu was
chosen more systematically, based on several criteria that make the village an
adequate counterpart to Shirazi. The second section turns to the actual methods of
conducting the household surveys. I describe how the participants were selected
mostly based on chance, but certain adjustments had to be made for cultural and
demographic reasons. I focus on the content and formulation of the survey questions
separately, and identify specific limitations and potential biases in light of actual
questions. The third part summarizes the profiles of the respondent pools from both
villages, in order to provide an understanding of whom we can attribute the survey
results to.

Chapter Four presents the raw findings from the household surveys and
analyze them in light of the theoretical framework. I divided this chapter based on the
nine categories dealt with in the surveys. For each category, I begin by discussing the predictions of responses from Shirazi and Takaungu respectively, based on corresponding theories and differences in socioeconomic circumstances of the villages. These predictions follow the theoretical mechanisms that uphold my hypothesis; they argue that Shirazi would exhibit greater adherence to social relationships that are communal, interpersonal, and more in accord with traditional social norms. On the other hand, Takaungu would place greater importance on social relationships that are based on institutional coordination, which are likely to be impersonal and more specialized. The hypotheses are followed by the presentation of actual results, prioritizing ones that indicate greater statistical significance. I provide explanations for the results referring back to the theory and observations presented in Chapters One and Two. Overall, this chapter demonstrates that Shirazi exhibits greater levels of adherence to traditional forms of social solidarity; however, with regard to some of the unexpected results, I suggest that Takaungu, despite its preference for institutional coordination over traditional ties, nevertheless depicts characteristics of social cohesion.

Before going further, I must acknowledge the limitations regarding the general approach adopted in this thesis. Admittedly, the use of “social capital” as the central theme of this study reflects my exertion to conceptualize the intangible experience of living in Shirazi. When I began the research, I had virtually no expertise or knowledge in sociological or anthropological concepts that have been viable for discussing intangible ties in a village context. I entered this discourse without knowing that “kinship studies” and “trust and reciprocity” existed as
academic, measurable subjects; nor had I mastered the techniques of measuring social capital—the community’s capacity to ensure social solidarity, upholding the sense of long-established interconnectedness. Therefore, while the immediacy of Shirazi to my emotional and academic intrigue led to the exploration of a concept as elusive as “social capital” in real-life village contexts, I renounce the definitional critiques of this concept as the focus of my thesis.

Second, while holistic picture of African development cannot be drawn without reference to colonial history, the historical context is nevertheless excluded from the scope of this thesis. Rather, I draw upon a rather generic notion of modernization, which assumes a unidirectional, systematic, transformative, immanent, and homogenizing (Europeanization/Americanization) process (So 1990).³

Third, the adoption of Durkheim and Smelser’s sociological framework as my central theoretical mechanism allows the discussion to focus largely on institutional transformations and resulting changes in socio-cultural values. In order to ensure that the simple “hypothesis-observation” approach is clearly followed throughout the study, I intentionally avoid concepts that inherently lead to ideological debates, such as the capitalistic market economy, Marxist notions of labor, and inclusive/exclusive democracy. That said, I aim to observe modernization and social relationships from various perspectives covering political, economic, and social spheres, thereby providing a clearer portrait of village circumstances in Shirazi and Takaungu.

³ So’s claim originates from political scientist Samuel Huntington’s notion of modernization based on European evolutionary theory, which suggests that social change is “moving societies from a primitive stage to an advanced stage, and making societies more like one another as they proceed along the path of evolution” (So 1990, 33).
To reiterate the purpose of this project: It examines two villages with uneven exposures to the modern economy, and tests whether Shirazi, a more rural and less-developed community, exhibits greater levels of social capital than its counterpart, Takaungu. The correlation between modernization and social capital is especially relevant when we observe the people’s engagement in various economic, political, and social activities. The more interpersonal and trustworthy the nature of social relationships is, the more we can suggest that the village utilizes its social capital. In the end, the empirical analysis demonstrates that Shirazi exhibits greater abundance of social capital compared to Takaungu. However, not all questions generated results according to the hypotheses. Instead, unexpected results were also discussed through different lenses in order to solicit possible explanations for the results. With regard to the abundance of social capital, it is important to keep in mind that results that were in accord with my hypotheses could also be interpreted otherwise. Even if Takaungu exhibits a lower level of social solidarity based on traditional social ties, I nevertheless treat this issue optimistically and suggest that interpretations are unlimited.
CHAPTER ONE

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK: THE MECHANISMS BY WHICH MODERNIZATION LEADS TO THE DECLINE OF SOCIAL CAPITAL IN RURAL KENYAN VILLAGES

You give me something, and it is my responsibility to reciprocate. It is not only my responsibility; my dignity, my honor, my humanity require it. Human relations assume their highest form during the process of exchange.

—Ryszard Kapuściński
The Shadow of the Sun

This chapter explicates the theoretical mechanisms by which modernization leads to the decline of social capital in a rural African village. The mechanisms outlined here will serve as the theoretical basis to explain the levels of social cohesiveness in my later empirical analysis of Shirazi and Takaungu villages. My framework owes its foundation to Robert D. Putnam’s work, Bowling Alone (2000), which lays out a trend towards decreasing social connectedness and civil participation in the recent American society.

1.1. Conceptualizing “Social Capital” in the Light of Rural Kenyan Villages

I borrow the term “social capital” from contemporary sociology, to refer to the intangible capacity of a group of individuals to ensure communal order or solidarity. Social capital is embedded in social relationships that are established on the basis of long-standing norms and means of trust and reciprocity, which act as internal institutions or “laws” that allow society to function cohesively. These relationships
are often (but not always) founded upon kin-based and interpersonal ties; they often function as core entities in the community’s economic, political, and social organizations.

As Putnam (2000) posits, social capital is distinct from “civic virtue” in the sense that the former concerns a high degree of reciprocity and mutual trust that enhances the benefit of civic virtues in social relationships. Social networks lack social capital if virtuous individuals are scattered or unwilling to connect with others. Thus, the effectiveness of social networks in achieving economic or political ends depends on the extent to which norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness are established in the connections among individuals. These networks involve mutual obligations and expectations; in a social network with a high level of social capital one can confidently expect others to fulfill their obligations. Putnam suggests that the more important a “norm of generalized reciprocity” is within a society, the higher the social capital, it denotes. A norm of generalized reciprocity calls for trustworthiness, not merely among specific relationships or in special situations but within the society as a whole (Putnam 2000, 20-21). Therefore, social capital reflects social networks that are based on reciprocity and trustworthiness, which exist not just among acquainted individuals but that also encompass the entire community. In societies with high levels of social capital, socioeconomic institutions will function more effectively, because of the informal social ties that facilitate interaction and enable people to work together to accomplish their goals. A society with an abundance of social capital, thus, is made up of individuals who not only follow the moral codes
but also are actively involved in social relationships based on the trustworthiness of each member.

The interrelationship of society and individual in the context of social capital can be discussed in light of Confucian “virtue ethics.” Confucian ethics endorse virtuous social relationships based on reciprocity and mutual benevolence, which entail an abundance of social capital. It conceptualizes personhood on the basis of “relationality,” meaning a self is not an independent entity in itself but is rather defined as part of and in relation to the community to which one belongs. Suggesting that “[n]o man is devoid of a heart sensitive to the suffering of others,” Mencius (372 – 289 BCE), a Chinese philosopher and interpreter of Confucianism, asserts that all human beings are born with ethical predispositions which, when nourished through self-cultivation, can lead them to achieve ethical ideals (Lau 1970, Book II: Part A [6]). The ethical cultivation of character involves engagement in rituals; by performing them with the proper attitudes one can polish one's own character in various cultural contexts. In other words, an individual “self” is shaped in the context of a specific traditional and social community that allows the attainment of “full personhood” (De Bary 1998, 25). The full personhood is achieved when one finds an ethical direction in life by first taking part in rituals pertaining to basic social units such as parent-child relationships. According to Confucian thinkers, these specific relationships are nourished by mutual obligation and love. Individuals, therefore, exist as part of a community, and develop virtue in terms of specific cultural and traditional social values the community holds.
Unlike physical and human capital that are embodied in observable materials, skills, and knowledge, social capital exists within the relationships among individual actors. We can therefore suggest that social capital represents the quality and effectiveness of relationships that are influenced by social norms and institutions. Due to the abstract nature of the concept, there is no standardized quantitative measurement for social capital. However, most theorists measure social capital using various socioeconomic indicators. Pioneer of social capital theory James Coleman emphasizes the density of the social network and the quality of relationships, and measures social capital by its contribution to the “creation of human capital in the rising generation” (Coleman 1988, 109). He suggests that social capital is a productive element that enables individual actors within certain social structures to achieve certain ends. Putnam (2000) defines social capital as a community’s sense of

---

4 Coleman suggests, “Social capital within the family that gives the child access to the adult’s human capital depends both on the physical presence of adults in the family and on the attention given by the adults to the child” (Coleman 1988, 111).

5 Because his concept of social capital focuses predominantly on the rational choice perspective of human action, his approach is often dismissed by more recent theorists, who suggest that social capital is more embedded in social relationships, rather than being possessed by individuals who are atomized actors in Coleman’s models. Coleman is especially critical of social capital on which “primordial social organization” depends, because in his perception, traditional norms inherently infringe upon actors’ autonomy based on individual interests. He suggests, “We need not mourn the loss of the supports for the social controls of primordial social organization. […] They operate more via constraints and coercion than via incentives and rewards. They are inegalitarian […] They discriminate, […] enforcing norms that are in the interests of elders; they inhibit innovation and creativity; they bring a greyness to life that dampens hope and aspiration. All this is due to their origins: The rights on which they depend are generated through a process of consensus; the interests of different members of the community are weighed differently” (Coleman 1993, 10). Although he was a leading proponent in the field, I dismiss his approach because for him, social capital is important in so far as it serves as the means to satisfy one’s individual interests. My approach rather assumes that social capital exists in interpersonal relationships and organic ties that result from particular norms and institutions that construct the society, but its abundance is not inherently determined by the structures themselves. Responding to both “undersocialized” and “oversocialized” accounts of individual behavior in economic transactions, Mark Granovetter (1985) argues that individual actions are embedded in
“trustworthiness,” and examines the frequency of civic association to discern generational changes in social connectedness among Americans.

My approach assumes that the abundance of social capital correlates to the extent of communal unity, which depends on the quality of people’s mutual connectedness. In a so-called traditional society, long-standing norms and strong interpersonal networks reinforce one another to promote cohesion. Therefore, I examine social capital by analyzing the mechanisms by which the community carries out economic, political, and social activities. These mechanisms include villagers’ engagement with others on the basis of trust and reciprocity, villagers’ adherence to traditions, and to the different social roles of individual, household, and society. I reflect upon the different circumstances in Shirazi and Takaungu villages to identify factors that are suggestive of communal solidarity, interpersonal connectedness, and interactions based on generalized trust. Through these informative accounts, we can discern the relative abundance of social capital in the two villages. Therefore, this comparison constitutes my test of whether Shirazi and Takaungu, with uneven exposure to modern development, exhibit different levels of social capital.

Putnam’s conceptualization of “eroding” social capital in *Bowling Alone* has particularly influenced my approach to the issues of social change and communal solidarity. As briefly mentioned earlier, contemporary theorists often emphasize structures of social relationships. Granovetter believes that economic transactions are carried out neither by “atomized” actors who pursue utilitarian self-interest outside a social context nor influenced by behaviors that pertain to set norms or values of particular social categories. I follow Granovetter’s stance in positing that individuals make purposive decisions within the “concrete, ongoing systems of social relations” (1985, 487). My framework also conforms to his approach by assuming that the level of trust that “fulfills the function of sustaining order” depends on how the interpersonal relations and social networks are arranged, and not on the presence of a social structure itself (Granovetter 1985, 491).
social capital’s instrumental role in modernization: Social networks based on trust and reciprocity are conducive to socioeconomic development. For this reason, the maximization of social capital has become one of the major concerns of recent rural development advocates. Meanwhile, it is important to note that socioeconomic development can alter social institutions that have hitherto acted as the foundation of a community’s culture.\(^6\)

I take the proposition further and question whether a community’s exposure to a larger socioeconomic system undermines the social relationships that promote communal cohesion and solidarity. Admittedly, some of Putnam’s models delineated in *Bowling Alone* are not inapplicable to a rural Kenyan village setting, as they are based on historical and cultural aspects of the industrialized, post-modern, and highly advanced American civil society. Thus, I retain Putnam’s broader definition and approach to the issue of social capital, and draw upon several other thinkers to create my own synthetic framework that seems best suited to the study of rural villages in Kenya.

Putnam’s study is based on French historian Alexis de Tocqueville’s observation that America in the 1830s fulfilled the social conditions for a stable,\(^6\)

\(^6\) Culture, American anthropologist Elliot Skinner argues, “provides necessary designs or models for living, indicating what is considered proper, or moral, or even sane” (2001, 172). Culture provides the knowledge and tools that enable people to deal with different social environments. It helps individuals construct their identities (i.e. comprehensions of self in relation to others), which are crucial for social cohesion. Viewing culture from a utilitarian perspective, Francis Fukuyama states, “[Culture] plays a very important functional role in any society, being the means by which groups of individuals communicate and cooperate in a wide variety of activities” (2002, 23). Like Skinner, Fukuyama perceives culture as accommodating certain roles in a society. While culture as a “form of creative expression” cannot be quantified, functional roles of culture are more measurable as “stock of social capital” (2002, 23). Social capital, or the functional role of culture, is best understood as the capacity for social cooperation that enhances important communal decision-making based on shared social norms.
democratic civil society because of the society’s inclination toward active participation in voluntary associations. Individuals’ lives were rooted in their adherence to civic freedom and pluralism. In his work, *Democracy in America*, de Tocqueville comments on the salient features of American public associations in civil life:

> Americans of all ages, conditions, and all dispositions constantly unite together. Not only do they have commercial and industrial associations to which all belong but also a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, very general and very specialized, large and small. [...] If they wish to highlight a truth or develop an opinion by the encouragement of a great example, they form an association (Tocqueville 2003, 596).

De Tocqueville argues that the development of these civil associations in nineteenth-century America was encouraged by the citizenry’s political freedom to associate, which led Americans from all backgrounds to “acquire a general taste for associations and grow accustomed to using them” in civil life (2003, 608). De Tocqueville asserts, “[N]othing deserves to attract our attention more than the intellectual and moral associations of America” (2003, 600), since “in no country in the world has greater advantage been derived from association nor has this powerful instrument of action been applied to a wider variety of objectives than in America” (2003, 200).

Confirming de Tocqueville, Putnam observes that America showed a rising trend of active participation in voluntary and civic associations until the late 1970s. He claims, however, that civil association has eroded ever since. As described by de Tocqueville, America was a rural, localized society of small towns, small farms, and small businesses in the 1830s when voluntary associations were prominent.
Technology and socioeconomic advancement during the late-nineteenth century, however, transformed America into a modern, urban, and industrialized society.

Putnam’s major finding is that the average frequency of civil participation in associational activities significantly decreased along with shifting social norms beginning in the 1970s. The four major factors that caused the erosion of Americans’ social connectedness and civic engagement in Putnam’s model are increasing pressure of time and money as a result of higher levels of women’s employment; suburbanization and greater mobility; increased access and changing forms of electronic entertainment; and most importantly, replacement of the civic population by a less involved generation (2000).\(^7\) He perceives the general trend of decreasing civic engagement and social capital in the following areas: political and civil participation, including involvement in clubs and organizations; religious participation; connections in the work place; informal connections with neighbors and friends; altruism and philanthropy; and general social trust. On the other hand, there is a countertrend of increasing involvement in small organizations, Internet-based activities, and social movements. The overall trend in America, therefore, is a decrease in interpersonal interactions and an increase in impersonal affiliations with the more abstract, ideological issues in society.

In my analysis, I incorporate Putnam’s trends and causal mechanisms to the extent that they are applicable to my two selected Kenyan villages. I retain Putnam’s focus on the levels of civil engagement to delineate the different degrees of social

\(^7\) Putnam provides percentages of total decline in social capital to which each of the four categories is attributable: pressure of time and money accounts for no more than 10 percent; suburbanization is an additional 10 percent; electronic entertainment accounts for around 25 percent; and generational change accounts for the rest—more than half of the total decline.
connectedness within the communities. Factors such as increasing financial pressure, changing gender roles, and changing forms of entertainment are also relevant. Causes like suburbanization and generational changes, however, are derived solely from the American societal and historical context; therefore, they are excluded from my framework.

Putnam links the decline of civil engagement to a “deficit” of social capital, which is the lack of trustworthiness in social relationships that causes people to feel reluctant to engage with others. The more cooperatively engaged the community is, the more social capital there is. For Putnam, social capital matters because the more trusting people are, the happier, safer, and more prosperous the society becomes. Comparing societies with different levels of socioeconomic conditions, Putnam suggests that societies with higher standards of living (such as better health conditions, education level, crime-rates, etc.) tend to exhibit higher levels of social capital. Presuming socioeconomic development and democracy as fundamental aspects of societal well-being in America, Putnam emphasizes the instrumentality of bridging (inclusive), as opposed to bonding (exclusive) social capital, which helps link a community to external assets and information by establishing what political scientists call “weak ties” among heterogeneous peoples. According to Putnam, bonding capital enhances communal solidarity within a homogeneous society, but can simultaneously create antagonism towards outsiders. With reference to Putnam’s

---

8 It must be clarified that bonding social capital can exist within ingroup relationships between people who are physically separate; therefore, while close physical proximity enhances the bonding capital, it is not a condition required per se.

9 The idea of extending or contracting social capital also relates to Putnam’s idea of generalized reciprocity. With regard to high levels of exclusive social capital, Putnam posits a disclaimer: Societies without such qualities follow the basic moral principle of “Do unto
concepts of social capital, my model is concerned with the decline of communal cohesion that is salient to societies with high levels of bonding social capital. In this sense, I treat bridging itself as a process of modernization and also a potential indicator of a decline in the kind of social capital that I examine in my Kenyan villages.

1.2. Theorizing Modernization: A Decrease in “Unmediated” Social Solidarity?

Modern social theorists have continuously questioned how societies can maintain a level of social cohesion under conditions of modernity. Some suggest that modernity is harmful to cohesion, as it breaks down traditional structures of living.\(^{10}\) Others argue that there is a shift in the mechanism by which solidarity can be maintained—in alternative forms. Emile Durkheim is in the latter group. In *The Division of Labor in Society* (first published in 1893), Durkheim responds to Marx and Rousseau’s skepticism toward modernity by arguing that modern societies can function as moral communities based on an extensive division of labor and dedication to individualism. Durkheim defines the division of labor as “mechanisms for co-

---

\(^{10}\) Karl Marx contends that a capitalist society is inherently prone to class conflict and is therefore self-destructive. Jean-Jacques Rousseau submits that only small, homogenous societies are able to maintain stability and reflect the will of the people. Marx and Rousseau both maintain that societal order is based on shared values, whereas modernity is subversive of communal solidarity and stability.
ordinating and solidifying the interaction among individuals whose interests are becoming progressively more diversified” (1984 [1893]). In any case, these debates on social cohesion necessarily assume that long-standing forms of social solidarity are compromised in the process of social transformation. Despite Durkheim’s effort to spell out the mechanism by which social solidarity can be achieved in a modern society, I particularly draw upon his fundamental idea that modernity compromises traditional forms of solidarity.

Durkheim argues that the division of labor can produce organic solidarity—a form of social solidarity based on the interdependence of individuals. Organic solidarity leads to the creation of order in a moral community because people retain their “sphere[s] of action that [are] peculiarly [their] own” (1984 [1893], 85), as they also exercise roles in which each one of them is “constantly dependent upon others and constitutes with them a solidly linked system” (1984 [1893], 173). The maintenance of such order necessarily assumes coordination by moral and economic regulations, which are predominantly promoted by institutions such as contracts and restitutory sanctions.

11 Durkheim suggests that for division of labor to function as a foundation of order in society, the “old structure” must necessarily disappear since “no longer is there any connection between the fixed number of segments and the ever-increasing number of functions that become specialized” (1984 [1893], 133).

12 Durkheim suggests that a modern society is present in restitutory law: “Generally it is true that [restitutory law] does not intervene by itself and of its own volition: it must be solicited to do so by the parties concerned. Yet although it has to be invoked, its intervention is nonetheless the essential cog in the mechanism, since it alone causes that mechanism to function. It is society that declares what the law is, through its body of representatives” (Durkheim 1984 [1893], 70). Similarly, Durkheim emphasizes that if contracts have binding force in society, it is society that bestows that force. Since restitutory sanctions do not involve the “common consciousness” (which is described in the next paragraph), these sanctions are imposed “directly, not between the individual and society, but between limited and particular elements in society” (1984 [1893], 71).
In Durkheim’s model, increasing specialization signifies the replacement of the type of social cohesion present in a “primitive” society by organic solidarity. A limited division of labor in the latter society entails mechanical solidarity—a form of social solidarity that is characteristic of traditional societies that Durkheim describes as “segmentary” (1984 [1893], 127). Segmentary societies consist of associations of clans and kinship ties comprised of homogenous elements among themselves that are distinct from others. To function as a segmented organization, these separate associations must resemble one another; otherwise, the society fails to unite as a whole. Furthermore, individual behavior must conform to norms and hence, people do not make autonomous decisions. Durkheim’s model suggests that mechanical solidarity arises from states of collective consciousness, which is defined as a “determinate system” formed by “the totality of beliefs and sentiments common to the average members of a society” (1984 [1893], 38-39). In other words, societies with mechanical solidarity are cohesive, in so far as the people assimilate themselves to others by forming diffuse and uniform beliefs, and hence, do not develop individuality. Durkheim suggests that domains of collective consciousness in modern societies are constantly diminishing due to an “increasing multitude of individual acts of dissent” (1984 [1893], 122). Division of labor, then, strengthens the necessary social links that get weakened by social changes occurring in a society based on mechanical solidarity, consequently leading to the emergence of organic solidarity that characterizes “higher” or more advanced types of societies. To achieve this organic solidarity, various systems of formal coordination replace the traditional form of social ties, which are analogous to the kind of
traditional bond depicted in Ferdinand Tönnies’ (1887) notion of Community [Gemeinschaft].

Due to progress in the division of labor, the Durkheimean advanced society inevitably requires greater contractual relationships, which help regulate social functions that are distinct, yet interdependent. Contracts, Durkheim posits, are essential to ensuring harmonious cooperation among people throughout the entire course of their relationship:

The duties and rights of each one must be defined, not only in the light of the situation as it presents itself at the moment when the contract is concluded, but in anticipation of circumstances that can arise and can modify it (1984 [1893], 160).

In contrast with communities whose solidarity is developed upon long-standing norms and traditional beliefs, Tönniesian Society [Gesellschaft] enhances people’s moral sentiments and actions through “convention,” which exist primarily within the basic form of competitive market society (Tönnies 2001, 255-258). For both Tönnies

---

13 Tönnies’ conceptual antithesis between Gemeinschaft, as “small-scale, ‘organic,’ close-knit Community” and Gesellschaft as “large-scale, impersonal, civil and commercial Society,” also helps to clarify my notion of social capital (2001, xli). Social relationships that are based on “positive mutual affirmation,” Tönnies argues, create social groups that can be referred to collectively as a union, fraternity, or association. The essence of Community [Gemeinschaft] is the real-life social bond that stems from the relationship itself, whereas Society [Gesellschaft] is a “purely mechanical construction, existing in the mind” (2001, 17). Tönnies contrasts the two: in the former, people “stay together in spite of everything that separates them”; while in the latter, “they remain separate in spite of everything that unites them” (2001, 52). My treatment of social capital is analogous to the interpersonal connectedness embedded in the Tönniesian Community. Here, there is a kind of pre-determined unity; whereas Society requires a fictional invention or manufacturing of “common personality with its own will, to whom the common value system has to relate” (Tönnies 2001, 53). Tönnies suggests that individuals in Society are self-interested and separated social beings, notwithstanding their living peacefully alongside one another. His concepts are relevant insofar as the development of Society presumes the subversion of Community, which is characterized by traditional forms of social cohesion.

14 While Durkheim suggests that contractual arrangements become increasingly important in a society with highly specialized and diffused social functions, he nevertheless points out that “voluntary co-operation” can emerge beyond the initial contractual actions that are based on mandatory regulations and agreements (1984 [1893], 161).
and Dukheim, therefore, a modern society that is characterized by impersonal social ties can enable its solidarity by adopting alternative coordinating mechanisms.\textsuperscript{15} This in turn suggests that achieving modern forms of solidarity is at the expense of the interpersonal ties that characterize traditional relationships, which are common in small-scale village communities.

To summarize, Dukheim presents a twofold argument: (1) Extensive division of labor undermines traditional forms of society based on mechanical solidarity; and (2) the division of labor may lead to organic solidarity. Focusing on his first argument that traditional forms of social solidarity decline through extensive specialization and contractual coordination, I intend to observe the difference in the level of traditional “solidaristic” social relationships in two villages that have undergone modernization unevenly.

On one hand, I examine the structural differences of two small-scale village societies—Shirazi and Takaungu—in their economic, political, and social dimensions. On the other hand, I intend to unveil the differences in village circumstances at the societal, household, and individual levels. The main focus is the divergence of people’s involvement and perceptions of interpersonal, trust-based relationships in the two selected villages. Each of the three levels contains distinct actors in the process of modernization, but all structural changes and resulting impacts on the people are nonetheless intertwined. I draw upon sociologist Neil J. Smelser’s models of structural \textit{differentiation} and the \textit{integration} of differentiated activities, which are components of what he calls the Weberian ideal-type constructs

\textsuperscript{15} However, for Tönnies, associations \textit{[gessellschaften]} are held together by rational and instrumental calculations, as opposed to the awareness of one’s dependency on others, as Dukheim argues.
of social change (Smelser 1967). This model owes its foundation to Durkheimean organic solidarity—the complementary roles of differentiation (specialization) and integration (rule-based coordination) ensure that the society functions with order. Like Durkheim, he also argues that rule-based coordination replaces traditional social organizations. My main concern here is that the latter is undermined in the process of modernization.

One might use Smelser’s terms, “external” and “internal,” to describe the forces of social change, “external” being the influence emerging from the presence of other societies, and “internal” being the “interrelations of values, social structures, and classes as they are institutionalized in a given society” (Smelser 1992, 369-370). Smelser suggests that external and internal forces cannot be dichotomized. Rather, they jointly cause or prevent social changes. In my framework, I am particularly interested in uncovering the different levels of “external” and “internal” forces that are manifest in the two communities. I assume that Takaungu, with a greater exposure to the modern economy, is characterized by a higher degree of impersonal, rationalized, and rule-based coordination. In contrast, the traditional form of “social capital”—the “internal,” interpersonal, and “unmediated” communal cohesion—is predicted to be more abundant in the Shirazi community, where people adhere to long-standing social norms and relationships based on trust and reciprocity.

16 Max Weber’s ideal-type construct refers to the conceptual model that suggests elements that are most common to a given phenomenon. It is utilized in analyzing various historical events, but its purpose is not to provide “perfect” structures or moral ideals. Weber suggests, “An ideal type is formed by the one-sided accentuation of one or more points of view and by the synthesis of a great many diffuse, discrete, more or less present and occasionally absent concrete individual phenomena, which are arranged according to those one-sidedly emphasized viewpoints into a unified analytical construct [Gedankenbild]” (Weber 2007, 212).
To reiterate, I aim to test the hypothesis that modernization leads to the decline of social capital, by observing the social relationships within the two communities that face uneven socioeconomic circumstances. I hypothesize that social capital is more abundant in Shirazi than in Takaungu, because the foundation of social cohesion in the former seems to be interpersonal and traditional ties, whereas in the latter, cohesion results from rule-based coordination imposed by external economic, political, and social organizations.

1.3. Structural Changes and the Decline of Social Capital at the Societal, Household, and Individual Levels

1.3.1. Economic Mechanisms

This section spells out the mechanisms by which highly agricultural, “semi-isolated” economies transform into commercial, market-based economies in Kenyan villages (Johnston and Kilby 1975, 3). The following framework largely draws upon Smelser’s differentiation—integration model identified earlier, which is further explicated with reference to aspects of economic transformation.

Karl Polanyi is an earlier proponent of a kind of economic transformation that Smelser constructs in his differentiation—integration model. Polanyi argues that the transformation of a traditional form of economy into a modern economy denotes a separation of labor from other activities of life while simultaneously applying the laws of the market to it. This process weakens all solidarity-based forms of existence and replaces them with atomistic and individualistic organizations. Through structural rationalization in the economy, Polanyi contends, “[N]on-contractual organizations of
kinship, neighborhood, profession, and creed were to be liquidated since they claimed the allegiance of the individual...” (2001, 171).

In so-called traditional subsistence societies, a high percentage of the population is involved in farming. There is a limited amount of independent exchange outside of a “family-community complex” (Smelser 1967, 34). Crops are produced and consumed within a family unit based on personal and reciprocal exchange; hence, the productivity of rural labor force is relatively low (Johnston and Kilby 1975). Individuals engage in diffuse roles, meaning that they are in charge of producing a wide range of agricultural and nonagricultural goods and services for their households. There is a limited market structure that operates on the power of money and the movements of goods and services. According to development economists Bruce F. Johnston and Peter Kilby, this small-scale social network necessarily suggests that the community (a) has limited exposure to technical knowledge and the ability to utilize it and (b) is likely to face difficulties in adopting innovations that involve interdependencies extending beyond the boundaries of trust and reciprocity (1975, 29).

*Structural differentiation* of the economy refers to the shift from a multifunctional role structure based on family units to a more specialized role structure of high-productivity systems. Introduction of cash crops, for example, differentiates the social activities of production and consumption (Smelser 1967, 34). Agricultural products no longer feed the community where such production occurs, but rather gets sold in distant markets to be consumed by strangers. The factory system also forces villagers to leave the community to work for production by external agencies.
Individuals who used to participate in various production activities as a family unit become increasingly specialized in agricultural, industrial, or commercial work. Adam Smith explicates in *The Wealth of Nations* (originally published in 1776) the extensive division of labor evident in the daily work of pin-makers. Each uneducated worker performs distinct operations that are independent from the others in the process of pin-making. The products of these separate “peculiar businesses” are combined to produce a higher total quantity of complete pins than they could otherwise have produced. Each operation, thus, involves separate trades and employment. Smith states:

> In every improved society, the farmer is generally nothing but a farmer; the manufacturer, nothing but a manufacturer. The labour too which is necessary to produce any one complete manufacture, is almost always divided among a great number of hands (Smith 1976, Book I, Chp. I [4]).

The shift from an agricultural economy to a commercial economy suggests that villagers increasingly join in industrial labor. Because manufacturing involves more subdivided specialized tasks compared to agricultural labor, workers become increasingly involved in jobs that are impersonal, individualistic, atomistic, and also mechanistic.

Differentiation increasingly specifies occupation and job tasks, leading to the increase in capital-intensive and wage-based labor. Traditionally, men and nature were inseparable in Kenyan village communities. People worked on the land to subsist; land was given by nature to all living organisms. In contrast, Polanyi’s description demonstrates Marxian objectification of labor and appropriation of land:

> “Man under the name of labor, nature under the name of land, were made available
for sale; the use of labor power could be negotiated for a price called rent” (Polanyi 2001, 173). This movement gives rise to the value of individual property ownership, which undermines the sentiments of “communal sharing” as were being endorsed traditionally. The replacement of the notion that land belongs to nature by “commercialization of the soil” can signify that people are not only giving up their labor power for the accumulation of capital, but also that values that have hitherto contributed to the stability of village communities are being undermined.

Another crucial step in Smelser’s modernization model is the integration of differentiated activities. Analogous to Durkheimean organic solidarity, the integration process imposes norms on differentiated tasks and organizes them into institutions that ensure the proper function of the new economic structure. This suggests that integration makes the coordination of the system by law, political groups, and other associations more salient in the community. Conditions of differentiation separate the social setting of production from consumption, and villagers become more productive geographically, temporarily, and structurally outside of their familial sphere (Smelser 1967). This integration therefore concerns balancing the interests of both family and firms. The examples of institutions and organizations that promote integration are: labor unions, government regulation of labor allocation, public welfare, and savings

---

17 The value of communal sharing was also emphasized as the ideal basis of the East African development model since the 1960s. Originating from the value of Ujamaa, or “familyhood” in Kiswahili, this “African socialism” particularly endorsed the traditional value of communal land ownership, especially in the rural village communities of East Africa. Land is regarded as nature’s “gift.” Kenyan politician Tom Mboya proclaims that in Africa, people believe that human beings are equally ‘sons (and daughters) of the soil’ (Mboya 1975, 60). This belief led to the notion of communal ownership of land—the “vital means of life”—which should be accessed with equal opportunity to hoe, the symbol of work. The replacement of the notion that land belongs to nature by “commercialization of soil” can signify that people are not only giving up their labor power for the accumulation of capital, but also that values that have hitherto contributed to the stability of village communities are being undermined.
institutions (Smelser 1967, 40-41). Highlighting Johnston and Kilby, the expansion of these organizations necessarily displaces communal solidarity based on “diffuse, personalistic ties” by “specific and sharply delimited contractual obligations” (Johnston and Kilby 1975, 54).

Integrative institutions increasingly gravitate towards valuing functional specificity, rationality, and universality.¹⁸ For example, there is gradual replacement of voluntary associations originally based on common tribe, kinship, and village by “functional” groups based on economic ends (Polanyi 2001, 41).¹⁹ The modern economy is regulated, controlled, and directed by price. A commercialized market system assumes the principle of profit-maximization, as opposed to exchange of commodities based on reciprocal sharing and traditional expectations.

1.3.2. Political Mechanisms

Smelser constructs the model of transformation in native African political system in distinct steps. Because political structures already assume the presence of institutions that ensure the cohesion of the community, here we assume that differentiation and integration both occur as a merged process.

The least differentiated African society in Smelser’s model is one where the largest political unit is based on kinship. Ghanaian economist George B. N. Ayittey argues that political organization in this type of society begins at the village level; each village has an individual known as the “head.” Ayittey refers to such polity as

¹⁸ Polanyi’s conception of capital as an “instrument of unification” also exemplifies the modern inclination towards functional specificity (Polanyi, 69). Polanyi assumes capital fosters unification by perpetuating an extensive market system. While this is a valid Marxist view of capital, it is often discredited in the context of a village environment.

¹⁹ Ibid, 41.
“chiefdom” and suggests that it usually contains four units of government: The chief, who does not rule but simply leads and assesses the council’s opinions; an inner council, comprised of the chief’s relatives and personal friends who act as checks and balances on the chief; a council of elders, who are headmen of village wards that represent the commons; and finally, a village assembly, a group of villagers who debate in front of the people and make ultimate judgments or final decisions on disputed issues (1998, 87-90). Ayittey argues that this form of government does not correspond to despotism in the contemporary sense. Reaching a consensus can be a lengthy process but there is “unity of purpose” since all are allowed to participate in the decision-making, one that is based on free discussion among people (Ayittey 1988, 88). An appointed chief can easily be forced to resign if he is considered politically abusive. We can suggest that this form of political structure upholds social cohesion, as it is based on social interactions that ensure a platform for people to freely and safely exchange ideas.

With modernization, the political society increasingly must integrate numerous kinship lineages. As people with diverse interests progressively interact, different groups are organized through more formal organizations, namely with the presence of administrative officials from the national government and business firms from other areas. Rule-based “external” bureaucracy replaces autonomous village politics based on personal ties and trust. Weber argues that this legal structure of authority emerges as the society requires more stability under untraditional forms of political leadership. Weberian ideal-types of authority suggest that political authority evolves from traditional (religious, familial, feudal, and/or patriarchal) to rational-
legal (presence of bureaucratic state and law) domination (Gerth and Mills 1946). The latter model, however, inevitably reduces the community’s personal connections to the authority. Rather, they perceive the leaders as individuals pursuing their legal obligations. The political society, therefore, becomes increasingly systematized. Social connections between people that hitherto ensured communal solidarity are superseded by rule-based coordination imposed by institutions.

1.3.3. Social Mechanisms

Social mechanisms of structural change include shifts in socio-cultural norms that function as the moral code of the society. I draw upon political economist Francis Fukuyama’s conceptualization of culture, which suggests that culture is an *inherited ethical habit* and hence, inseparable from social structure. With reference to Weber’s work, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, Smelser demonstrates that structural changes may involve differentiation of religious systems. Capitalism, Smelser contends, “establishe[s] an institutional base and a secular value system of its own—economic rationality,” which undermines the traditional ascetic values of the society (1971, 361). Secularization is therefore an integrative movement in a society where the differentiation of economic and political activities proceeds.

---

20 Fukuyama suggests that the culture is best understood in terms of what it is not; it is not a rational choice that involves “consideration of alternative ways of achieving a particular end and the selection of the optimal one based on available information” (Fukuyama 2002, 34-35). In other words, culture entails choices that are habitual, rather than rational utility maximization (Fukuyama 2002, 36-37). Certain ethical codes, Fukuyama argues, create moral communities and promote a wider radius of trust, an essential component in the enhancement of social capital. When traditional ethical norms are undermined by “modern” habits, the series of social virtues that produce social capital in the village community also diminishes.
Increasingly, people’s values gravitate toward those that help attain certain economic ends such as material wealth.

At the household level, social changes influence the function of a “family.” Smelser maintains that family activities are more concentrated on obtaining “emotional gratification and socialization” as economic functions are increasingly distinguished from family functions (1971, 359). Apprenticeship declines within a family and individuals leave their homes to find their own occupations. With the growing inclination towards protecting one’s property, extended family relationships progressively differentiate into nuclear family units. As a result, there is less control and generational transmission of teachings by elders; therefore, long-standing cultural values and practices are gradually undermined over time.

The emergence of nuclear family norms and personal-choice paradigms reduces social constraints allowing family members to leave their community more frequently. For example, the increase in the number of women leaving the community for wage-labor is an indication that the community is subject to differentiation from their traditional cultural roles. Similarly, we can observe the shifts in extended family relationships, namely in the culturally accepted African wedding norm that “whole families and not individuals, marry” (Njoh 2006, 52). In particular, the shifting cultural significance of the dowry, or bride price as a token of accepting a bride into the groom’s family, denotes the extent to which marriage is an individual or familial concern. The more a community is involved in the couple’s marriage, the more we can suggest that individuals are perceived to be undifferentiated from the community.
Social changes at the individual level can be demonstrated by Putnam’s observation that eroding social capital is attributable to generational changes in values. Putnam submits that changes in individuals’ value influence the ways in which they interact with one another in society. While Putnam discusses the generational change in the context of American history that led up to the socio-cultural conditions in the late twentieth century, the tendencies towards ideological shifts are nevertheless applicable to Kenyan village situations. Economic growth and technological advances, Putnam observes, have made individualism, competition, and materialism ever more salient. Consequently, individuals prefer private socializing; they would rather spend time by themselves and make use of home entertainment than interact with others in public (Putnam 2000, 266). Individuals physically and mentally isolate themselves from others, as the participation in voluntary associations necessitates coping with antagonistic interests. Changing types of technology and entertainment available for individuals also reinforce private socializing. Traditionally, people have enjoyed sharing the access to technological entertainment. In modern times however, the core of entertainment is the information and context that the technology reproduces and as a result, socializing often becomes extraneous.

Social scientist Alvin So describes this phenomenon as a shift in individuals’ identities from “collective orientation” to “self-orientation” (1990, 22). Intensifying individualism can be associated with the universalizing value of “human choice.” Political scientists Ronald Inglehart, et al. demonstrate that choice-oriented values such as “self-expression and [...] democratic rights” grow as people obtain more material and intellectual resources (Inglehart et al. 2004, 6). Consequently, people
progressively value engaging in activities that empower them to become productive beings in society.

* * *

Despite contemporary thinkers’ attempts to recognize social capital as an instrument of development, the same concept has not received much scrutiny from the standpoint of its elasticity. Using Durkheim and Smelser’s models of structural change in modernization, I have suggested that differentiation (division of labor) and integration (institutional and formal coordination) erode the foundation of social solidarity based on long-standing norms and trust-based social relationships. From here on, I use the term, “social capital,” to refer to the community’s capacity to ensure its solidarity through traditional forms of social ties, which is to be distinguished from formally-mediated cohesions. My hypothesis is that social capital in traditional village communities decline with modernization, namely due to changes in economic, political, and social structures. Therefore, ideally my empirical test—described in detail in Chapter Three—will show that the village that has undergone a lower degree of modernization exhibits higher levels of social capital. On the other hand, the more advanced community will show lower levels of solidarity based on adherence to traditional norms.
CHAPTER TWO

SHIRAZI AND TAKAUNGU: VILLAGE PROFILES

The first hours of the night are the most social time in Africa. No one wants to be alone then. Being alone? That’s misfortune, perdition! Children don’t go to sleep early here. We enter the land of dreams together—as a family, a clan, a village.

—Ryszard Kapuściński
The Shadow of the Sun

This chapter provides background information on the geographic, administrative, demographic, and socioeconomic conditions surrounding Shirazi and Takaungu. Focusing on topics relevant to my village surveys, such as physical infrastructure, production, finance, health, education, telecommunication, I discuss the salient features by highlighting the differences and similarities between the two communities. In doing so, I rely on my qualitative observations as well as statistical data collected from regional administrative offices and government publications. However, specific statistical accounts of the Shirazi and Takaungu communities that I use as my case studies are limited, as they are only communities within certain administrative boundaries. Therefore, I use data that represents political units of which Shirazi and Takaungu are constituents, and project it upon my villages. The information I provide here will henceforth serve as the foundation for my empirical analysis.
2.1. Geographic Locations, Settlement Patterns, and Administrative Units

Shirazi and Takaungu are both rural village communities located in the southern Coast Province of Kenya. Coast Province is comprised of 13 administrative districts (Map 2.1). Shirazi is part of Msawmbweni District, which borders Kwale District to the north and Tanzania to the south. Takaungu is constituted in Kilifi District, which is in the north of Kwale, Mombasa, and Kaloleni Districts, and it borders Malindi District to the south. Both the Shirazi and Takaungu villages face the Indian Ocean.

As summarized in the tables below, Msambweni District includes Msambweni Division as one of its three administrative divisions. Within this division, there are four locations, Kingwede-Shirazi being one of them. The Shirazi community that I focus on is part of Shirazi Sub-location, one of the 10 sub-locations that is included in Msambweni Division. Turning to Takaungu, the specific community of my focus is part of Takaungu Sub-location, one of the 11 administrative sub-locations within Kikambala Division. Kikambala is one of the seven divisions in Kilifi District.

---

21 Kenya is comprised of hierarchical administrative units: Eight provinces, 46 districts, 262 divisions (formerly called constituencies), 2,427 locations, and 6,612 sub-locations.

22 There are a total of 11 administrative locations and 24 sub-locations within Msambweni District. As for Kilifi District, there are 27 locations and 86 sub-locations.
Map 2.1: Districts in Coast Province, Kenya

As we compare the two administrative districts (Table 2.1), we discern that Kilifi has a higher population density than Msambweni. The divergence in population density becomes even more apparent as we compare the two divisions that include Shirazi and Takaungu, respectively: Msawbweni Division has a density lower than half of Kikambala. If we go down to administrative sub-locations (Table 2.3), the density is 110 in Shirazi compared to 345 in Takaungu. The region encompassing Shirazi is more sparsely populated than the area surrounding Takaungu.

Table 2.1: Administrative District (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>No. of Divisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Msambweni</td>
<td>283,658</td>
<td>3,235.3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilifi</td>
<td>459,024</td>
<td>3,870.2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Msambweni District Development Plan, 2008; and Kilifi District Development Plan, 2008.*

Table 2.2: Administrative Division (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Density</th>
<th>No. of Locations</th>
<th>No. of Sub-locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Msambweni</td>
<td>59,311</td>
<td>349.3</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikambala</td>
<td>129,402</td>
<td>299.7</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2.3: Administrative Location and Sub-location (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Sub-location</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>% M</th>
<th>% F</th>
<th>Area (km²)</th>
<th>Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kingwede-Shirazi</td>
<td>Shirazi</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,883</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>1,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takaungu-Mavueni</td>
<td>Takaungu</td>
<td>5,457</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21,314</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>3,320</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


One explanation for the divergence in densities is the uneven population distribution between commercial and rural areas. The largest portion of land (82 percent) in Msambweni District belongs to Lunga-lunga Division, but it has the lowest density at 38 per square kilometer. This is because much of the land in this area is rangeland, which is suitable for ranching and animal husbandry but not as much for agriculture. Hence, a large bulk of the population in the district lives around commercial centers (MPND *Msambweni* 2008). Diani District is one major commercial and tourist center of the region. It has the smallest area (covers seven
percent of the entire Msambweni District) of the three divisions but has the highest density at 382, which is more than twice as high as that of Msambweni where Shirazi is located, and ten times higher than Lunga-lunga.

The land directly surrounding Shirazi village is agricultural and pastoral; villagers own small-scale farms and herds of livestock within the village area. A large portion of land that surrounds the village, however, is made up of uncultivated grasslands and forests of coconut and mango trees. Due to its close proximity to the Indian Ocean, mangrove forests also occupy the east side of the village, and are not being exploited. The nearest commercial center is Msambweni town, which is located at least half an hour away by matatu (local quasi-public van transportation that operates along the main tarmac road). People also access Ukunda for administrative, business, and financial purposes, which is another 15 minutes north from Msambweni town.

Within the immediate surroundings of Shirazi, there is Barabarani village located across from Shirazi and on the other side of the main tarmac road. Due to its proximity to the main road and the availability of electricity, the village offers various convenient services for the local people. These services include convenience shops that sell daily necessities such as food grain and cereals, cell phone credits, and sanitary items. A couple of villagers also operate a charging service for phone batteries, which Shirazi people frequently make use of. There is Bodo, a slightly larger village 45-minutes away from Shirazi by foot. Some Shirazi people have familial relationships with the neighboring villagers.
While there are some business operations within the Shirazi village area, they are not large enough to make Shirazi a commercial center. The vast parcel of land that stretches from near Ukunda, all the way to Shimoni in the south of Shirazi, belongs to Kwale International Sugar Company (KISC) located in Ramisi, which is another town within the district. There are also several small-scale tourist resorts near and within Shirazi village, such as Funzi Keys and Paradise Lost, respectively. These companies hire predominantly the local villagers to carry out tasks within the region. It is rare for non-Shirazi locals to access the Shirazi region for commercial purposes.

In contrast, Takaungu village is located in relatively close proximity to major tourist and commercial centers (See Appendix Table II). Out of the seven divisions in Kilifi District, Kikambala has the largest population and the highest population density of 431 (MPND Kilifi 2008). This region includes major towns that provide employment opportunities in both the manufacturing and service industries. Located along the coastal areas, the same region is also known for its high agricultural production and fishing activities. The area connecting Takaungu village to commercial towns is made up of vast farmlands, most of which are operated by the wealthier Arabs in the region.

Takaungu-Mavueni Location has a high density of 219 per square kilometer, contrasting with Kingwede-Shirazi’s 146 (MPND Kilifi 2008). While Takaungu itself is not a regional commercial center, the high population density can be explained by its proximity to Kilifi town, as well as tourist resorts that have been established along the Indian Ocean and Kilifi creek, such as Mnarani. Kilifi town is one of the largest commercial towns in coastal Kenya, along with Mombasa and Malindi. While the
towns are relatively close to Takaungu, forests and a creek around the village area nevertheless segregate them from one another. From Takaungu village, one can access the towns in two main ways. One is a 15-minute ride on a pikipiki, a local motorcycle “taxi.” To get on the pikipiki, however, villagers must cross Takaungu creek in a rowboat. The second transportation is a matatu that runs along the tarmac road, which connects Mombasa and Kilifi. The main tarmac road is a five-minute pikipiki ride from the village center towards the inland. From the pikipiki-stop, it takes about 15 minutes to reach the town. This shows that people from both Shirazi and Takaungu require some effort to access the commercial centers. However, we can perceive that Shirazi’s environment is more dispersed in terms of population distribution and opportunities for formal employment and commercial activities.

Map 2.3: Kilifi District

Source: Kilifi District Development Plan, 2008.
2.2. Demographics

2.2.1. Population Size and Distributions

The population sizes within administrative units are presented in Tables 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 above. Overall, the population sizes of Kilifi District and its constituent administrative units are larger than those of Msambweni District. While the area of Shirazi Sub-location is more than twice as large as Takaungu Sub-location, the latter’s population is 5,457 and is still larger than the 4,182 of the former (Table 2.3). To clarify, Shirazi and Takaungu, which I cover in my study, are locally identified “villages” that in reality constitute Shirazi and Takaungu Sub-locations, respectively. The population is 679 in Shirazi and approximately 1,500 in Takaungu. There are about 150 households in the former, and 300 in the latter. For both Shirazi and Takaungu, the population to household proportion in the sub-location is fairly consistent with that of the village; the values are 4.5 heads per household in Shirazi and 5.8 in Takaungu.\textsuperscript{23}

Using the district population distribution data projected for 2008, we can estimate the proportion of age groups based on gender in both villages. The gender proportion in both villages is 49 percent male and 51 percent female.\textsuperscript{24} Overall, the population distribution is similar between Shirazi and Takaungu, particularly in terms of the size of representation of each population category in relation to other categories. For example, Shirazi (Msambweni District) has the largest group of

\textsuperscript{23} Keep in mind that both Takaungu village’s population of 1,500 and household number of 300 are estimations.

\textsuperscript{24} Kilifi District Development Plan 2008-2012 projects that the sex ratio of male and female in the district is 47.5 and 52.5 percent (MPND Kilifi 2008). Here, I use the ration calculated using the 1999 Population and Housing Census data for Takaungu Sub-location, as it would represent a more accurate representation of Takaungu village.
people within the labor force category (ages 15-64), who represent 53.3 percent of the total population. Similarly, the same category comprises the largest proportion of 49.3 percent of the total population in Takaungu (Kilifi District). The elderly population, who are above the age of 65, make up the smallest proportion of the total population in both districts; the percentages are 2.9 in Shirazi and 3.2 in Takaungu.

Table 2.4: Village Population Summary of Shirazi and Takaungu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age by Percentage to Total Population(^c) (2008)</th>
<th>Shirazi</th>
<th>Takaungu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre School (3-5)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School (6-13)</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School (14-17)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth (15-29)</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive (15-49)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Force (15-64)</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 65</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data for Shirazi was directly obtained from Kingwede-Shirazi Location Sub-chief Amani Mazuri in July 2010. These numbers were extracted from the raw data prepared for the National Population and Housing Census 2009. Data for Takaungu is an approximation provided by Maalim Aziz, former SIT coordinator in Takaungu.

Notes: M = Male, F = Female. The numbers in parentheses are actual population.

a. The population and the number of households presented here represent the village communities that are subject to my case studies. These villages constitute but are not the same as Shirazi and Takaungu Sub-locations, which are administrative units.


Turning our attention to the three largest population categories: labor force, youth, and primary school level children (in descending order of proportion), we see that all population categories in Shirazi comprise slightly larger proportions of the population compared to Takaungu. When it comes to other population categories, such as children under five, pre-school-level children, secondary school level age group, infants, and elders (in descending order of proportion), their percentages of the total population are slightly higher in Takaungu. As for the female population of reproductive age (15-49), the proportions are 23.6 percent in Shirazi and 24.0 percent in Takaungu, which are very close.

2.2.2. Tribal Groups and Village Settlement History

The dominant tribal community in Msambweni District is the Mijikenda, mainly the Digo and the Duruma. Mijikenda is a congregation of nine closely related indigenous tribes in East Africa, the Digo and Duruma tribes being two of them. Almost every villager in Shirazi is ancestrally linked to both the Arabs and the Digo. Arabs landed in Shirazi in the 1800s and intermarried with indigenous Bantu-speaking peoples, predominantly the Digo. The extensive intermixing of different cultures resulted in Shirazi customs that villagers suggest are “unique to Shirazi.” These customs can be characterized as an amalgam of both Swahili and Digo cultures. People almost uniformly identify themselves as Muslim. Shirazi people

---

25 Mijikenda is a Swahili term used to refer to the congregation of nine closely related indigenous East African tribes. It is comprised of Digo, Duruma, Rabai, Ribe, Kambe, Jibana, Chonyi, Kauma and Giriama.

26 Swahili culture is a complex mixture of Arabic, Persian, and European influences on the indigenous culture of the Bantu-speaking peoples of Africa. It is the culture the Swahili tribe practices, but Swahili culture encompasses a wider range of coastal tribal cultures in Kenya and Tanzania, where Persians and other Arabs settled during the tenth century.
communicate in Kikifundi, a vernacular language of Shirazians that originates from Kidigo (the language spoken by the Digo tribe). Kiswahili, Kenya’s official language, is also spoken widely.\footnote{Kiswahili literally refers to the language of the Swahili tribe.}

The two dominant ethnic groups in Takaungu are the Swahili and the Giriama. The Swahili ("Kiswahili" = Swahili language, “the Swahili” = tribal group) is considered to be the ethnic group that emerged as a result of intermarriage between indigenous African tribes, especially the Mijikenda, and Arabs during the early colonial era in the tenth century. The most prominent Mijikenda tribe in Kilifi area is the Giriama, which also has the largest population among the Kenyan Mijikenda community. There are also direct descendants of the powerful Arabic clan, Mazrui, which settled in Takaungu during the 1800s. These people have intermarried with the Swahili; therefore, it is difficult to draw a distinction between the descendants of the Arabs who settled in the 19th century, and the long-resided Swahili people in Takaungu. These people practice Swahili culture, whereas the Giriama practice their own tribal culture. While the former group is Muslim, the latter group predominantly practices Christianity or other pagan beliefs. Most Giriama people in Takaungu communicate almost solely in Kigiriama, their vernacular language. They often have difficulties understanding Kiswahili, the language that both Arabs and the Swahili speak on a normal basis.

According to Shirazi elders’ oral accounts, Shirazi village developed as a family settlement in the plot that is currently called Pwani. The village includes the following informal subsections: Pwani, Mkwajuni, Madukani, Kakira, Taveta, Mangawani, Mwachimba, and Mwakikole. People use these as informal labels for
different geographic locations in Shirazi. They also function as administrative units for Shirazi’s internal government. Pwani, meaning “coast” in Kiswahili, is located along the mangrove-forested shore of the Indian Ocean. As the family members intermarried over time, the population growth necessitated a physical expansion of the settlement. As a result, the newly exploited piece of land that is a minute away from Pwani became the subsection known as Mkwajuni, which is consequently a community of kin. The village extended into the present state as the newly established subsections repeated this procedure. Therefore, these separate plots often represent an extension of family units, and the closeness of biological relationships tends to correlate with the physical proximity of the subsections.

The size of the plots vary; Mkwajuni, where I stayed throughout my study, for example, has nine houses, a few small huts, and acreage for livestock such as cattle, goats, and chickens. The most populated subsection, which is in the geographic center of Shirazi, is Madukani (which literally means, “around the shops”). There, one family owns a small but a major shop, making it an active social and economic center within the village. The biggest mosque and madrasa—the school for Islamic teachings—are also located in Madukani.

Like Shirazi, Takaungu is divided into multiple subsections. The many sections include but are not limited to Mtaajuu, Mtaagunya, Mtaamboni, Vyungani, Langoni, Lungani, Maweni, and Vuma. These divisions are essential because the villagers refer to different clusters of communities in these names. However, unlike Shirazi, subsections in Takaungu do not necessarily represent kin relationships. Rather, the bigger implication of the manner in which the village is divided into
subsections is that they denote the ethnic boundaries between the Swahili and the Giriama.

The Swahili population generally resides in Mtaajuu, Mtaagunya, Mtaamboni (*mtaa* literally means “town” in Kiswahili), and Lungani, and together they constitute the major commercial center of Takaungu. There are numerous shops, a video-screening theater, small-scale cafés, and a barbershop in the village center, all privately established by the residents. In addition, there is a large mosque, incomparable in size to the ones in Shirazi. Takaungu also has a large-scale Hindu temple, which opens on the weekends for Hindu worshippers, who, according to the villager who lives next door, “come to Takaungu once in a while.” A majority of the Giriama lives in the rural outskirts of Takaungu, which include Langoni, Maweni (meaning, “rocky place” in Kigiriama), and Vuma.

During the early 1800s, Mazrui, a powerful Arabic clan, settled in Kenya’s coastal region that encompasses Takaungu. It was an attempt for the Mazrui to extend their prosperous trade partnership with the Giriama people, preceding Mombasa’s takeover by Bisaidi, a young man from another Arabic clan (Brantley 1981). Interestingly, after the Mazrui settlement, Giriama migrated from their fortified *kaya*, an indigenous settlement, into the Takaungu hinterland in order to expand trading opportunities. Some Giriama worked as slaves in Mombasa and later settled in Takaungu as squatters. In the later 1900s, the colonial government sponsored several resettlement schemes and moved the Giriama nearer to coastal destinations including Takaungu. As a result, many of the relocated population converted to Islam and were incorporated into the Swahili population (Brantley 1981).
2.3. **Physical Infrastructure**

Only 95 kilometers (16.4 percent) of the 578 kilometers of road in Msambweni District are tarmac (MPND *Msambweni* 2008). There is only one tarmac road that connects Mombasa city and Lunga-lunga town; all the others are dirt roads. During the rainy season (June/July), most dirt roads are impassable due to mud and swamps. The walkable areas in Shirazi are made up of white soil, which is unsuitable for large vehicle and bicycle traffic, especially during the rainy season. The major transportation within Shirazi, therefore, is on foot.

Unlike the environment in Shirazi, the streets around Takaungu’s commercial area are often paved with concrete. The Ministry of Roads has upgraded and maintained the regional roads by patching, gravelling, grading, constructing, and repairing bridges and culverts in the district (MPND *Msambweni* 2008). The ministry also supervises construction of roads and bridges by private contractors. It partners with domestic and international donor organizations including the Constituency Development Fund (CDF), European Union, and Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA). During the summer of 2010, I witnessed an official road sign that indicated the EU’s sponsorship for improving Takaungu’s road conditions. The hinterland of Takaungu, however, is less refined. The streets are no longer paved but dirty and narrow, and sometimes rocky. People refer to these agrarian areas as the Giriama “outskirts” lands.

The entire Shirazi village has no physical infrastructure such as electricity, running water, gas, or sewage system. People rely on kerosene lamps and handmade *taa* (“lamps” made from small, used tins) for lighting from night till dawn. Within
Msambweni District, only 5.2 percent of all households have electricity (MPND Msambweni 2008). 70 percent of the households use wood fuel for cooking (CBS 2001a); women in Shirazi also cook with fire by burning wood and dried coconut shells and leaves. People dump both organic and inorganic trash in a huge hole dug in each subsection. They burn the trash once the hole is filled.

Only a quarter use piped water as the main source of water in Kwale (the former administrative district that included Shirazi, prior to 2007). The entire Shirazi community uses wells and boreholes as their source of water. In early 2010, villagers slowly but progressively participated in water “dam” constructions on the vast land that stretches between Shirazi homesteads and the main street. Again, the KISC owns this land. These “dams” however, are merely four enormous holes that hold rainwater to nourish the surrounding grass and crops. By late-July in the same year, certain portions of the land had been turned into huge muddy pools. The company hired Shirazi men to do the digging.

In contrast, especially the Swahili population in Takaungu has access to electricity and piped water in their houses. In Kilifi District, a majority of the households have access to piped water (CBS 2001a). Regional companies, rather than the central government, manage the distribution of water in the community through activities such as water surveys, extension and maintenance of pipelines, promotion of roof catchments, and supervising drilling boreholes and shallow wells. These companies work in conjunction with numerous international organizations such as the Red Cross, Plan International, World Vision, and numerous European governments.

---

28 14.56 percent of the households in Kwale District use wells as the main source of water, and 15.31 percent fetch water from boreholes (CBS 2001a).
In the hinterland where the Giriama reside, people do not have access to electricity in their houses. In shops and stalls, however, electricity is available. While wealthier households utilize piped water on a daily basis, a majority of Giriama households obtain water from wells, boreholes, and occasionally, public faucets.

House material is one indication of the levels of socioeconomic advancement. The most commonly used type of household roofing material in Shirazi is *makuti*, dried and knitted palm leaves. Most walls of the houses are made from a mixture of wood and mud, or a mixture of brick and block. The main floor material is earth, as in nearly 75 percent of all district households. Some long-established and inherited houses are built with cement floors.29

Unlike most of the houses in Shirazi, Swahili houses around the village center of Takaungu are often paved with cement or coral. The common roof materials are tin, iron, and concrete. There are at least several private rooms and a spacious common space or living room inside the houses. The kitchen is installed under the same roof as the common space, implying that these households do not collect firewood from nature to make fire like the Shirazi community and some Giriama households. Most households around the village center use a charcoal burner to cook. The Swahili population can afford to build houses that are larger, refined, and more complex compared to average Shirazi houses. These people often furnish their houses with outer fences, artificial yards, and carved wooden doors. Giriama houses in the

---

29 *Makuti* is used in 56 percent of all houses in Kwale district. The other common material is grass, which is used in 16 percent of households. As for wall materials, the most common type is a mixture of wood and mud (64 percent), or a mixture of brick and block (12 percent). The major floor material is earth in 75 percent of the households, and cement in 25 percent (CBS 2001a).
forest areas are mainly built with mud and *makuti* roofs. The most common floor material is earth. The inner structure of these houses is more complex than the average Shirazi houses.

### 2.4. Economic Activities and Production

#### 2.4.1. Agriculture, Livestock, and Business

Agricultural production is an important aspect of Shirazi’s economic activities, as are diffused non-agricultural activities. George Ayittey (1998) states that traditional African societies, like modern societies, rely on market structures that aim to reach fair market prices and allow producers to be profit-motivated. Upholding Ayittey’s statement, Shirazi villagers also engage in economic activities that generate profit. While Shirazi has historically embraced reciprocal market transactions, the semi-integration of the village into the modern avenues of production has prevented people from being entirely self-sustaining.

Livestock is integral to Shirazi villagers’ economic and cultural activities. There are a couple of villagers own huge herds of cattle, which are likely to be inherited across generations. The head of the clan and his immediate family collect milk from the cattle and deliver to some households in the village. For special occasions, such as religious celebrations and wedding ceremonies, the custodians donate their cows to the community of extended family, to be sacrificed and eaten.

---

30 Nine percent of houses in Kilifi use mud and cement to build their walls, similar to the Swahili households, while 66 percent use mud and wood like the Giriama. 24 percent of floors are made from cement; 75 percent are made from earth, which is common in coastal dwelling units. 26 percent of roof materials are iron, as is often the case of Swahili houses, whereas 60 percent of roofs in Kilifi households are created mainly from *makuti* like the Giriama houses (CBS 2001a).
among the villagers. The cattle custodians hire herders and provide meals and shelter for them.\textsuperscript{31} These cattle herders are in charge of leading the herds around the village and into an open field, namely the KISC land. A number of households own other livestock, such as goats and chickens. Goats are recognized to be the symbol of wealth by the general Shirazi population. They constitute the main portion of the dowry in Swahili-Digo marriages, as commonly practiced in Shirazi. People raise their livestock in their communal yards. Goats are kept for milk, and for their meat. Chickens produce eggs and are also consumed for meat. Every animal belongs to a household. Nevertheless, the land, in this case the “tool of production,” is shared, as Ayittey argues to be characteristic of traditional African societies.

As political scientist and scholar of African studies and development Ambe J. Njoh (2006) emphasizes, land is central to African cultural and traditional practices. In pre-colonial East Africa, land was treated as communal property. In practice, the elders or heads of lineages controlled the land; they worked as custodians and ensured that each member of the lineage was appropriated a piece of land that belonged to the lineage. Shirazi’s land tenure practically functions in such a way that upholds the African tradition; land is regarded as an ancestral property—if a villager wishes to build a house, he must first and foremost receive permission from the kin-based community that resides on the parcel of land. The deceased are buried directly on the ancestral land.\textsuperscript{32} In terms of agriculture and herding, the access to land is enabled

\textsuperscript{31} I use the term, “custodians,” to distinguish the communal nature of ownership from private ownership, which also has legal connotation.

\textsuperscript{32} Tönnies explains the implication of kinship based on ancestral lands: “the dead are reversed as invisible spirits, as if they still had the power to watch over their descendants, so that fear and honour together maintain co-existence and co-operation more securely” (Tönnies 2001, 28).
based on family and community needs (Njoh 2006). While each land belongs to a clan, it is nevertheless used communally. For example, the custodian of the land would allow another villager to farm on the land with no official lease. Cattle graze on any open land within the village area. Interestingly, every coconut tree in the village is allocated to a household, but neighbors often share the fruits among themselves, unless the family uses them as cash crops.33

Men and women have distinct roles and engage in different types of work. Men build houses, go fishing, engage in agriculture, and travel to neighboring towns in search of temporary jobs. Most men in Shirazi are virtually “jobless.” They engage in a wide range of productive activities at different locations and hours. In other words, most villagers do not specialize in occupations or tasks. Many households own a shamba, a small farm, where they often produce cassava and maze. Some families informally lend out farmlands to their relatives and friends. In many cases, land is shared communally among neighboring households. People sell their fish and agricultural products to the community at village stalls or at the neighboring Barabarani village to access a larger market. Working outside of the village is progressively becoming common for men. Normally they work in town during weekdays and come home for weekends. However, a more recent phenomenon is that some men leave the country to work for an extensive period of time and send over remittances.34

33 The villagers voluntarily allocated the trees to themselves. It must be noted that some households collect a massive amount of coconuts from their trees and sell them within or outside the village. Some families export other cash crops such as mangoes to Tanzania.  
34 My 34-year-old host father in Shirazi left for Saudi Arabia in May 2010 to work as a “driver” for several years. He has been sending a monthly remittance to my host mother and
Women do most of the housekeeping. Mothers and daughters fetch water, collect firewood, cook, hand-wash clothes, sweep the yard, buy groceries from the village shop, and raise children. These activities take up the majority of women’s hours during the day. However, women are progressively involved in various social and productive activities, mostly within the village, including farming and selling foods that men collected, and participating in microfinance activities. Unlike men, however, it is still rare for women to physically leave their houses and spend extensive periods of time away from the village. Women work within the village area, where they can return home whenever they need to resume their housework.

Some villagers engage in entrepreneurial activities. For example, a 23-year-old male villager started an informal movie-screening business in Madukani subsection, where both children and adults can gather and watch rented movies at an affordable price. He started the business in 2007 after being inspired by the larger-scale “cinema” businesses in the Barabarani and Bodo villages.\(^{35}\) Both Barabarani and Bodo have had electricity since the late 1900s to early 2000s. Unlike these two neighboring communities, Shirazi’s cinema business relies on an electricity generator that runs with vehicle motors. While villagers do not have constant access to a wide range of media, people from a wide range of age groups nevertheless have access to Western, East African, and Chinese movies.

To ensure that certain supplies are distributed evenly among the village community, some households operate informal businesses, such as selling kerosene. Unlike sales of fried fish and vegetables that take place at visible stalls, these

---

\(^{35}\) The interview was conducted in December 2009.
households simply own a large supply of kerosene and share it with villagers at a low price. Villagers informally visit the house and ask for the kerosene. There is no advertisement. The villagers simply know where to go, for instance when the shop runs out of its fuel supply.

In Takaungu, agriculture takes up a significant portion of productive activities for the Giriama population, but not so much for the Swahili population. Historically, the Giriama were agriculturalists, cattle-keepers, and traders that dominated Kenya’s immediate coastal hinterland between Mombasa and Malindi towns (Brantley 1981). Today, many Giriama households own small-scale farms, where they commonly grow maize and cassava to be consumed at home or by the community. Giriama people also own small herds of livestock, but the lack of vast empty lands and capital to purchase stock prevent them from keeping large herds of cattle.

Unlike in Shirazi, there are large-scale farmlands in Takaungu that are owned by wealthy descendants of the Mazrui. These farms grow cash crops, such as coconuts, mangoes, and cashew nuts, to be sold both domestically and internationally. Therefore, Mazrui farms operate solely for commercial sales. Unlike the condition of the majority of the village, these farms are cultivated constantly and extensively. They are capital-intensive and high-productivity units, and the landowners hire mostly Giriama people to conduct the agricultural work.

Swahili families are involved in a wide range of businesses. Men from wealthier households are often wage-laborers, or have retired from their occupations outside of Takaungu. One Arab family, for example, runs a primary school. My host father, who is around 70 years old, worked as a seaman in Greece for more than 30
years and married a local Greek woman.\textsuperscript{36} He recently married a Swahili woman in Takaungu, who is now his second wife. The family relies on the father’s assets, as well as financial assistance from his son in Greece. Other men worked as truck drivers in bigger cities like Nairobi and Mombasa for over 20 years, coming back after retirement. As briefly mentioned earlier, some men in the village own small barbershops; others own a \textit{duka} or store that sells daily necessities and limited groceries. Some operate a garage for motorcycle repairs, which is essential for independent \textit{pikipiki} drivers who constantly transport customers from Takaungu village center to the tarmac road and vice versa.

On the other hand, a significant proportion of the men from the productive age group of 29-49 are unemployed. They rely predominantly on \textit{kibarua}, part-time or casual employment. The jobs available to them include building houses, translating for visitors, and temporary contract jobs available in Kilifi town. \textit{Kibarua} workers generally earn 200 to 300 Kenyan shillings (KSH) (2 to 4 US dollars) a day, which is equivalent to four bags of maize flour, which would feed a family of five for two days.

Like in Shirazi, women are often in charge of the housework. Swahili mothers tend not to work outside the home, and the household usually relies financially on the husband’s income. There are many divorced and widowed women in Takaungu. One reason, explained Aziz, the local SIT coordinator, is that “Islam allows women right to get divorced.” In other words, women are culturally and empirically allowed financial independence. Putnam has observed that high divorce rates in the late-20th century correlate with the decline of social capital, as well as with the growth of

\textsuperscript{36} The first wife lives in Greece.
individualism that comes with modernization. Putnam (2000) also observes that there has been a progressive movement of women from housework to the work place. The many divorced or widowed women live off of their assets or conduct small businesses of their own. For example, they cook and sell fried fish, *chapati* (fried flatbread made from flour), *mandazi* (fried bread equivalent to western doughnut), and other hand-made snacks for Takaungu residents at cheap prices. Some women also operate a restaurant from their own houses, where village workers often buy home-cooked meals for lunch at 25 to 50 KSH (30 to 60 US cents). One major difference from the Shirazi women is that a number of mothers leave Takaungu for years to work as a housemaid abroad and send periodic remittances to the family back in the village.

**2.4.2 Industry and Tourism**

Kwale International Sugar Company in Msambweni recently replaced the former Ramisi Sugar Company, established in 1927 (KISC 2011). According to Shirazi villagers, an Indian man runs the company today. The factory has bought the huge parcel of land that stretches from near Ukunda all the way to Shimoni, which is to the south of Shirazi. The company hires the local villagers to dig enormous hole/ponds on the land to store rainwater and naturally irrigate the land. It operates as one of the few companies that are expected to have an immediate impact on the future employment situation of the Shirazi community.

Southern Coast Province is known for both domestic and international tourism. Within Msambweni District, Diani is the cluster of major tourist resorts. It has a number of highly-rated hotels, restaurants, bars, and cottages. These tourist attractions include beach resorts, marine parks, as well as the cultural centers and
kaya (sacred forests) of the Mijikenda community. People also have access to casual hotels, cafés, and villas in such larger towns within the region, Msambweni, Ukunda, Lunga-lunga, and Vanga. These are local trading centers for fish, livestock, and agricultural products. These towns offer commercial services, such as banking and the Internet.

Regional tourist businesses influence Shirazi’s economic activities both directly and indirectly. There is a tourist beach resort, Paradise Lost, on the outskirts of Shirazi. Paradise Lost used to be run by two Belgian brothers, who were replaced by Indian managers in 2009. As of May 2010, 24 Shirazi men are permanently employed at this resort, working as bartenders, chefs, tour guides, or clerks. During the tourist season in July to August, Paradise Lost organizes a bus tour around the Shirazi homesteads. Villagers use this opportunity to participate in the cultural exhibition that is organized under the central mango tree in the Madukani subsection, where they demonstrate traditional tasks, such as baking cashew fruit and grating coconut using an interlocking Swahili stool. Some women bring out bags of bead accessories and line them up on the ground to sell to the European tourists.

There are more externally-run businesses and industries within Takaungu than in the Shirazi area. For example, Belgians own a factory that hires the residents to manufacture handcrafted goods for tourist souvenirs. The products are exported to Nairobi, Mombasa, and other larger cities. Within the village area, there is Mombasa Cement Factory, which also hires Takaungu residents. There is also a factory that manufactures maize flour in Vuma subsection; it hires a number of villagers and pays

---

37 I gathered this information through villagers’ oral accounts.
38 This information was provided by a former coordinator of Paradise Lost, who resides in the neighboring Barabarani village as of July 2010.
them about 300 KSH (≈ 3.5 US dollars) a day. Unlike within the Shirazi complex, private factories have outsourced into Takaungu, providing the villagers with numerous employment opportunities.

Tourism plays an essential role in the economy of Kilifi District. Bordering Malindi, a district also known for higher-class tourist resorts, and Mombasa, the largest commercial center in the coast, Kilifi attracts people from various locations within Kenya and abroad. The nearest tourist town from Takaungu is Mnarani, located 20 minutes away by pikipiki. Known for its ruin and port, Mnarani is a small-scale, yet diverse town that offers every basic commercial service. There are a couple of schools and private hospitals, which Takaungu residents constantly access. At a beach that is incorporated in the Takaungu village complex, an Italian man owns a beach resort, patronized mostly by European tourists.

2.5. Financial Activities

2.5.1. Regional Access to Formal Services

Msambweni District offers financial services including the following: six commercial banks, three microfinance institutions, three village banks, eight ATMs, and 14 informal sector enterprises (MPND Msambweni 2008). There is a stall for M-PESA in the neighboring Barabarani village. M-PESA is a mobile cash transfer system that is operated by Kenya’s major phone network, Safaricom (Safaricom 2011). The nearest commercial bank and ATM access for Shirazi villagers are in Ukunda town, 45 minutes away by car. That said, there is no formal financial service available within the village area, except for several microfinance activities that provide villagers with basic saving and loan opportunities.
The organizations that support the activities include but are not limited to Kenya Women Finance and Trust (KWFT) and the Aga Khan Agency for Microfinance. Notwithstanding the organizational help provided by individual agencies, the groups that operate within Shirazi are nevertheless “self-initiated.” This means that the villagers sought help from the organizations and voluntarily recruited participants themselves. Mama Somoe, an initiator and active participant of KWFT in Shirazi, stated that she visited every household to invite women to join her in microfinance programs. When asked why loans and credits are important in the village, Mama Somoe indicated, “They help women start small businesses and pay for children’s school fees.”

In Kilifi District, there are six commercial banks and ten microfinance institutions. There are also six village banks and six ATMs (MPND Kilifi 2008). There is no financial service available inside Takaungu village. Microfinance is less active in Takaungu than Shirazi, despite the numerous socioeconomic initiatives taken by external organizations such as the U.S. non-profit organization, East African Center. To access financial services, people visit Kilifi town, where all the major commercial transactions in the region take place. Some also go to Mnarani, a small town and a tourist district that is half an hour away from Takaungu by boat and pikipiki, the motorcycle taxi.

2.5.2. Community Self-Help Activities

More commonly in Shirazi, people also self-operate a similar voluntary money lending system, locally known as the “merry-go-round.” This activity is commonly practiced among women, who earn a relatively small income each day by
selling food and snacks to the villagers. Since pre-historic times, African communities have faced severe scarcity of resources due to various environmental hardships. In order to survive these hardships, African communities have developed a variety of “social, non-kinship common interest groups” such as a “rotating task execution group” and “rotating savings and credit associations,” most of which operate in informal groups and under unwritten rules (Njoh 2006, 127-130). Every participant places a certain portion of her earnings into a pool of money, which is then redistributed to one group member each day. The fair rotation of the large portion of money is successful only when all members diligently commit to their daily sales and the sharing of the proceeds. The success of this system is enabled by the people’s shared expectation that the “merry” will be reciprocated. When asked how the members get selected, the participating mothers stated that it is purely opportunistic—it is based on who is involved with the selling of goods at the instance when “merry-go-round” is organized. Observing from the popularity of such informal rotating-credit groups in Shirazi, it seems that the activity has long been perceived successful.

2.6. Health

2.6.1. Regional Access to Health Care Institutions

There are three hospitals, one health center, 19 dispensaries and 38 private clinics within Msambweni District, which Shirazi villagers can access when needed. Most facilities are located around the Ukunda and Diani region (See Appendix Map I). The total bed capacity is 149, and the doctor to population ratio is an appalling 1:247,478 (MPND Msambweni 2008). The nearest health facility for Shirazi villagers is the clinic in Bodo, established in 2008 by a group of students from American
colleges, who were attending the School for International Training (SIT) study abroad program. It is located a 45-minute walk from Shirazi and provides basic medications and blood tests for AIDS and malaria. However, when people get sick in Shirazi, they usually go to the Msambweni District Hospital. As of January 2011, there is ongoing construction of a dispensary near the village center of Shirazi, initiated by my group of fellow SIT students in the fall of 2009.

In Kilifi District, there is one hospital, three nursing homes, four health centers, 16 dispensaries and 18 private clinics. The bed capacity at the one hospital is 172 in total. The doctor to population ratio is 1:57,378, which indicates a greater availability of doctors than Msambweni District (MPND Kilifi 2008). Takaungu also has a public dispensary built within the village area. The dispensary is relatively big in area, with 10 separate rooms for various purposes. It was established with a government sponsorship, namely Bahari Constituency Development Fund (CDF).\textsuperscript{39} It offers a wider range of government-sponsored health care, including immunization, pregnancy tests, family planning, malaria tests, chlorine for water, and various injections at 20 KSH ($\approx 30$ US cents).

In 2006, the Vutakaka Maternal and Reproductive Health Clinic was established within Takaungu by the U.S. non-profit organization, East African Center, with the private sponsorship of H.D. Fowler Company. The clinic provides pre- and post-natal care, immunizations and growth monitoring for children, HIV/AIDS testing, and basic medical care. With an increased supply of drugs from government hospitals and clinics, the clinic provides health services at low prices: 10 KSH ($\approx 15$

\textsuperscript{39} While the dispensary began operating since around 2007, the government sponsorship with the construction was completed in 2009 (CDF Bahari 2011).
US cents) for adults and free for children. Staffed by a registered nurse and two assistant health workers, the clinic treated 1,522 children and 864 women in 2009 (EAC 2009b). For serious illnesses, Takanugu villagers can access the Kilifi District Hospital located in Kilifi town, which is about a 15-minute matatu-ride from Takaungu. Some people prefer the private hospital in Mnarani town, notwithstanding the higher cost of treatment.

2.6.2. Traditional Medicine

Traditional medicine and healing are a large part of Shirazi culture, more so than Takaungu. The World Health Organization (WHO) reports that 80 percent of the African population use traditional or non-conventional health care to fulfill their health needs (WHO 2002, 1). There are approximately seven traditional medical practitioners (TMPs) in Shirazi. These people are locally known as waganga wa kienyeji (literally “traditional healers,” in Kiswahili); they are knowledgeable about herbal medicines and are usually associated with spirits—often the Islamic djinn. Most waganga in Shirazi are not government certified TMPs, but are locally recognized healers. These practices are endorsed through apprenticeship, which requires extensive oral transmission of knowledge. Waganga are seen as active transmitters of spiritual and herbal rituals.

40 To become a registered TMP, a healer must receive an approval of the national Ministry of Culture (Note that the certification is not provided by the Ministry of Public Health and Sanitation or the Ministry of Health Services) after a submission of numerous documents to the local authority. The certification is complete when the Kenyan Medical Research Institute (KEMRI) verifies five herbal remedies based on their non-toxicity. Such certification, however, is only available for herbalists, and not for spiritual healers. In other words, only certain herbal medicines are recognized officially as culturally significant health care; those associated with spirits are disseminated only through unauthorized credentials.
One of the most communally-acknowledged practices in Shirazi is the Kayamba. Both scenes in Figures 2.1 and 2.2 were captured at a Kayamba ceremony. It is a healing ritual that involves songs, dances, and a spiritual “communication” with the djinn that are suspected to have caused the patient’s illnesses. The term, “kayamba” literally refers to small handcrafted “rafts” rattled to accompany songs and dances (See Figure 2.1). Bakari Chipeta Nvoi is a proponent of traditional medical practices, who is also a renowned master and host of Kayamba rituals.\footnote{Chipeta is the man in a red gown seated at the far left in Figure 2.1.}

Despite the general antagonism developed against TMPs in modernized (in this case, Western) cultures, Chipeta became Shirazi’s elected secretary of the dispensary project committee in December 2009.\footnote{The SIT students initially launched the dispensary project in Fall 2009. The project is still in progress as of March 2011.} Kayamba and the associated medical practices, Chipeta argued, would not subside with the development of modern health institutions in the region. He shared his optimistic view about the persistence of traditional medical practices:

I am not worried that I might lose my job; the clients who have traditionally come to me will continue seeking my help, even after the clinic is built. Herbal medicine is important... There are diseases that cannot be healed with modern medicines. This culture will continue as long as my pupils are trained well... Kayamba is very popular; even radio plays the songs. People make them into cassettes and sell them (Chipeta).

Chipeta explained that the knowledge of a TMP is orally transmitted by apprenticeship. As a result of its regional and cultural specificity, the songs and “callings” incorporated in Shirazi’s Kayamba practices are mostly in Kidigo (the vernacular of the Digo tribe). The Shirazi community therefore contributes to the
extensive diffusion of Kayamba culture through communal respect and endorsement of the knowledge that is being passed down traditionally. In other words, this is a sign of cohesiveness that signifies Shirazi’s capacity to maintain its social unity.

**Figure 2.1: Kayamba Ritual in Shirazi (Indoor)**

*Notes*: The small rafts carried by the standing men are called *kayamba*, which is an instrument that accompanies the *Kayamba* songs and dances. Chipeta leads the ceremony by improvising songs and movements, which are supplemented by the disciples’ music and singing.

The dissemination of the belief that one’s illness might be caused by evil spirits is not imposed by formal religious teachings. Instead, it is due to pragmatic beliefs and village legends that are passed down from generation to generation. This further supports the proposition that Shirazi’s community is united under an
established social network that allows mutual sharing of the knowledge among the people. Likewise, Chipeta suggested that there is no pressure for his son to follow him as a TMP; according to him, “the time will come” when the son receives a calling from the *djinn*. Chipeta said that he himself dropped out of secondary school in Form Two to pursue a spiritual vocation of becoming a traditional healer.

In fact, the impact of this traditionally transmitted knowledge is significant among the younger generation today. Shirazi youths from approximately 10 to 19 year old also fear the *djinn*. 12-year-old Mohamed mocked his sister by suggesting that she wanted to become a “witch doctor,” a derogative term used to refer to *waganga*. My 19-year-old assistant, Juma, shamelessly expressed his fear of strolling about Shirazi in the dark. He worried that *djinn*, which are believed to possess free will and coexist with humans, would “talk to people.” Some villagers avoid swimming at the sea near Pwani subsection; based on a historical account that *djinn* once grabbed a man’s leg and drowned him. This led me to expect a similar reaction to Islamic *djinn* in Takaungu. In spite of its greater exposure to modernity and predicted preference for scientific and reasonable knowledge, the Takaungu community appeared more devoted to Islamic practices than Shirazi. Nonetheless, when asked whether people believe in *djinn* or any version of spirits, my 34-year-old assistant dismissed the topic, stating that it was only common “*kitambo* (long time ago).” The villagers’ differing accounts therefore demonstrated that Shirazi endorses a greater network of interpersonal relationships as well as shared norms and beliefs.
Notes: Chipeta is the man in the black outfit, holding a hen in his right hand. Seated in front of him was his female client for this specific Kayamba. As part of the ritual, he soaked the hen in a mixture of water and herbs, and shook the hen above the client’s head. The others surrounding Chipeta and the client are Chipeta’s “pupils.”

2.7. Education

2.7.1. Brief Overview of Kenyan Education System

In 1985, the Kenyan government introduced the 8-4-4 system of education, which issues eight years of primary school education, four years of secondary
education, and four years of university education. Primary education is free and compulsory in Kenya. Children begin primary education at the age of six or seven, after attending a nursery level education for a year. They start the first year of primary school as Standard 1 and continue up to Standard 8 in order to receive the Kenya Certificate of Primary Education (KCPE). While enrolment in primary school has improved in recent years due to free education opportunities, many children from poor, rural families still fail to finish or even attend primary school.

Based on the score of KCPE examination, government-funded schools select their students. Students with the highest KCPE scores are assigned to national schools, and those with lower scores attend provincial and district schools. There are also harambee (self-help, or fundraising) schools, which are partially sponsored by the government. Students with low scores are admitted into these schools. Students begin their first year of secondary education as Form 1, and finish school in Form 4. They take the Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education (KCSE) examination at the end of their fourth year. Due to school fees and the prerequisite of completing primary education, secondary school enrolment is highly contingent upon the financial capability of the student’s family.

### 2.7.2. Regional Access to Education

Within Msambweni District, there are 123 primary schools; 108 are public and 15 are private. The total student enrollment is 59,972, which is comprised of 31,150 (51.9 percent) boys and 28,822 (48.1 percent) girls. The teacher to pupil ratio

---

43 Since 1967 to 1985, Kenya, together with Uganda and Tanzania, adopted the 7-4-2-3 system of education, which had seven years of primary education, four years of secondary education, two years of high school education, and three years of university education.
is 1:59 (MPND Msambwewni 2008). Kilifi District has a greater total of 160 primary schools and the teacher to pupil ratio of 1:57, which is around the same as Msambweni (MPND Kilifi 2008). The total enrolment is 108,171, with 55,987 (51.8 percent) boys and 52,184 (48.2 percent) girls. The gross enrolment rate (GER = number of actual students enrolled as a percentage of the total number of official correspondents based on age) is 95.2 (94.2 for boys and 96.3 for girls) for all Msambweni students (MPND Msambwewni 2008). By contrast, the same rate is 120.4 (123.3 for boys and 117.4 for girls) for all primary school students in Kilifi (MPND Kilifi 2008). This shows that Kilifi has a relatively higher rate of primary school attendance than Msambweni, although the age distribution of the student populations might vary.

In terms of secondary education, Msambweni has 17 secondary schools with the total enrollment of 4,769, consisting of 2,331 (48.9 percent) boys and 2,438 (51.1 percent) girls. The teacher to pupil ratio is 1:37. In Kilifi, there are 23 schools, and the total enrollment is 8126, with 5035 (62.0 percent) boys and 2891 (38 percent) girls. The average teacher to student ratio is 1:36. Girls’ secondary school enrolment is relatively lower in Kilifi than in Msambweni. The latter has a GER of 19.1 (17.7 for

---

45 In Kilifi, the net enrolment rate (NER = number of children of official primary school age enrolled as a percentage of the total number of children of the official school age population) for primary schools is 72.3 (70 for boys and 74 for girls). While the overall attendance is high, this value shows that approximately 30 percent of the district residents in the primary school age group do not attend school.
46 The total number of students enrolled in public secondary schools is 7,226, which comprise 4,488 (62.1 percent) boys and 2,738 (37.9 percent) girls. On the other hand, the total enrolment of private school is 901 students, 547 (60.9 percent) boys and 354 (39.1 percent) girls. Girls’ public school attendance is almost as low as the half of the boys’ attendance
boys and 20.6 for girls), whereas it is 18.7 (22.8 for boys and 14.4 for girls) for the former.47

Shirazi Primary School, together with a nursery section, was built in 1996 with help of a Belgian donor. Approximately 250 students attend the school; they come from Shirazi and neighboring villages such as Ramisi, Bodo, and Barabarani. According to the teachers at Shirazi primary school, about half of the entire student body comes from Shirazi village, although it is impossible to obtain an accurate number of students since the school does not keep a record of student profiles.48 While tuition is free, obtaining school uniforms and books is the parents’ obligation, which can occasionally prevent children from attending school. Some children do not attend or drop out of school for different reasons, such as the need to assist parents at home or societal ambivalence about the necessity of education, especially for girls. At the same time, there are quite a few Shirazi girls, as well as boys, who attend secondary school. Attending secondary school depends predominantly on the family’s financial capability. It is common for secondary school students who board to occasionally return to the village and seek the means to pay for school tuition.

The 1999 Population and Housing Census data (nevertheless shows that while the overall rate of school attendance is slightly higher in Kilifi, the relative female school attendance is better in Kwale (Shirazi’s administrative district prior to 2007). The proportion of the entire population in Kilifi and Kwale who never attended school is 36.7 and 39.2 percent, respectively. Out of those who never attended school, female makes up 70.1 in Kilifi and 64.7 percent in Kwale (See Appendix Tables III

47 Kilifi’s secondary school NER is 13.4 (17.0 for boys and 7.6 for girls).
48 I visited the school in December 2009 and conducted interviews with the school principal and teachers. I was told that they do not keep records of student information.
and IV). In terms of the highest level of education achieved by the district populations, 29.0 percent indicate that they achieved Standard 5 or above (up to university) in Kilifi, and 27.7 percent in Kwale. For both populations, about 41 percent of those who have achieved higher education are female.

Within Takaungu, there is a nursery school, a public primary school and a district secondary school. Along with these government-sponsored education opportunities, the East African Center (EAC) provides an alternative nursery and primary education at Vutakaka Junior School for children with more financial means. Established in 2004, Vutakaka program serves approximately 270 children today from kindergarten through Standard 6. Each year, the school adds a classroom and hence a grade, in order to ensure that the students who entered in 2004 can continue their education at this school. According to the EAC, students at Vutakaka constantly score the highest among students from other surrounding schools in Kilifi District. The school’s funding is sustained 63 percent by individual contributors, 23 percent by payment for services provided, seven percent by corporations, and seven percent by grants (EAC 2009a).

In both villages, students attend the village madrasa, an extra-curricular school for Islamic education that teaches the Qur’an and Arabic language, but the scale and importance seem to vary. Normally, parents pay fees for their children to attend. In Shirazi, the madrasa is usually opened on weekends. During Islamic holidays and fasting months when the primary school closes early, the children attend the madrasa every weekday. Takaungu’s madrasa is larger and operates more formally; students wear special uniforms, apart from the ones they wear to their
regular schools, and take its teachings more seriously than the students in Shirazi. Students attend the madrasa several times during the week after they finish their regular classes. The attendance at the Takaungu madrasa is more common for the Swahili population, who are predominantly Muslim. Some Giriama residents are Christian, and others practice their ancestral cultural beliefs, so the madrasa education is only relevant to a certain portion of the population. In Shirazi, only those who can afford the education send their children there.

2.8. Information, Communication, and Technology

There is 80 percent mobile network service coverage in the area of Msambweni District. Shirazi people, especially households with employed men, use mobile phones as their main means of long-distance communication (MPND Msambweni 2008). The network reception is generally good; however, receptive is worse in some subsections and inside houses that are built of concrete. Most households own a radio; people attach extended wire antennae to receive better radio networks. Villagers listen to stations that play regional Taarab music, news etc.49

Radio is one of the main household entertainments for adults, especially women. Women listen to the radio when they can afford to buy batteries, as they do their household chores. Due to the lack of electricity, no house in Shirazi has a television, except for one household in the Kakira subsection, which obtains electricity from a solar panel placed on their roof. The closest cyber café with Internet services is in Ukunda, which takes about half an hour to reach from Mombasa by car.

49 Taarab is a music genre that is popular among the coastal regions in East Africa; it originated in the Arab countries and was developed on Zanzibar Island of Tanzania.
Within the district, there are six cyber cafés in total; Internet coverage is merely four percent of the entire district (MPND Msambweni 2008).

The infrastructure for telecommunications is generally more developed in Kilifi than in Msambweni. The mobile network coverage is 85 percent in the area around Takaungu, and there are a total of 16 cyber cafés (MPND Kilifi 2008). Within the village area, there is a computer laboratory in one of the primary schools. While the Internet service there is not always reliable, virtually every student has access to the computers. When in need of Internet access, Takaungu villagers usually visit Kilifi town for the cyber cafés that provide service for two to five KSH (≈ three to seven US cents) per minute.

Television coverage in Kilifi District is about 30 percent of the total households (MPND Kilifi 2008). Many Swahili households in Takaungu own a television, which allows access to first-hand information, including news and entertainment. It is not unusual, especially for Swahili individuals, to own a personal cell phone. Unlike Shirazi, where it is usually working people who utilize cell phones, even primary and secondary school students own cell phones in Takaungu’s Swahili households. The Giriama population, however, have considerably little access to telecommunication devices other than the radio, due to their low income and the lack of electricity in households.

2.9. Community Administration

Shirazi’s village politics demonstrate greater interpersonal involvement and adherence to traditional expectations than Takaungu’s. As described earlier in reference to Ayittey’s accounts of traditional African administration, Njoh similarly
posits that the pre-colonial African polity was based on the notion of “village
democracy,” administered by the three major bodies that ensured the “implementation
of the public interest” (Njoh 2006, 112):

- Council of Elder
- Chief Priest
- Moral Elders and Chiefs.

Shirazi is politically administered under a similar system. There is an elected
chairman, Mr. Mshenga, a committee comprised of the village elders, and the people
who give unofficial but moral advice and insights to the committee. These people are
not necessarily immediate kin but are extended relatives or friends of the average
village population. The council operates flexibly: Frequently, they gather the village
departmenters from each subsection and assign them to disseminate information to the
residents in their subsections. Other times, they organize elections to select committee
members for different village affairs and give the elected individuals political
responsibility over conducting meetings and administering events. The meetings are
often conducted in public; they are held under the central mango tree in the Madukani
subsection and are open to all residents to participate. Some Shirazi elders resemble
the Chief Priests, who function as religious leaders and educators of spiritual laws
that ensure harmonious living with the natural environment. A few elderly women are
respected spiritual practitioners, who serve as health officials—working as midwives
and healing the sick.⁵⁰ As can be seen, the villagers are integral to the community
administration—the committee is led by individuals who are their extended family

⁵⁰ Many of these individuals are registered traditional medical practitioners (TMPs), but some
midwives and spiritual leaders do not have the official recognition in the form of national
certification.
members and close friends. No formal or written records are kept, but village
traditions are orally transmitted from one generation to the next.

In Takaungu, the impact of village elders on community administration is not
as significant as it is in Shirazi. While there are individuals who are recognized as
“elders” in each village subsection, these people are not directly influential or active
in village associations. Rather, its governance is centered on the administration by the
regional office, namely the “chief lady,” who is an appointed official who works in
the village complex.

* * *

Despite the fact that both Shirazi and Takaungu have not undergone a massive
scale of modernization, they nevertheless exhibit notable socioeconomic differences
that are relevant to the discussion of social change in village communities. Chapter
Three and Chapter Four will refer back to the information presented in this chapter.
CHAPTER THREE

NOTES ON METHODOLOGY
AND THE SYNOPSIS OF SURVEYS

Emotion, power, and the interest in form that we call ritual were all tied together, all shaded into each other. Worldly power was not just a matter of who owned the land and the money. It was also a matter of who had the unpredictable, dangerous love of the laborers, the landowners, the voters, the politicians, and the deities. Religion was not just a “belief system” that started where empirical knowledge left off. It was not an imaginative superstructure spun off a hard material infrastructure. It was not a restricted, sacred domain cordoned off from the everyday, the profane. [...] It was personality, it was the physiology of plants and animals, it was economics, it was sex. It was not “not real.” Kinship organization, in the same way, was much more than just “social structure,” a stable architectural framework through which generations passed. It was also a form of poetics, a set of biochemical equations, a web of deep-seated longings.

—Margaret Trawick

Notes of Love in a Tamil Family

My case study compares two distinct rural Kenyan communities: Shirazi and Takaungu, with the aim of using these two villages as models of social entities that have undergone different levels of socioeconomic transformations as a result of modernization. I lived in both of these villages for an extensive period of time and conducted research that consists of participatory observations, household surveys, and conversational interviews. This chapter particularly reflects on the chronological procedures that led up to and was followed through the household surveys. The surveys helped gather both quantitative and qualitative accounts that are essential for my analyses. As I describe the methods of my study, I account for limitations and possible biases that may have influenced the survey results.
3.3. **Village Selection: What Led Me to Them**

Shirazi village is representative of communities that have been less exposed to modern economic and political structures. I spent a total of three months in Shirazi to confirm the village’s applicability as my case study, which hypothesizes that a less-advanced community would exhibit higher levels of social capital. Admittedly, my initial attraction to this village was based on an earlier-formed academic interest and emotional attachment to the community. Since my first visit in September 2009, Shirazi village has been the reason behind my inquiries into the impact of modernization on socioeconomic factors and culture in rural villages. On the one hand, Shirazi lacks both the electricity and running water, and appears to have limited exposure to modern technological and economic advancements. Other than a small-scale assortment shop that operates in the village center, it is difficult to discern the villager’s involvement in commercial activities, or other nonagricultural means of production. On the other hand, Shirazi is a community that adheres to the values of communal sharing and cooperation—a cultural norm shared widely across many subsistence economies on the African continent. The Shirazi community generates an outstanding emotional comfort for its residents; its extensive network structures bind the village community and enable the people to discern the community’s needs at all times.

The communal cohesion of Shirazi community is achieved through a sense of connectedness through long-standing norms and interpersonal connections, as opposed to other institutional and rationalized means that allow people to appropriate

---

51 I borrowed Margaret Trawick’s subheading for one of the chapters in her work, *Notes on Love in a Tamil Family* (1990).
themselves to impersonal networks within the realm of larger social entities. A ten-year-old girl, Ashura, frequently visit my host family’s house from next door. The purpose of her visit is to join the dinner that my host mother, Mama, cooked for us—Mama, her two young daughters, and me. Ashura’s visits were irregular and unexpected; and yet, they happened with everyone’s tacit consent, including Ashura’s family. Ashura would sporadically appear on evenings to help Mama prepare the meal, and Mama never questioned her extemporaneous visits. Given my own personal experience in Japan in treating neighbors like strangers, Mama’s casual acceptance of her neighbor was quite stunning to me on a personal level.

I discovered that Shirazi villagers are often aware of the menu in every neighboring household. Knowledge of the neighbor’s menu is not necessarily communicated verbally, but sensually. The rhythmic sound of grating coconuts, the floating smell of mchuzi wa samaki (stew with fish), mothers sharing a pestle to pound rice—passive cognition through the senses convey all the necessary information to discern the specific dishes about to be served that day. The simplicity of the environment—reinforced by the lack of electricity and piped water—and the absence of interferences like mechanical noises, the smell of industrial waste, and compounds that would segregate households, enables boundless transmission of sensory information. Mama knew what meals Ashura disliked; her visits automatically hinted that the meal being served at her own house was not her favorite. When asked why she takes care of a neighbor, Mama responded frankly in Swahili, “Because she is a daughter of a sister to your father.”

52 According to Mama, there

52 By “your father,” Mama meant my host father, who is her husband and her daughters’ father. Culturally, the Shirazi people do not refer to their married counterpart as their
was no reason to distrust the girl, who is her husband’s niece and the daughter of people she trusted. *Mama* similarly accommodated the needs of other children, who came from houses located farther away from Mkwajuni, her village subsection. She trusted the people, and simply knew that other villagers would do the same if her children asked them for help.

The Shirazi villagers’ confidence in the fulfillment of this reciprocal exchange relates to the concept that Putnam terms, *generalized reciprocity*” (Putnam 2000, 20-21). Cultural anthropologist Nancy Bonvillain (2009) suggests that generalized reciprocity is embedded in exchanges that are based on the expectation that the cost of exchange will eventually be compensated. Generalized reciprocity, Bonvillain maintains, can occur within clan and extended kin relationships. The more advanced the society is, the more coordinated its trust system is by institutional agencies like legal norms. Reciprocal relationships and high levels of trust seemed to exist in Shirazi village through an extensive system of organic social networks. This confirms the applicability of Shirazi to my research project, with the presumption that it represents a small-scale, less-advanced society, whose communal cohesion is enabled by the long-standing interconnectedness of the villagers.

The choice of Takaungu village as the contrasting, more “globalized” counterpart was made after several systematic selection procedures. I sought a village community that could represent rural communities that are more exposed to modern economic and political structures. A specific request was made to my former "husband" or "wife.” Rather, they refer to the counterpart as somebody’s father or a mother: “baba [insert the eldest child’s name],” and “mama [insert the eldest child’s name].” In addition, all villagers used phrases, “your father” and “your mother,” to refer to my host parents. Naturally, I also called them “baba” and “mama,” respectively.
academic director, Jamal Omar, from the School for International Training (SIT) study abroad program, to recommend a village community. I asked for villages that are culturally, geographically, and demographically similar to Shirazi, but somewhat more developed. One essential criterion that I articulated was the ability to stay and engage with the community throughout the course of my research. The academic director introduced me to two villages located along the coastal strip, similar to Shirazi. One was Gazi village, located relatively close to Shirazi and to the south of Mombasa. The other choice was Takaungu, which is to the north of Mombasa and south of Malindi.

I visited both villages early in the summer of 2010. The tour of Gazi village lasted for one day with a local young man as my guide. I concluded, after a short observation of the village environment and several informal interviews with community members, that the village lacked adequate socioeconomic differences to be effectively contrasted with Shirazi village. The guide also stated that finding a host family for an extended stay would be difficult in this village for reasons that never became clear.

Takaungu, known locally as a “modern village,” is situated near Kilifi, Mnarani, and Malindi towns—major tourist destinations in the region. It was larger in area and population size than Shirazi, and it also seemed to exhibit more aspects of modernity. After consulting with Maalim Aziz, the former SIT coordinator from Takaungu, a local Swahili family agreed to host me for several weeks. During the first three days, I conducted 15 interviews and observed the village’s major landmarks to determine the appropriateness of Takaungu village for my case study. In
general, socioeconomic life in Takaungu employs more advanced technology than Shirazi. A higher proportion of the houses is constructed with cement and concrete, and utilizes infrastructure like public electricity and piped water, as described earlier in Chapter Two. The villagers also have greater access to a variety of health care institutions, such as the Takaungu dispensary and Vutakaka maternal and children’s clinic. There are two primary schools within the village complex; one of them is run privately by an American non-profit organization. The assistance of external organizations appeared to be more integral to the life of Takaungu villagers than in Shirazi. Commercial activities appeared greater in number and variety than those that the Shirazi villagers practice on a daily basis. Thus, I saw that the socioeconomic environment in Takaungu contrasted significantly with Shirazi village.

While demographic characteristics in Takaungu somewhat resembled Shirazi, the greater ethnic diversity in the former challenged the incorporation of certain village subsections for inclusion in my case study. Unlike Shirazi, where the community is ethnically and culturally homogeneous, Takaungu is comprised of two distinct tribal groups, the Swahili and the Giriama. Their cultural and lifestyle practices diverge from one other. The Swahili people generally reside around the commercial center of Takaungu village, and they are often regarded as the wealthier population, with access to modern means of production. The Giriama population is sometimes referred to as the “squatters,” with extensive but unofficial settlements. They are the poorer population in Takaungu, and reside in the “outcast” land within the village area. The question of whether I should incorporate the Giriama population into my examination of Takaungu village was a major complication. Would the
inclusion of the Giriama population contribute to a better representation of Takaungu as a “modern village?” Is the socioeconomic life of the Swahili population contingent upon their cohabitation with the Giriama population within the same village area?

After careful consideration of responses collected from preliminary interviews with both the Giriama and Swahili peoples, it was evident that the Swahili and Giriama peoples were interdependent in their economic lives. A 52-year-old Swahili man suggested, “The Giriama and the Swahili are good friends. We live together, and help each other. I know everybody in this village. I even know how to speak Kigiriama (the native language of the Giriama tribe).” I concluded that the Giriama population needed to be considered in the population profile of Takaungu village. It is worth noting that my knowledge about the distinct settlement histories between the Swahili and the Giriama that contributed to present socioeconomic disparities between them was limited at the time. Nevertheless, in confirming Takaungu as Shirazi’s counterpart, I assumed that the visible inequalities between the Swahili and the Giriama could be traced back to, at least in part, modernity and exposure to the market economy.

My choice of Shirazi and Takaungu was therefore based on careful preliminary participatory observations and interviews that allowed a better comprehension of the villages. The selection of Takaungu was based on opportunity and the fulfillment of certain demographic and socioeconomic criteria. The fulfillment of these qualifications was necessary in order to ensure that I had a fair, applicable, and relevant counterpart to compare Shirazi to. While some preliminary research was conducted as a process of confirming Takaungu as my case study, it
should be clarified that my understanding of the degrees of social capital and social network systems in Takaungu developed as I lived and conducted my research in the village for two weeks.

In must be noted that this study would have been conducted under the best circumstance if I had managed to control all the variables besides the different levels of socioeconomic advancement in Shirazi and Takaungu. However, due to the nature of my selection method, finding a “developed” village with identical demographic and environmental circumstances as Shirazi has been difficult. Thus, it is possible that the differences between the two villages observed in the survey results are due to conditions impertinent to modernization. In spite of the perceived differences between the villages, the survey is circumscribed by the fact that even under the best of circumstances, the distance on the scale of socioeconomic modernization is very slight for both of these villages, and hence the predicted impact of modernization on social capital might be difficult to discern. That said, I attempt to analyze the results in the light of socioeconomic divergences presented in Chapter Two.

---

53 In other words, my study hypothesizes that Takaungu will exhibit lower levels of traditional social capital than Shirazi, owing solely to forces connected to modernization. That said, I must acknowledge that this approach unavoidably assumes that the initial level of social capital in both villages was identical at the beginning of the modernization process, even though such might not be the case in reality. Different aspects can affect the abundance of social capital, such as history of warfare, disease calamity, immigration, leadership, and environmental hardships including natural disasters. If we consider colonization to be the “starting point” of modernization in Kenya, we can suggest that not all villages in pre-colonial Africa had an identical level of social capital.
3.3. Conducting the Field Research

3.2.1. Introduction to Village Household Surveys

As a substantial part of my field research in the summer of 2010, I conducted a total of 130 original household surveys: 57 in Shirazi, 62 in Takaungu, and 11 in Mnarani town near Takaungu and Kilifi. I conducted the surveys in Kiswahili—an official language of Kenya alongside English—with help of a local resident/assistant. The survey results from Shirazi and Takaungu are summarized in statistical format and are presented later in this chapter. The purpose of the surveys in Mnarani was to observe the difference, if any, in the nature of responses provided by residents and workers in a town that is known for tourism and trade, as a means to contextualize the two villages. However, the description of methodology presented in this section is focused predominantly on the surveys conducted in Shirazi and Takaungu.

I designed my surveys by adopting Putnam’s approach and the types of questions that he asked during his research for *Bowling Alone*. Survey questions were divided into nine categories that discern different levels of socioeconomic development as well as the people’s perception and awareness of trust-based social networks within the respective villages (See Appendix Survey I). All respondents were residents of the respective villages at the time these surveys were conducted. They were asked to provide basic personal information such as age, gender, education level, and marital status. Where appropriate and relevant, I recorded the respondents’ ethnicity. The survey questions required the respondents to indicate their levels of agreement or disagreement on a scale of 1 to 6. Other questions asked them to choose

---

54 Note that I conducted the surveys in Mnarani as a segment of the research in Takaungu. The survey method in Mnarani was almost identical to those adopted in Takaungu.
a category from a list of choices, and others asked the respondents to formulate their own responses.

In conducting the surveys in both Shirazi and Takaungu villages, I visited every household and directly conversed with all the respondents. A few local residents assisted me in clarifying the survey questions for the villagers if necessary. A 30-year-old male resident of the neighboring Bodo village, Thabiti translated the survey questions into Kswahili. This version was used throughout the research. Thabiti phrased the questions in ways that allowed the local villagers to comprehend them easily. It is worth noting that Thabiti’s personal interpretations of the survey questions might have influenced his translations. While I comprehend and use his translations, my knowledge of Kiswahili is insufficient to examine the nuances and expressions that could have possibly affected the messages conveyed in the questions.

3.2.2. Participant Selection: Impact on the Distribution of Respondent Populations

In Shirazi, my primary assistant was a 20-year-old male resident and a recent secondary school graduate, Juma Mohamed. He comes from one of the central clans in the village, and is related to many of the village residents. His primary role was to introduce me to the respondents and clarify my questions. Fluent in both English and Kiswahili, he also translated the villagers’ responses often expressed in strong Shirazian dialects. His assistance was voluntary.

The households were visited spontaneously when in presence of the residents. My goal was to cover all village subsections and interview villagers from as many

---

55 See Appendix Survey II.
households as possible. Beginning in Mkuwajuni subsection, Juma and I visited each household in order of physical proximity. If residents were not home, we proceeded to the next house and returned to the original house later. Occasionally, Juma’s familiarity with the village individuals meant that he suggested deliberately avoiding certain families, as he predicted that some families would resent sacrificing their time or getting involved in my research. To some extent, my household selections reflected Juma’s personal knowledge about the families and his individual relationships with them. Distributing the questionnaires to every household within the village area would have selected a group of respondents less obliquely; however, the purpose of my surveys was such that I wanted to focus on hearing the villagers’ live voices. Nevertheless, the selection of households was fair, as survey responses are often considered to be contingent upon the level of comfort in the survey environment both for the respondents and the interviewers. The survey responses also demonstrate a fairly even distribution over the different subsections that comprise Shirazi village.

Individual respondents were also selected based on their availability and willingness. I chose individuals who were generally perceived to have relevant experiences, so as to ensure both the respondents’ comprehension, as well as the obtainment of relevant information. As a result, the respondent pool did not include school children and students, unless they were integral to their household production or had thorough knowledge of their household’s administration. Every respondent represents a different household, but because of the large extended family relationships throughout the village (See Chapter Two), it is impractical to distinguish

---

56 Since my understanding of the local language is incomplete, my “hearing” was based on Juma’s translations.
distinct “households” in Shirazi. Therefore, it is important to note that the survey results likely reflect the viewpoints of close kin with inevitably similar backgrounds.

Selecting the respondents greatly depended on the villagers’ physical presence and willingness to participate. As described earlier, the surveys were generally conducted at individual households, but they were also frequently conducted impromptu with strolling villagers. In other words, the respondents varied in terms of gender, age, marital status, etc, and it is reasonable to assume that they reliably describe the patterns of social environment and customs of the village as a whole. The surveys were conducted seven days a week, approximately from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., each day.\(^{57}\) Conducting the surveys beyond these hours was practically difficult; first because it was dark by 7 p.m., and second, partly due to the darkness, households went to sleep as early as 8 p.m.\(^{58}\) In Shirazi village, this often limited the respondents to mothers or elders, who were present at their houses when their husbands and family members were away working during the daytime. Table 3.1 below shows the age distribution of the Shirazi respondents by gender. Largely 77 percent of the total respondents are female; 33 out of 44 are in their reproductive ages, and others are elderly women. 34 female respondents together have at least 74 children under 16—the age until which children generally require parent’s support and presence at home, unless they attend boarding school.\(^{59}\)

---

\(^{57}\) Following cultural expectations, I often started my interviews after helping with some house chores and waiting to eat breakfast with my host mother who cooks 100 potatoes to sell at the primary school every morning. While villagers rise by 6 a.m., these factors made my research start later. I also finished my interviews by early evening to help prepare dinner.

\(^{58}\) Note that there is no electricity in Shirazi, and people rely on small kerosene lamps for light.

\(^{59}\) Especially in rural and poorer regions of Kenya, children attend a primary school until up to the age of 16. Culturally, children are considered “adults” after puberty. Girls at the age of
There were also cultural limitations as to who and when the surveys could be conducted. For example, adjustments were made to the number of surveys conducted each day in order to respect the village’s cultural expectations and needs. For example, fewer interviews were conducted on Fridays, when many villagers attended the mosque for Islamic services, even though the higher physical presence of men during this time could have been exploited so to increase the number of men in my respondent pool.

Table 3.1: Respondent Profiles by 10-Year Age Group and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10-Year Age Group</th>
<th>Shirazi Village</th>
<th>Takaunungu Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 or above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the proportion to the total population. * = Women in the reproductive age group (United Nations defines it as ages between 15-49).

16 are expected to manage all chores that their mothers take on. Here, I simply chose the age of 16 because in Shirazi, many children of this age seem to stay at home, regardless of their attendance at a secondary school. Mothers are therefore in charge of feeding their family.
My assistant in Takaungu village was Mohamud, a 34-year-old Swahili resident, who is a relative of SIT’s local coordinator, Maalim Aziz. As he suggested, the small compensation of this assistant job would mean significant financial support for his wife and infant daughter. Unlike Juma’s voluntary assistance, Mohamud operated under a verbal business contract, which was also validated by his family and our coordinator, Maalim Aziz. As a result, the surveys were conducted more systematically and efficiently, taking two weeks to interview 62 individuals—less than half of the duration spent surveying the 57 Shirazi candidates.

Mohamud’s assistance involved directional guidance and selecting the potential participants. The surveys were conducted in all main subsections, including those populated by the Swahili and the Giriama, respectively. This process ensured that the survey results reflected the population dynamic of Takaungu more accurately. It must be admitted, however, that the respondent profile in Takaungu is influenced by a systemic selection process. As can be observed in Table 3.1, Takaungu’s respondent pool has a more balanced gender distribution, while the selection of the Shirazi respondents was based almost solely on their availability and willingness—skewing the respondent pool towards women. The respondent profile in Takaungu was adjusted based on profiles including gender, ethnicity, and occasionally, experience. The participants could choose (not) to participate in the surveys. Nevertheless, the systematic selection of potential participants implies that the survey results were contingent upon the partiality behind the initial selection of respondents. In hindsight, the artificial gender distribution of the respondent pool did not significantly misrepresent the gender proportion of the Takaungu population:
Research has shown that the more or less equal proportion of male and female populations within the respondent pool somewhat resembles the estimated gender proportion of the Takaungu village population, which is 47.5 male and 52.5 percent female (See Table 3.1). At the same time, the distortion of the population profile implies that the selection of this respondent pool is nevertheless prone to some biases due to the facetious dissimilarity in the procedures of participant selections in the villages. On the other hand, the respondent selection conveys that Takaungu offered more potential participants than Shirazi, partially due to its larger population size and the more even gender representation among the people who stay in the village during the day. This disparity between the degrees of male daytime presence in the two villages deserves further attention, and will be further elaborated on in the later empirical analysis.

3.3. Scope and Limitations

3.3.1. Survey Content

In light of my modernization framework, the survey questions were intended to encapsulate a broad range of relevant socioeconomic dimensions. The incorporation of nine distinct categories demonstrates my attempt to comprehend the village circumstances from multiple perspectives.

It must be conceded, however, that the survey omits a range of issues that would have been otherwise valid. One aspect that lies outside of the scope of my survey, for example, is the issue of timeframe concerning the effect of modernization.

---

60 These percentages are estimated using the projected male-female populations from the base year of 2008 (MPND Kilifi 2008).
on the community. For example, Section IX of the survey questions the extent of technological diffusion in the villager’s daily life. The primary objective of these questions is to investigate the ways in which the villagers’ access to modern appliances differ between the Shirazi and Takaungu communities. The data derived will be analyzed in light of social capital and the theoretical framework developed earlier in this chapter. Hence, the questions disregard the additional issues of a) how long it takes for a certain technological diffusion to make its impact felt on the social cohesiveness of the village community; and b) the threshold at which a decline in social capital begins.

Moreover, my surveys omit the absolute social changes that constitute longitudinal, or generational transformation with respect to each village. Instead, they focus on delineating how people from societies with uneven exposure to modernization respond differently to questions concerning socioeconomic advancement and social networks. The lack of earlier statistical data and information specifically relevant to these rural communities prevents the confirmation that Shirazi and Takaungu today are in fact different from what they were like in the past. It should be acknowledged, however, that the implicit argument for Takaungu as a more socioeconomically advanced counterpart to Shirazi is that its social capital has declined more significantly from the past, in comparison to Shirazi.

In order to test this conjecture, Section I: 1, “Compared to ten years ago, my life has become better because of the material goods and opportunities that are available from the outside,” and IV: 2, “Which of these things are you doing less/more now than you used to, five years ago?” for example, seek to measure the
relative changes that took place in the certain decade. The results can then be compared to analyze the impact of modernization, presuming that the two villages have experienced different degrees of modernization. Applying the measurement of relative changes necessitates the control of all variables in the respective villages, except for levels of socioeconomic advancement—the variable that the abundance of social capital is theoretically dependent upon. It is for this reason that two communities with varying socioeconomic development became the core of my study, rather than investigating the generational change in one community, which is a distinct approach of its own.

The content targeted a population without discrimination on the basis of gender, age, ethnicity, and social status, given certain prerequisites pertinent to the respondents. At the same time, the questions were solely designed for this particular case study, and they made references to certain characteristics that are relevant to the village communities. I drew upon Putnam’s contextual approach to formulate my questions. Yet, certain variables were omitted or adjusted accordingly when they appeared to be intrinsically irrelevant to the villagers.

In spite of my efforts to equally accommodate every villager as a potential survey respondent, the surveys nonetheless faced limitations in configuring the questions to complex village circumstances. With respect to each question, the participants might have perceived themselves as ambivalent or unable to answer definitively, since certain activities are considered gender- and/or generation-specific in their communities. Section VI: 2, “What is the longest time-period you were away from the village for work?” for instance, asks for a specific time-period when the
respondent was away from the village for business purposes. Ideally, the results were meant to reflect the degree of social mobility between both genders as well as within a wide range of age groups, given that all individuals supposedly have equal access to opportunities that allow them to move outside of the village area. Individual’s activities are often confined by underlying social norms and cultural expectations with respect to gender and generation in the two villages. Therefore, the responses to this specific question might have undermined the comprehensive representation of the village circumstances.

3.3.2. Contextual Formulation of Survey Questions: Potential Biases

The wording of the survey questions accounts for possible biases in the response trends and hence, the representation of the overall village populations. Some questions caused inconsistent interpretations because of my contextual and structural formulation.

Before going further to elaborate specific issues, it must be acknowledged that the choice of relatively casual and conversational terminology was intentional, in order to maximize respondents’ comprehension. Admittedly, many of the statements are contextually open-ended and phrased vaguely, especially when measured by general Western academic standards. Any ambiguity that I was able to identify in the questions was verbally clarified during the interview, especially technical topics. Conforming to the average education levels and living standards in the village
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61 In post-colonial Kenyan society, Kenyan people appear to believe that occasions that require disclosing personal information is a threat to their well-being. Culturally, many Kenyans resent responding to direct questions.
communities, the wording of the questions purposefully avoided obscurities and the social inappropriateness.

One consequence of my choice of wording was inconsistency among the respondents’ interpretations. Most frequently, the inconsistency was due my limited knowledge about the villagers’ perspectives on certain concepts. Section IV: 2(b) specifically asks whether the respondent “spends time in the village” less, about the same, or more compared to five years ago. The concept of spending time in the village meant within the village area, as opposed to places outside of the village. While some respondents understood the crux of this question, others interpreted it as being outside their houses and within the village area. Contradictory responses helped reveal the problem of flawed interpretation; those who suggested that they “spend time at home” more, at the same time indicated that they “spend time in the village” less. The greater tendency of this interpretation reflects the cultural and social conceptualization of the “village” in relation to their “homes.” However, the consecutive presentation of the questions that deal with these concepts also accounts for the increased likelihood for people to interpret “village” relative to their definition of “home.”

Similarly, Section IX: 1, “Phones, computer, television and the Internet are all very important for my daily village living,” faced the tension of inconsistent interpretations. The issue with this question was the reconciliation between presenting a normative value, and speaking for an empirical reality. When asked about the level of agreement with the “importance” of telecommunication devices in their “daily village living,” most respondents indicated strong agreement, notwithstanding their
own lifestyles and whether they utilized such devices on a daily or frequent basis. The implication is that many respondents interpreted the “importance,” not as practical utility based upon their personal experience, but rather, based on abstract notions of significance. The problem with the latter type of interpretation is that it is almost impossible to extrapolate people’s reasons for suggesting that technology was important in their daily life. One might believe in its importance, simply because wealthy people have access to it. If, on the other hand, one argues that telecommunications is important because the lack of it generates practical inconveniences in their daily activities, it infers that one is making an empirical argument, based on their presumption that the opposite reality would increase utility. Likewise, it is possible that the respondents were referring to specific items like the cell phone, which they do not necessarily own but have made use of, and are familiar with its usefulness. When asked why they suggest that these technological devices are important, many respondents who do not own the devices claimed, “Because they allow you to communicate with someone far away.” Regrettably, it is impossible to infer that these respondents were actually forced to give up long-distance communication due to the lack of technology, or that they were simply making a generic value judgment. These interpretational inconsistencies contribute to the survey results as a source of bias.

The acknowledged biases need not discourage us from examining the survey results. As being described here, we can recognize identifiable interpretation tendencies and cultural limitations as information relevant to the understanding of the village circumstances.
3.4. Summary of Respondent Profiles

I conducted the surveys with 57 individuals, each representing their own households in Shirazi village. 13 (23 percent) of them were male and 44 (77 percent) were female. In Takaungu, a total of 62 individuals, 32 (52 percent) male and 30 (48 percent) female, were interviewed. Roughly 31 of the Takaungu respondents live in the Swahili subsections.\textsuperscript{62} The other half lived in the defined Giriama subsections or other regions in between. It is important to note that this gender imbalance between the respondent pools may affect the survey results, especially because there are considerably apparent gender-based roles in both villages, as shown in Chapter Two.

The average age of the respondents was 38.5 (39.7 for male and 38.1 for female) in Shirazi, and 44.1 (50.9 for male and 37.3 for female) in Takaungu (See Table 3.2).\textsuperscript{63} The age distributions by gender in both communities are compared in Table 3.1. The elderly men in Takaungu are often those who are originally from the village but lived elsewhere for an extensive period of time and returned home after retiring. As will be discussed further in the next chapter, most of these men have lived and worked elsewhere for an extensive period of time, ranging from a few months, up to 44 years.

As Table 3.3 shows, roughly 75 percent of the respondents are married, and 25 are unmarried in Shirazi, whereas 69 percent are married and 31 percent are unmarried in Takaungu. The traditional household administration in Sub-Saharan

\textsuperscript{62} Many of these people came from Swahili lineages; others were of a mixed descent, of the Swahili and the Giriama.

\textsuperscript{63} Many villagers, especially in Shirazi, do not have records of their actual birth years, and often estimated their ages. In calculating the average age, I treated responses like being in the “70s” as the age of 70. I excluded the two Shirazi cases where the respondents had absolutely no idea what age group they belonged in.
Africa is oriented towards child rearing and supporting the community. As John C. Caldwell *et al.* suggest, marriage has a strong significance in rural African households: By becoming parents, people are considered to be fully developed individuals who are capable of transmitting the cultural heritage of the community (Caldwell and Caldwell 1990). As for women, marriage is associated with child rearing and it denotes the women’s responsibility of ensuring that the family functions properly as an economic units. Unmarried women with children tend to run small businesses and earn income independently. Sometimes they rely on their extended family members for financial assistance. On the other hand, unmarried men work to provide financial support for the elders in their family, or simply work low-paying jobs to support themselves.

Table 3.2: Percent Population and Average Age by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shirazi Village</th>
<th>Takaungu Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Popul.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ave. Age</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Population by Sex and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shirazi Village</th>
<th>Takaungu Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Unmarrieda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex M</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43 (.75)</td>
<td>14 (.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: The numbers shown in parentheses indicate the proportions to the total population.
  a. “Unmarried” includes single, divorced, and widowed. All respondents who answered that they had “no husband/wife” are counted.*
As indicated in Table 3.1, the proportion of female respondents in their reproductive ages is higher in Takaungu than in Shirazi; the proportions are 83 and 75 percent, respectively. At the same time, relatively more women are unmarried in Takaungu. In fact, relatively more unmarried women are divorced in Takaungu than in Shirazi, where most of the unmarried women are widowed instead. Unmarried men are singles or widowers in Shirazi, similar to Takaungu. In the latter, however, many are widowers, reflecting the relatively high proportion of elderly men in the Takaungu respondent pool. This result will be touched on in Chapter Four with reference to individuals’ social and economic roles in relation to their marital status and gender.

Table 3.4 portrays the distribution of education level by sex. It indicates that largely 48 percent of the Shirazi respondents have no formal education, or “no school”; 86 percent of them are women. In Takaungu village, the percentages were 42 and 58, respectively. The proportion of the uneducated female population was similar in the two villages; it was 55 percent in Shirazi and 50 percent in Takaungu. While more than half of the female respondents in Shirazi did not receive the formal education, another 43 percent had completed at least primary education. In Takaungu, the percentage was lower at 40 percent. In overall, the proportion of the uneducated population is higher in Shirazi, while there is also a greater proportion of individuals who have completed secondary education or higher. In both villages, a greater proportion of males received education higher than the primary level, as compared to the females.
Table 3.4: Respondent Profiles by Education Level and Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Shirazi Village</th>
<th>Takaungu Village</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Primary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial Secondary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Secondary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College or Higher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a. These education levels are based on Kenya’s 8-4-4 education system adopted after 1985. For more information, refer to the previous chapter on the village profiles. “No school” refers to having no formal education; therefore, attendance at madrassa and NGO-sponsored “adult schools” all fall under this category.

b. A full primary education consists of eight years in total. “Partial” refers to any attendance up to the fourth year, and “complete” refers to any levels of attainment from and above the fifth year. Those who attended the primary education before the national education reform in 1985 had 7 (as opposed to the current 8) years in primary school after completion.

c. A full secondary education lasts for four years. “Partial” includes any levels up to the second year; “complete” includes levels above that.

The summary of respondent profiles indicates considerable divergence in gender distribution, marital status, and education levels. It is important to keep in mind, that while empirical analyses are conducted based on the quantitative results of the household surveys, the divergence in responses can be attributed to the representation imbalance of the two populations. The analysis will account for any identifiable possibilities that the results were influenced by the difference in respondent profiles, instead of the actual village populations.
CHAPTER FOUR

EMPirical Analysis: How Has MODernization Led to the Decline of Social capital in Shirazi AND Takaungu?

The Community, as far as possible, turns all disagreeable work into a kind of art form in tune with its own nature, giving it style, dignity and charm, and a particular status within its social structure, in the form of a ‘calling’ and honourable estate.

–Ferdinand Tönnies
Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft

Using the information gathered through my household surveys, interviews, and participatory observations, this chapter examines the ways that modernization has affected the level of social capital in my two village cases. The hypothesis is that Shirazi demonstrates a greater degree of social capital—the capacity to ensure solidarity based on traditional forms of social ties—than Takaungu, on the assumption that the latter represents a community that is more exposed to the modern economy. The survey results are analyzed in the light of my personal modernization framework that spells out the processes that lead to the decline of social cohesion in rural village communities (See Chapter One).

To reiterate, the purpose of this case study is to assess the conjecture in varied village circumstances, and it is not to prove the validity of the hypothesis in a wider range of communities. We can position this study as an attempt to examine real-life village affairs in view of an ideal-type theoretical framework. It aims to contribute to the modernization discourse by providing a platform for exploring the possibilities for reconciliation between long-standing village cultures and modern social
transformations, which is especially critical in the midst of the long-existing international wave toward promoting Third World development since the 1950s.

4.1. Presenting the Survey Data

Presented below in Table 4.1 is the summary of responses to the questions that asked the villagers to indicate the levels of agreement on a scale of 1 (“definitely disagree”) to 6 (“definitely agree”). The average values (x) of the responses are compared between the two communities. Standard deviations (σ) denote the diversity of the responses in relation to the mean; the greater the value, the more dispersed the responses were. The differences in the mean values between the two villages are calculated in order to depict the divergence of their average responses. Statistical significance is calculated for all differences using the unpaired, or “independent samples” t-test. Assuming that the dependent variables—the two respective sets of responses from the Shirazi and Takaungu communities—are normally distributed, this t-test evaluates the likelihood that the specific results were engendered by chance. When the difference of the two means is said to be statistically significant, it denotes greater confidence in the level of the village representations, relative to the counterpart. Hence, we can suggest that the result uniquely depicts the given populations. If, on the other hand, the test preserves the “null hypothesis” that there is no relationship between these two observed data sets, we interpret that the result might have occurred simply by chance. The significance levels indicate the extent to

---

64 From here on, see Appendix: Survey I for reference.
65 While chi-square tests would have generated a more statistically accurate set of results than t-tests, the former were not suitable for this study because of the relatively small sample size. However, informal chi-square tests generated the same levels of statistical significance for most of the questions; the results at the 1 percent significant level under t-tests were all likely confirmed by the chi-square tests.
which the populations are similar. The values under the “statistical significance” column are \( t \)-values. The greater the number of asterisks placed, the greater the statistical significance of the difference between means.

To contrast the responses between the villages, the results that show a higher statistical significance deserve greater attention, because the statistical significance suggests that the differences between the two villages did not result from chance. The basis of this discussion is not only the observation of antagonistic relationships but also of the size of the differences in the responses. When the discussion instead focuses on the similarities between the villages, the results that preserve the abovementioned “null hypothesis” (that results are likely to have occurred by chance) will also be examined.

Table 4.1: Summary of Raw Data: Mean, Standard Deviation, and Statistical Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Question</th>
<th>Shirazi ( \bar{X}_1 )</th>
<th>( \sigma_1 )</th>
<th>Takaungu ( \bar{X}_2 )</th>
<th>( \sigma_2 )</th>
<th>Difference in means ( \bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2 )</th>
<th>Statistical Significance (( t )-test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1. Life better now?</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.825</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.777***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2. Equal financial status</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>2.119</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.136</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1. % Remittances(^a)</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>17.887</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>12.674</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3. Money lending</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.115</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>1.842</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>3.475***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4. Trust borrower?</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>0.972</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>3.215***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.5. Lend money without system</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>2.195</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>6.297***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6. Family &gt; bank</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.209</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>2.359</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2. Good leader</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.980</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>2.217**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4. Chairman is effective</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>5.352***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.5. Voice heard</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6. Educated &gt; Elders</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>2.142</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1. Trust villagers more</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>0.983</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>1.077</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2. Outsiders help</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.060</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>2.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Dev.</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3. Involved outside</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.076</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.408</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.020***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4. More friends and relatives outside</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1. Proximity important</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.488</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.532</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-1.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.3. Job opps &gt; 15 yrs ago</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.939</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4. Travel far for better jobs</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.014</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>1.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.5. Cooperate &gt; compete</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>0.982</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-3.492***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.6. Paid less here</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-3.973***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.1. Good health</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-2.702***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.2. Convenience</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>2.070</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-2.260**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.3. Listen to traditional advice?</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.780</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.024</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.787***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.1. Education outside</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.110</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.1. Technology important</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.793</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.2. Surf Internet?</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>2.963***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.3. In person &gt; technology</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.860</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>2.420**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.4. Tend to be alone</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.754</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: $N_1 = 57$ and $N_2 = 62$, unless otherwise stated.

*** Significance at the 1 percent level.
** Significance at the 5 percent level.
* Significance at the 10 percent level.

a. Unlike all other questions, this question asks for responses based on a scale of 0% to 100% in 25% intervals (See Appendix Survey I), instead of the scale of 1 to 6. I nevertheless used a $t$-test to calculate the statistical significance of the results.

b. $N_1 = 56$.

c. This question asks respondents to indicate one of the following estimates of frequency: never, yearly, half-yearly, monthly, weekly, or daily, which are not distributed at consistent intervals. Therefore, technically, the $t$-test is not the most statistically accurate test for this question. However, assuming that the frequencies indicate “degrees” of likelihood that villagers access the Internet, I have nonetheless conducted the $t$-test for this question, along with others. I conducted an informal chi-square test, and it resulted in the same confidence level (chi-square value = 7.884***).

Before going further, I must acknowledge the “limitation” of this analysis.

Due to the nature of my study, the discussion presented here is almost solely based on my observations of village circumstances presented in Chapter Two and the survey.
results. Even without the limitations accounted for in Chapter Three that could possibly lead to bias and faulty results, analyzing social relationships involves complications that in turn imply that this type of direct hypothesis-assessment test might have been inadequate. One obvious complexity is that there are unlimited ways to interpret the difference between village responses.66 Since the delimited space and time does not allow me to explore all possible interpretations, I have unavoidably focused on issues that had more information available to add dimension to the discussion. Admittedly, I am better-informed about Shirazi than Takaungu; therefore, even though the purpose of this chapter is to examine whether the survey results support the hypotheses, the multi-layered analyses could still tend towards suggesting that Shirazi exhibits greater levels of social capital than Takaungu.

4.2. Predictions and Analyses: Reference to Survey Categories

4.2.1. Economic Development

Based on the presumption that Takaungu represents a community with greater influence of the modern economy than Shirazi, it was initially predicted that Takaungu enjoys better access to material goods and opportunities. The purpose of specifying the timeframe to the past 10 years was to ensure that such wellbeing resulted from modernization, namely the villages’ integration with the advanced

66 For example, how do we explain the complexity of bonding social relationships that withstand the actors to be physically apart? If villagers exert themselves to enhance their interpersonal connections with “insiders” that reside outside of the community, what does it imply about the interpersonal relationships with others who currently reside in the community? Does it indicate an abundance of social capital—for which social ties and in what aspect? While not every outcome can be attributed to a sole cause or an explanation, I have nevertheless tried to indicate as many relevant and insightful accounts in the discussions as possible.
economy (See Appendix Survey I, Section I: 1). As mentioned in Chapter Three, I did not design this survey based on any external evidence that Takaungu had experienced a longer period of extensive advancement than Shirazi, due to the lack of written accounts on generational change. Nevertheless, Section I attempts to uncover people’s longitudinal perception of how their circumstances have improved due to modernization. The purpose of this section is not to show that the Takaungu village has enjoyed relatively more improvements than Shirazi in the past 10 years, but rather, it aims to suggest that the village situation has not been static. In other words, it is unclear whether Takaungu developed most rapidly during another 10-year timeframe besides the one immediately past, but it is still a valid indication that the village has experienced socioeconomic advancements. We therefore examine current conditions and find the correlation between socioeconomic advancements and the levels of social capital.

Undermining the initial prediction, Takaungu villagers generally disagree with Section I: 1, “Compared to ten years ago, my life has become better because of the material goods and opportunities that are available from the outside,” with the average of 2.61. What is more, Shirazi’s average response of 3.91 indicates a greater agreement (1.30 difference) than Takaungu, overturning the prediction that the latter would recognize a higher degree of material welfare and opportunities due to its integration with the larger economy.67

67 If this indicates Takaungu’s failure to become fully incorporated with the modern economic structure, we might also suggest that Takaungu does not have the adequate bridging social capital and structural norms to ensure its communal solidarity. As explained earlier in Chapter One, Putnam (2000) suggests that there are two types of social capital: bonding and bridging. The former social capital unites homogeneous groups, whereas the latter connects heterogeneous groups and promotes solidarity between different populations.
Economic inequality, discussed in Section I: 2, is generally understood as an indicator of a competitive market economy. Since the last third of the 20th century, Putnam maintains, America has faced both eroding social capital and growing inequality (2000). In response to radical views that fear that social capital reinforces social stratification by bonding only certain groups, he argues, “Community and equality are mutually reinforcing, not mutually incompatible” (Putnam 2000, 358). The integration of the villages into an external economic structure without major intervention by the central government assumes the advancement of a small-scale village economy into the global market economy. In a more advanced society under a market economy, it is more likely that there are economic disparities caused by uneven outcome (e.g. income and wealth) due to volatile access to opportunities (e.g. job availability). Therefore, in spite of the increased material welfare and opportunities, relatively more Takaungu residents would indicate that there is economic disparity within the village community due to

Putnam is a proponent of bridging social capital since it allows social cohesion based on generalized reciprocity—trusting strangers for their mutual contribution to the wellbeing of the community. Nevertheless, Putnam provides a disclaimer: bonding and bridging social capital cannot be fully distinguished from one another. I mention Putnam’s concept of bridging social capital here, because in some ways it relates to the mechanism behind Durkheimian organic solidarity—social cohesiveness that is created by extensive division of labor and the system of trust that is mediated by institutional norms. Since I hypothesize that there is a lower degree of “unmediated” social cohesion and interpersonal connectedness in Takaungu, it is possible to guess that the former has been replaced by systemic norms and moral codes that connect the people with differentiated social roles. However, within the scope of my thesis, it is impossible to make a solid claim about the presence of formal/institutional coordinating systems in Takaungu.

Putnam accounts for his converse observations: “In terms of the distribution of wealth and income, America in the 1950s and 1960s was more egalitarian than it had been in more than a century... those same decades were also the high point of social connectedness and civic engagement” (2000, 359). In 1990, income distribution was more equal in societies that were observed to have high social capital. From 1974 to 1994, people from different social classes more likely attended public meetings and led local organizations in societies with high social capital, whereas the civic life in societies with less social capital were highly stratified (Putnam 2000, 360-361).
the propagation of the competitive economic structure and the enhanced notion of private ownership.

As was predicted, Shirazi’s average response of 3.11 to Section I: 2, “My household is at an equal financial status as my relatives and friends,” is 0.38 higher in the direction of agreement than the result in Takaungu, which is 2.73.\(^9\) Admittedly, both means suggest that both villages somewhat disagree with the statement that the household wealth distribution is equal within the respective communities. However, the higher level of concurrence with the view of economic equality is likely to suggest that Shirazi upholds shared experience and cooperation, which are factors indicative of a society that adheres to collectivity and mutual sharing.

### 4.2.2. Finance

In terms of household financial administration, the Shirazi community can be predicted to exhibit a relatively higher reliance on communal lending and borrowing, without acquiring collateral. This is because the necessity of institutional structures that secure the payback of loans indicates the community’s reliance on formal rule-based institutions to preserve social order, instead of on traditional social norms.

As observed in Chapter Three, a great number of Takaungu residents are male elders who returned after spending an extensive period of time elsewhere for business purposes. Taking into account that these residents tend to be retired, their current household income often comes from assets and remittances. Assuming that Takaungu is more integrated into the larger economic structure, we can postulate that there are

\(^9\) This result, however, failed to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, it is likely that the result was generated simply by chance and not due to the actual difference in the populations.
relatively more Takaungu villagers who are remitting their income from town. This phenomenon supports the argument that the village social capital is necessarily affected when the villagers leave the community for an extended period of time, or permanently. This is not to say that the social capital necessarily declines along with the villagers’ physical abandonment of the community, but that the promotion of social cohesion is more difficult than if the people were to maintain the inclusion of these individuals in the village social network. With limited access to telecommunication, for example, the preservation of connectedness might be challenging. However, adequate infrastructure might ensure that the villagers’ shared values and norms would be endorsed. This twofold discussion is presented later with greater details.

In response to Section II: 3, “Money lending is very important in this village,” the Shirazi villagers indicated greater agreement ($\bar{\chi}_1 = 5.16$), compared to the Takaungu villagers ($\bar{\chi}_2 = 4.18$). The statistical significance at the one percent level denotes that the particular outcome was not due to chance, and hence, it is at the greatest “confidence” level. The observed financial activities in Shirazi support this empirical outcome; the community’s active participation in widespread financial self-help groups exemplifies Shirazi’s high level of social capital. As described in Chapter Two, the Shirazi area has limited access to formal financial institutions. What is more, a majority of the villagers lack the means to access financial services as basic as checking and saving accounts, much less credit and loans. However, the villagers initiated the informal rotating-credit groups that are perceived to be very successful. These groups are comprised of individuals—often mothers—who share the similar
interest in the activity. As everyone is familiar with almost everyone else in the community, these people are generally confident that other villagers are trustworthy.

In relation to the discussion on money lending, the Shirazi villagers indicated that they “trust the borrower that the money will be repaid” (See Section II: 4; Table 4.1). Money lending and borrowing is an activity essential to people’s daily life in Shirazi. Unemployed male villagers are the most active borrowers on a daily basis; in their casual conversations with others, they often subtly request 20-shilling coins (locally called, “blue”) that would buy them chewing gum and cigarettes. Such scenes are utterly integral to people’s interactions; an indiscriminate observer would hardly notice the transaction. More importantly, the most prominent “lending and borrowing” that occurs in Shirazi is the kind of transaction described above, whereas for the same activity, the Takaungu villagers seemed to prefer larger loans. In contrast with Shirazi villagers, people in Takaungu often complained, “Hakuna pesa (there is no money),” and “No one is willing to lend.”

Money lending takes place in various forms in Shirazi. At the shop in the Madukani subsection, the owner’s 35-year-old wife remarked on her frequent experience with customers asking her to postpone payment:

They say they don't have the money now and will come back [with the money] in one month so ‘let me take something’... I say ‘yes, just take it,’ but I know [the money] might not come back [on time]... I just give it, because they know they owe me money... They will do something to pay it back. So I wait as long as they take... it’s just how things work (Mwanamimi).

The shopkeeper’s account leads us to the next statement: “I would lend money without relying on interest and/or collateral” (Section II: 3). The difference in the
response between Shirazi and Takaungu was 1.81, nearly two intervals on the scale of 1 to 6 ($\chi_1 = 5.84; \chi_2 = 4.03$). As expected, the Shirazi villagers agree to the conjecture at a higher degree and with a lower divergence from the average ($\sigma_1 = 0.527; \sigma_2 = 2.195$). As the average response in Shirazi shows, most respondents testified to the claim firmly, without doubt. In contrast, the Muslim population in Takaungu clearly indicated that they would not place interest on any of the loan to adhere to the Islamic code, but also suggested that they require certain systems that ensure the return of money. According to the interviews conducted in Takaungu, part of the reasons for the villagers skepticism with “borrowing [money] from family and relatives” (See Section II: 6) was not only because the families have insufficient savings to lend, but also because banks guarantee the money acquisition with an orderly system—that is, without dispute. These results demonstrate first, Shirazi’s disposition to offer help without expecting an immediate and precise return from the counterpart, based on the culturally-induced expectation that the action will be reciprocated in some way. Second, Takaungu’s expressed need of formal arrangement contributes to the view that the community requires an institutional coordination to ensure its solidarity, unlike Shirazi.\footnote{According to Durkheim, such external coordination can promote communal cohesion if people mutually recognize their social dependency on strangers. However, in the case of Takaungu, people are not entirely willing to help each other on the basis of generalized trust and reciprocity. We must acknowledge that the information available here is not sufficient to make substantial claims about formal institutional structures. Neither can we conclude that there is no adequate formal coordination in place, nor can we argue that the existing formal institutions are simply failing. Therefore, we cannot fully analyze whether there is Durkheimian organic solidarity in Takaungu.} As described in Chapter One with reference of Durkheim and Smelser’s modernization mechanisms, the necessity of institutional
mediation implies that the traditional forms of solidarity have been undermined in the community.

4.2.3. Political Participation

In relation to the traditional social norms versus the rule-based institutional dichotomy, this section of the survey also attempts to unveil how conscious the villagers are of the effectiveness of the national administration, an institution external to the village community. At the same time, the questions examine the villagers’ involvement with the internal village administration. Based on Ayittey’s description of rural village governance in Africa, Shirazi is deemed more representative of a community with a familial or kin-based communal administration. Having observed that the Shirazi villagers are generally active participants in village politics, we can predict that the people would indicate a relatively greater support and involvement in village meetings. In contrast, we can foresee that the more supposedly “rationalized” Takaungu community would emphasize the importance of better-educated and rule-conscious personnel to work for the village administration.71

Compared to Shirazi, Takaungu’s village politics are more coordinated by established institutional structures. Namely, the village life is more integrated with the national administration, more so than with ancestral political structures. The divergent averages for Section III: 4, “The village chairman is an effective leader,” provide support for my hypothesis that the more modernized village makes less use of “unmediated” social capital. When asked about the village “chairman” or leader, Shirazi cohesively referred to Mr. Mshenga, whereas Takaungu referred to the

71 The term “rational” here refers to the Weberian notion of rationalization.
Kenyan government official who moved into the community following her appointment. This is not to suggest that the latter is oblivious to the notion of “elders”; there are some individuals who are regarded as respected elders and yet, these elders have less of an impact on communal solidarity, as far as the village administration is concerned. Moreover, this government official was markedly unpopular; people suggested that the office had “too much corruption.” When asked to describe his involvement with village politics, 52-year-old male resident Ali Mohamed expressed his contempt for the regional office:

That chair-lady lives in a really nice house, but look at where those poor people are living. They don’t have power (electricity); they live in mud houses… She just gets paid; she doesn’t do anything… It’s all corruption! … And what meetings are there [for us] to attend? (Ali).

The disintegration of the institutional structure and the resulting contention of the villagers suggest that the societal wellbeing of Takaungu is somewhat dependent on the formal coordination of the national government. Furthermore, we can also observe from the prevalence of remarks similar to the one above that material welfare such as living in nice houses contributes significantly to the villagers’ overall happiness. In other words, the perceived inequality causes villagers to express contempt towards the official. These ideas in turn indicate the community’s integration with the modern political economy.\textsuperscript{72} Greatly shaped by the notion of Weberian rational-legal authority, Takaungu residents regard their material happiness as being contingent upon the effectiveness of the coordinated bureaucracy,

\textsuperscript{72} As mentioned briefly in Chapter Three, this official moved to reside in Takaungu after she was appointed. Since she is an outsider who is given a nicer house than the village norm, the sense that the power is externally imposed might also be contributing to this contempt. At the same time, villagers do not confront or openly try to humiliate her.
In relation to the communities’ recognition and acceptance of externally-implemented initiatives, Shirazi again indicated a lower disagreement of 2.28 compared to Takaungu’s 1.58. These are responses to Section III: 2 “I believe that my political leader makes good changes to my community,” and the difference of 0.70 was statistically significant at the five percent level. This difference could simply be that externally initiated projects turned out to be more successful in Shirazi than those implemented in Takaungu.

We can, however, examine the result from another angle. Greater advancement in a society theoretically assumes a greater inclination toward formal, policy-based, and rationalized bureaucracy in the political sphere. While expressing support or positive anticipation for a national political party does not necessarily correspond to the extent to which the conventional political administration is diffused in the villages, the responses nevertheless give insight into how pertinent politics is to the villagers’ lives. It is tempting to simply suggest that Shirazi, contrary to the prediction, considers national politics to be relatively more integral to their lives than in Takaungu. However, taking the latter’s relatively skeptical view of community development into account (Section III: 2), it is reasonable for the people to be similarly skeptical about regional government. This in turn highlights Takaungu’s dependency on institutional mediation to bring about communal development. On the other hand, the results suggest that Shirazi people are more content with their

---

73 Approximately 63 percent and 71 percent of the Shirazi and Takaungu respondents respectively suggested that they are not supporters of any political party (See Appendix Survey I, Section III: 1).
74 Yet, such coordination does not seem sufficient to the fulfillment of community needs.
circumstances, since long-standing organic ties and interpersonal relationships facilitate unity and hence, communal welfare.

4.2.4. Lifestyle

Unlike the other sections, the questions under this category required respondents to select (using multiple choices) the cases that best illustrate their lifestyle and perceptions about life-related topics. All choices represent activities or concepts that can be placed largely into two distinct categories: one being communal and social, and the other being individualistic and private.

For example, in reference to Section IV: 1, the choice (a), “Chat and relax with family and friends” is a more social and interactive activity than (c), “Surf the Internet or watch the television,” or (d) “Do chores,” depending on what the chores entail. Generally speaking, Shirazi is expected to exhibit relatively higher average involvement in activities that entail socializing. In contrast, the life in Takaungu, as Putnam observed in America in the late 20th century, is predicted to be more individualistic and oriented towards the maximization of private wealth. However, it must be clarified that some of the activities listed here and in Section IV: 2 and 3 are not intrinsically social or individualistic. Rather, the significance of the involvement in certain activities depends on how the activities are conducted in the specific village community and the ways that the villagers understand the listed concepts, such as “family,” “friends,” “marriage,” and “children” (See Section IV: 3 and 4). These cultural specificities are taken into account as we interpret various trends in the responses from the two communities.
Table 4.2: *T*-Test Summary of Responses for Survey Section IV: 1, “What do you do most frequently after having dinner and before going to sleep?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean(^a)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>(t)-value/Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shirazi</td>
<td>Takaungu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Chat/relax with family</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Radio</td>
<td>0.263</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Watch TV and private activities</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Go for walk</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.´ Pray at mosque and other social activities</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>-0.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: The conditions are the same as the other survey results presented in Table 4.1.

*** Significance at the 1 percent level.

** Significance at the 5 percent level.

* Significance at the 10 percent level.

a. Every time each category was tested, all other factors were treated as “dummy variables.” The tested category was treated as 1 and the others were treated as 0. Therefore, the maximum value for the mean is 1, and every mean value denotes the proportion to the respective village population.

As presented in Table 4.2, the difference in the means that exhibited the highest confidence level was for activities that constitute socializing and association with others in a sphere outside of people’s homes.\(^{75}\) About 11 percent of the Takaungu villagers indicated that they pray at the mosque after dinner or go out to interact with people. On the other hand, none of the Shirazi respondents responded in this way. The most common activity for both Shirazi and Takaungu people was to “chat and relax with family and friends” (See Section IV: 1). From the data, we can

---

\(^{75}\) I divided responses under Category (f) “Others specify” into two parts; one includes watching TV and engaging in private activities at home, and the other includes social and associational activities that constitute seeing and interacting with people.
suggest that Takaungu people tend to socialize more in public (within the village) in their free time, while Shirazi people interact with their immediate family members or engage in private activities more frequently. Initially, I formulated this question expecting that the activities would diverge into interactive versus isolated activities. However, the results undermine this expectation and imply instead that it is almost impossible for people to isolate themselves from the community by engaging in the kinds of activities linked to their daily lives.\(^\text{76}\)

### Table 4.3: \textit{T}-Test Summary of Responses for Survey Section IV: 4, “What is a ‘good life’?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean(^a)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>(t)-value/Statistical Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shirazi</td>
<td>Takaungu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Happy marriage</td>
<td>0.877</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Children</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Material luxury</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td>-0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Money</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Jobs that do good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Meals every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Notes:} The conditions are the same as the other survey results presented in Table 4.1.

*** Significance at the 1 percent level.

** Significance at the 5 percent level.

* Significance at the 10 percent level.

\(^a\) Every time each category was tested, all other factors were treated as “dummy variables.” The tested category was treated as 1 and the others were treated as 0. Therefore, the maximum value for the mean is 1, and every mean value denotes the proportion to the respective village population.

\(^{76}\) In fact, Putnam examines the home (private) versus the public dichotomy and suggests that social capital is found more in societies where people interact in the public sphere by participating in associations and club activities. Taking into consideration that the notion of home in relation to the village is understood differently in Shirazi and Takaungu from American civil society, I chose to disregard Putnam’s approach here.
Nevertheless, looking at Table 4.3, it seems relevant to suggest that one’s sense of belonging to a family contributes relatively more significantly to the Shirazi community’s happiness. 87.7 percent responded that marriage and children are linked most significantly with a “good life.” In Takaungu, it was 50 percent of the respondents. Being statistically significant, the result indicates that Shirazis recognize their optimal life would be when the tight social network that involves family and children supports them.77

4.2.5. Inter/Intra-Village Relationships

Here, we aim to observe the levels of villagers’ association both within and outside the village community. Assuming that intra-village association—as opposed to participation in external organizations—is relatively more common in Shirazi than in Takaungu, the former community is likely to exhibit relatively greater trust for people within the community—as opposed to outsiders—than the latter. On the other hand, we can predict that the latter is more involved in socioeconomic activities external to the community, and hence, the people are likely to demonstrate a relatively greater trust and collaboration with people and organizations from the outside. In terms of social capital, we can suppose that the greater the relative trustworthiness of outsiders, the weaker the internal communal solidarity that has hitherto been channeled through intra-village norms.

77 Although I kept this issue out of the main discussion, we must not ignore that (f) “having meals everyday” also generated a significant result (highest confidence level). While it could be assumed that meals would appeal more to a poorer community, Takaungu indicates a greater degree of appreciation. The reason might be that the options presented to the respondents disregarded important items that they actually value.
To the extent that an advanced community can be expected to have more connections with the external socioeconomic and political systems, we can predict that Takaungu would express a higher degree of involvement with outside organizations. The responses to statements in Section V, however, were contrary to these initial predictions. First, Takaungu villagers expressed a greater disagreement of 1.60 to Section V: 3, “I am often involved with political, economic, or social group/organization outside of the village.” Shirazi’s average response was 2.89. The results were statistically significant.

If villagers were extensively involved with external organizations physically beyond the realm of the village community, it would imply that the people are more socially connected with non-village entities. In this case, it is likely that these people are involved with the enhancement of social ties elsewhere, but less within the community from which they originate.\footnote{In Putnam’s terms, we can suggest that the community has lower bonding but greater bridging social capital, if the social connection established with this specific external organizations clearly leads to the betterment of the village community.} In fact, Shirazi’s involvement with outside organizations often occurs \textit{within} the community. Certain features of the villagers’ participation in organizational programs suggest that the above result alternatively exhibits an abundance of social capital. One example is the women’s involvement in microfinance teams. As described in Chapter Two, the villagers are active initiators as well as participants in the programs offered by the external organizations. That said, these programs are run within Shirazi, involving residents all participants are familiar with. According to an active female resident, Mama Somoe, the kinds of microfinance programs introduced in Shirazi do not assign intensive preconditions such as having land ownership, which is to be used as collateral. This in turn might
suggest that Shirazi avoids certain mechanisms of rule-based coordination that are otherwise facilitated by traditional norms. We can suggest that the engine of success in these programs in Shirazi is the tight social relationships that are already established among the residents.

Interestingly, the results also reject the prediction for Section V: 1 and 2, although the results may have been generated by chance. Compared to the counterpart villagers, Takaungu villagers expressed relatively more strongly (0.17 difference) that they trust the villagers more that the outsiders, and Shirazi villagers expressed a greater agreement (0.87 difference) that outsiders help bring socioeconomic improvements to the village. With regard to external help, the latter also suggested that the community receives certain tangible benefits (Section V: 2). The responses were 3.60 for Shirazi, 2.73 for Takaungu. In Shirazi, people listed the primary school and Paradise Lost to be institutions that were established by external means and have had major positive impacts on the community. Notwithstanding the manifold external (both governmental and non-governmental) assistance that the community receives and their proximity to the biggest tourist destinations in the region, Takaungu villagers were angered that outsiders do not contribute to the socioeconomic development of the village. This simultaneously explains Takaungu’s high agreement (5.71) with Section V: 1, “I trust people within the village more than people outside of the village.”

The results on questions dealing with the villagers’ sense of connection with communities outside of their villages do not support the initial predictions. For

---

79 The response was 5.54 in Shirazi; it was 0.17 lower (lower agreement) than Takaungu. The result failed to reject the null hypothesis.
Section V: 4, “I have more friends and relatives outside than inside the village.”

Shirazi’s average was 3.61 and Takaungu’s was 3.18, indicating that the former has a greater sense of connection with people who reside outside the village.\(^{80}\) While this result should not be explained away, it must be pointed out that these “friends and relatives” may very well be those who are “ingroup” members. In other words, the connection maintained with old friends and relatives from the same village also indicates the existence of strong interpersonal ties. The results for Section V: 4 somewhat parallel the percentage of income that households rely on remittances for (Section II: 1): The average in Shirazi is 8.3 percent, whereas in Takaungu, it is as low as 4.8 percent (Section II: 1).\(^{81}\) This does not confirm the prediction stated earlier in the Finance section of this chapter. Using Putnam’s term, these results uphold Shirazi’s strong bonding (inclusive) social capital—the tightness of the community no longer requires the physical presence of its members to endorse communal cohesion. Tönnies states with regard to familial community:

> Wherever [the spirit of kinship] is strong and lively in the most intimate relationships, it can find its own nourishment, feeding upon past memories and recalling close-knit communal activity, however far it may be from home (2001, 28).

With sacred customs and habitual gatherings, a village community based on the connectedness of neighborhoods can also persist without the physical presence of the people.

---

\(^{80}\) The results, however, do not reject the null hypothesis.

\(^{81}\) The calculated \(t\)-value is 1.237 for the difference of 3.49. The result failed to reject the null hypothesis; hence, the result is not statistically significant.
4.2.6. Work

This section examines villagers’ involvement with the outside and their perceptions regarding work within the village. The Takaungu community is predicted to have more engagement with communities elsewhere, and would therefore indicate less resistance toward people leaving the village community for a long-term occupation. In contrast, the Shirazi community, whose social cohesion is based on the villagers’ long-standing interpersonal connectedness and association, would ideally respond that cooperation between friends and colleagues is more characteristic of their work ethic than engaging in competition. The higher levels of competition depicted among individual parties would also denote a higher degree of people’s inclination towards maximizing their private gains, as opposed to the communal benefits. As described earlier, the Shirazi community is constructed largely on a foundation of kinship, which expanded into a community of extended family, neighbors, and friends. It is for this condition that cooperation is expected to be greater in Shirazi than in Takaungu.82

Contrary to our conjecture, the latter expressed a higher degree of agreement to Section VI: 5, “My colleagues and I cooperate more than compete” than Shirazi. The results were 5.71 in Shirazi, and 4.95 in Takaungu. The difference of 0.76 was at

82 Assuming that cooperation embodies people living harmoniously “in an organic fashion by their inclination and common consent,” Tönnies suggests that Community can exist in three original forms: (1) The home or kinship; (2) neighborhood; and (3) friendship or comradeship (2001 [1887], 28). The commonality that ties people together in the first is their physical humanity; in the second, it is the sharing of land; and the third is the sharing of sacred places, opinion, and experience. While in each, the unity is created through different mechanisms, all are intimately bound together “in respect of both place and time, both in particular phenomena and in the whole of human culture and its history” (2001 [1887], 28). In particular, not all relationships are organic or instinctual, but they nonetheless depend on residual organic ties; “the concrete reality of such connections must manifest itself in mutual trust and belief in one another” (Tönnies 2001 [1887], 29-30).
the one percent significant level, highlighting a difference between these two populations. One possible explanation is that a tight-knit community is bound for disruptions. Communities that are rooted in continuous proximity and constant interaction can be said to have mutual support, but they are also susceptible to restrictions based on traditional expectations and negativity (Tönnies 2001 [1887]). This is because each individual is aware of his desire and necessities, which might clash with others’. Therefore, relationships display cooperative qualities only when their tightness allows the people to cohere.

An alternative explanation is that Takaungu residents recognize the sense of cooperation on the basis of shared moral codes that are established by coordination. As explained in Chapter One, Durkheimean *organic solidarity* and Smelser’s *integration* model both assume a high level of division of labor in society and an extensive establishment of institutions and regulations that coordinate the differentiated peoples. Unlike the communal solidarity that we can assume in Tönniesian “Community,” Durkheim and Smelser suggest that a modern society can maintain its cohesiveness through alternative mechanisms, namely the division of labor and *differentiation-integration*. As described in Chapter One, these thinkers argue for the possibility of replacement of traditional social ties by highly rationalized social arrangements based on extensive—yet impersonal—interdependence. Referring to these ideas, we can alternatively suggest that the high level of Takaungu’s “cooperation” exhibits the kind of solidarity, which is based on villagers’ recognition that they are interdependent on each resident’s role. In terms of the traditional forms of social capital, which is the central focus of my study, the result
does not support the hypothesis that Shirazi would exhibit a higher degree of cooperation than Takaungu.

Land tenure and business relationships are aspects that help explain the ideas above. As explained in Chapter Two, Shirazi villagers utilize land communally, often sharing products and parcels of *mashamba* (small farmlands) with the community. Unlike the absence of extensive legal control over land tenure in Shirazi, Takaungu villagers manage their lands and properties according to a more individualistic and specialized notion. It is unclear whether or not the lands and houses in Takaungu are individually owned, but the concept of private ownership significantly shapes the villagers’ commercial and cultural practices. For example, some Swahili residents are involved in real estate and they lease out houses. As described earlier, the lands are not necessarily inherited from ancestors, even though in some parcels, relatives reside in close proximity. Unlike in Shirazi where each clan has its own ancestral land where their dead are buried, the Takaungu residents are generally buried in a communal cemetery established within the village area. This suggests that Takaungu abides less by traditional values placed on worshipping ancestral spirits, which are, as Ambe Njoh (2006) suggests, linked to the notion of land and nature.

As described earlier, the Swahili and Giriama generally reside together in Takaungu without disputes. A possible reason for this is the high level of interdependency between these groups of residents, namely in their business relationships. A 52-year-old Swahili male resident explained that the traditionally wealthiest Mazrui clan owns a massive proportion of Takaungu land to this day. These landowners operate massive commercial farms, where they predominantly hire
the Giriama people. The commercial sales in Takaungu seem to concentrate in capital-intensive farm units with greater technological inputs in production. As can be observed, there is greater division of labor and an “organizational hierarchy” in Takaungu’s commercial agricultural system (Johnston and Kilby 1975, 26). The idea of “cooperation” might have originated in this owner-worker relationship, which allows for mutual benefits, especially in the short run.

When asked if they would live apart from the community to work for a better-paying job, the average response was 5.30 in Shirazi and 4.90 in Takaungu (Section VI: 4).\(^{83}\) Rejecting the initial hypothesis, these results imply that Shirazi is in more accordance with being involved outside the community. It also appears to be less dismissive of dispensing with physical proximity and the intimacy of interpersonal relationships for a cause. While I must be careful to resist the temptation to explain away results inconsistent with my hypothesis, nevertheless, the Shirazi people’s willingness to leave the village might be understood better in terms of the villagers’ confidence in maintaining the traditional bond with the community.\(^{84}\) Referring back to the findings in the previous section on inter/intra-village relationships, this premise seems especially relevant for Shirazi villagers, who often rely on personal connections with their friends and relatives to find jobs outside of Shirazi.

---

\(^{83}\) The results, however, do not reject the null hypothesis, so the result might have been generated by chance.

\(^{84}\) In fact, it is presented in Chapter Two that a lot of elderly men in Takaungu used to work outside of the village for an extensive period of time, and that recently women also leave their families to work in foreign countries.
4.2.7. Health Care

The more advanced the community is, the more physically accessible and modern health care institutions are. This is different in a rural village, where the community is often isolated from major commercial centers that offer formal medical services. This specifically means that the advanced community faces fewer obstacles to obtain modern health care when needed. In a more traditional community, people commonly rely on elders’ medical advice and knowledge of herbal medicines for certain illnesses. On other occasions when the health issue is believed to have an association with cultural or religious spirits, the villagers who are proficient in the field help heal the illness with ritualistic practices involving songs and dances. In Shirazi village, these traditional medical practices are still very prominent in comparison to Takaungu. Therefore, in the former, we can predict that traditional knowledge is utilized in the provision of health care to at a greater degree than in the latter.

As described in Chapters Two and Three, Takaungu has a greater number of health institutions that provide a variety of modern medical treatments. The progressive introduction of medical innovations suggests that the practice of unscientific traditional medicine is increasingly becoming obsolete in the Takaungu community. Referring to the African saying, ‘It takes an entire village to raise one child,’ Lisa Berkman, a leading researcher in the field of social networks and health argues:

To improve health among vulnerable and high-risk populations, we will need to focus on preventive efforts that, at their core, promote social support and develop family and community strengths (1995, 251-252).
Similarly, Putnam submits that societies with higher social capital have better overall health, promoting both physical and mental wellbeing:

[S]ocial networks furnish tangible assistance, such as money, convalescent care, and transportation, which […] provides a safe net. […] Social networks also may reinforce healthy norms—socially isolated people are more likely to smoke, drink, overeat, and engage in other health-damaging behaviors (2000, 327).

Presuming that the Takaungu villagers consider that health care is readily accessible, we can suggest that the people are more comfortable with maintaining health. At the same time, if strong interpersonal social networks enhance health, we might predict that the Shirazi villagers are relatively more content with their physical and mental wellbeing than the Takaungu villagers.

Section VII: 3, “I listen to elderly people’s traditional knowledge and advice on health care,” generates a difference of 0.98, which is approximately a one-interval difference on the scale of 1 to 6. While people from both villages indicate that they disagree with the conjecture (3.72 in Shirazi and 2.74 in Takaungu), Shirazi villagers are generally less dismissive of traditional medicine and healing. This is because traditional healing is an essential part of the established Shirazi tradition. As described in Chapter Two, even though Shirazi villagers seek modern health care when necessary, there is always a large group of residents who both provide and prefer traditional or “unconventional” treatments, such as herbal medicine and spiritual healing, as the primary source of health care.

As predicted based on the availability of health care institutions, Takaungu villagers somewhat agreed ($\bar{x} = 4.52$) to Section VII: 2, “It is physically convenient
to send an ill person to a medical institution for health care.” The response of the Shirazi villagers was at a lower degree of agreement of 3.60, and the difference between the responses was 0.92. When asked to indicate the “burden of accessing health care” (Section VII: 4), 96 percent of Shirazi respondents chose (a) physical distance to the nearest medical institution and (b) cost of health care. In contrast, 50 percent of Takaungu respondents suggested that the above categories are problems; yet another 47 percent perceives that decent health care is accessible without obstacles.

The following incident depicts the abundance of social capital in Shirazi’s tight social network that contributes to ensuring communal safety. Despite the cultural acceptance of traditional medicine, the people in Shirazi are well aware that certain illnesses cannot be treated by local TMPs. When in urgent need of medical assistance at the nearest Msambweni Hospital, the lack of transportation becomes a major issue. One night in December 2009, a five-year-old girl in Mkuwajuni subsection collapsed with a high fever. Nobody in her immediate family had a car, and the car was also unavailable at Paradise Lost, the resort within Shirazi that normally lends the car to villagers. The villagers gathered at the girl’s house to commiserate with the parents over the girl’s illness, until after a few hours when a

---

85 The result was at the five percent significance level, rejecting the “null hypothesis” that the phenomenon has only a chance relationship with the two populations.
86 While an Indian man ran the resort in December 2009, a substantial number of workers at the resort were from Shirazi and the neighboring villages. The village community had access to the resort’s truck, because of the connection some villagers had to the resort administration. We can suggest that social network is one crucial aspect by which the needs of transportation and other tangible assistances are fulfilled in Shirazi.
relative rushed home from Mombasa, and transported the girl to the hospital.\textsuperscript{87} As Putnam suggests, such interpersonal network provides people with tangible help that allows them to access health care, notwithstanding the limited ready accessibility of medical services.

However, unlike Putnam’s proposition presented earlier that the community with more social capital tends to be healthier, Shirazi agreed relatively less to the statement in Section VII: 1, “I am in good health condition (I have no major health issue).” The response was 4.65 for Shirazi, and 5.44 for Takaungu. While both means are in the range of “agree” with a fairly small difference of -0.79, the high statistical significance (one percent level) suggests that the result was due to differences between the populations, instead of chance. Both the results of Section VII: 1 and 2 complementarily suggest that while extensive interpersonal connectedness might indirectly enhance communal wellbeing, the availability of trustworthy health care is nevertheless a prerequisite for overall physical and mental wellness.

\textbf{4.2.8. Education}

The willingness to send children outside of the village for a better secondary education suggests that the community is subconsciously compromising social solidarity that is based on in-person interconnectedness amongst the villagers. In more advanced Takaungu, the community is more likely to accept and adapt to the people’s movement to the outside of the village community, because the intermediary

\textsuperscript{87} This relative is my assistant Juma’s father, who is a Shirazi resident and a relative of the girl’s. The girl’s mother comes from one of the largest clans in Shirazi; her father is a Tanzanian, and head of the clan. The girl’s mother is his daughter with his second wife. Juma’s father, who drove the girl to the hospital, was the son of his first wife. This extensive familial network ensured that the girl was treated.
role of socioeconomic and political institutions might substitute for its social cohesion. The level of desire and value placed on obtaining a better quality education indicates the community’s recognition of the worldwide acceptance of education as the means of enhancing one’s standard of living. What is crucial here is the reason behind thinking that education is important—the more aware the community is of the notion of “universally” endorsed conventions, such as human rights, the more rationalized the people’s mindsets might be. In contrast, the more pragmatically inclined the people are in identifying the importance of education, the more concerned the people are with communal solidarity based on traditional expectations, such as gender roles, and obtaining material satisfaction.

While Takaungu indicated a greater agreement with Section VIII: 1 “I would send my children outside the village for a better secondary education” as predicted, the difference with Shirazi’s response was a mere 0.18. Admittedly, there is no secondary school within Shirazi, so to send their children to secondary school, people are required to compromise the distance to some extent. In contrast, Takaungu has a secondary school, and yet the villagers suggested that they prefer that their children

---

88 Here, I am particularly referring to the Section VIII: 2, “Going to school is important today because: __________.” One of the multiple choices presented to respondents is, (a) “It is my right to do so.”
89 The results also failed to reject the null hypothesis.
90 As explained in Chapter Three, this is one of the contextual issues of the survey, where the questions failed to take into account the different village circumstances. While all respondents interpreted the question accordingly, the results could have been skewed by minor faults and biases. Nevertheless in both villages, people suggested that they hope to send their children to a better high school, only if they had the financial capacity to do so. In other words, they interpreted the statement in such a way that questioned their ability to afford a secondary education, instead of their willingness to allow the children to leave the community. The tendency toward such an interpretation was more commonly observed in Shirazi. This suggests that the cost of education is still an important factor that prevents Shirazi children from continuing with their education.
attend a better school regardless of how distant the school might be from the village.91

The results suggest that both villages almost equally recognize the importance of education. Interestingly, Shirazi villagers exhibit a greater agreement to the idea that people with education are more respected than wazee, the elders (Section III: 6).

Shirazi’s response is 4.82, and Takaungu’s is 4.49. Unlike the prediction that Takaungu would indicate a greater preference for listening to educated people over wazee, Shirazi villagers also agree that education is important.92

4.2.9. Technology

The major concerns of this section are the levels of availability and the ways villagers make use of technology, namely telecommunication devices. The more integral long-distance communication—via mobile phones and email—is to the community, the more we can suggest that the community is exerting a type of social solidarity outside of the village. And to the contrary, we can predict that the higher levels of importance placed on face-to-face communications would likely display the village’s higher adherence to social networks promoted by long-standing interpersonal cohesiveness.

Drawing on Putnam’s observation in Bowling Alone, we can also argue that people’s isolation and growing inclination toward private activities in an advanced society is reinforced by the spread of modern technology, namely mass media, like

---

91 However, it must be clarified, as explained in Chapter Two, that Kenyan public secondary schools usually send out invitations to students based on the students’ score for the KCPE exam. Students and their families select a school from the set of schools where the invitations were sent. Therefore, unless the student is attending a private school, where to go to school is not determined based on a fully autonomous decision of the family.

92 The percentage distribution of responses by categories is also very similar for both villages (See Appendix Survey I, Section VIII: 2).
television and Internet. Putnam predicts that watching television is negatively associated with social connectedness because it provides “pseudopersonal connections to others,” which “allow[s] social ties to be divorced from physical encounters” (2000, 242). From this, we can predict that Takaungu, which contains more households that have constant access to television, would indicate lower levels of engagement with the community.

Based on the results of Section IX: 3, “Communication in person can be trusted more than communication via technology,” we can suggest that Shirazi values interpersonal connectedness to a greater degree than Takaungu. The means were 5.51 (i.e. in the range of “generally agree” to “definitely agree”) and 4.82 (i.e. in the range of “moderately agree” to “generally agree”), respectively, and the difference was 0.69, which is smaller than was predicted. This is at the five percent significance level, allowing a fairly high level of confidence that the results were due to actual differences between the populations.

This outcome is supported by the difference between Shirazi and Takaungu’s perception of long-distance communication and their involvement with the dissemination of information. First, the form of public announcements adopted in each village depicts Shirazi’s greater conformity to the idea that face-to-face communication is more trustworthy. Say there is a village meeting that invites communal attendance. Unlike Takaungu, where one posts written notifications on various landmarks, Shirazi hires an mpiga mbiu, or “town crier,” who goes around on a bicycle from one subsection to another and orally spreads the announcement.93

---

93 The “town crier” who works for Shirazi comes from the neighboring Bodo village. Shirazi always hires this same individual. It is unclear as to why Shirazi does not hire an individual
Other times, a villager visit households, one by one, to invite participants to join a cause. Interviewees often suggested that conversation in person prevents one from deceiving others; they also stated that one convinces others more effectively. “Mtu hakatai mwito, hukata aitwalo”—“A person does not object to being called; he objects to what he is called for.” As this Swahili proverb epitomizes, face-to-face interactions serve as the baseline of interpersonal relationships in Shirazi.

This is not to suggest that technology-mediated communication is absent in Shirazi. Out of all the modern telecommunication appliances, cell phones are the most fundamental source of long-distance communication in both villages. However, while most owners of cell phones in Shirazi are working men and mothers, those who utilize cell phones in Takaungu also include primary and secondary school students, especially among the wealthier Swahili households. Hence, it was initially observed that telecommunication devices, including those associated with mass media like televisions, were relatively more diffused in Takaungu, and access to these items was somewhat fairly distributed among the Swahili individuals. Nevertheless, the importance of cell phones, reinforced by the relatively high agreements (5.68 in Shirazi and 5.73 in Takaungu) with Section IX: 1, “Phones, computer, television and the Internet are very important for my daily village living,” seem to imply that the usage of these devices is crucial in enhancing interpersonal relationships in both villages.

As touched on in Chapter Three, it is likely that most respondents were referring strictly to cell phones when they indicated that these devices are important in their daily living.

within the village. It is also uncertain whether this individual from Bodo is a family member of Shirazi residents, which would explain his commitment to serving the Shirazi community and also Shirazi’s loyalty in hiring him.

94 As touched on in Chapter Three, it is likely that most respondents were referring strictly to cell phones when they indicated that these devices are important in their daily living.
Particularly regarding Internet usage, however, the following outcome overturns our hypothesis. Shirazi indicated relatively more frequent Internet usage than Takaungu (Section IX: 2), where people seem to have easier access to cyber cafés at neighboring towns. The average response in Shirazi was 1.75, whereas the response was 1.10 in Takaungu. The difference of 0.65 is at the highest confidence level. Moreover, the percentage of the population who suggested that they never surf the Internet was 82.1 in Shirazi but 96.8—considerably higher—in Takaungu. While these percentages indicate that people rarely utilize the Internet in either village, the greater frequency of Shirazi’s Internet usage in spite of their limited access is worth scrutiny.

Referring to Putnam’s observations in America, we initially suggested that enhanced access, especially to television and the Internet, is a potential cause for individuals’ isolation from the civic sphere. For example, Putnam perceives the “allure of electronic entertainment” to be a factor that leads to growing individualism and increasing “private socializing,” which he argues to be one cause of the decline in America’s community involvement (2000, 266). Based on this account, we can suppose that the more integral the use of modern communicative electronics is to one’s living, the more isolated one is from active face-to-face interactions with the larger public. According to this idea, the quantitative finding that Shirazi accesses the

---

95 “Private socializing” refers to entertaining at home. Putnam in fact gives an example of playing cards, pointing out that in the short run, people prefer private activities and interactions to actively engaging with/in the public. In the long run and by “generational forces,” Putnam argues, people participate less in activities that are associated with public engagement, such as volunteering, religious observance, voting, club meetings, organizing groups or committees, and even family dining, which are considered to be public norms (2000, 266).
Internet more frequently than Takaungu implies that “private socializing” appeals more to the former.

However, technology-mediated communication and transmission of information through media might constitute highly social activities in rural villages. This seems more true in Shirazi where people do not own televisions like many Swahili households in Takaungu. On the other hand, since a greater number of households in Takaungu own a television and other telecommunication devices, it was predicted that the residents would indicate a higher level of isolation and individualistic tendencies. Back to the discussion of Internet usage, we can similarly suggest that Internet entails socializing for Shirazi villagers.

Contrary to the proposition, the Takaungu residents expressed greater disagreement with Section IX: 4, “I tend to be by myself when I use modern appliances for attaining information and entertainment.” The results are 2.47 and 2.08 (both in the range of “moderately disagree” and “generally disagree”) for Shirazi and Takaungu. However, the former’s greater agreement with individualistic tendencies might be explained by the imbalance in gender distribution between the two communities and hence, the difference in the proportion of respondents who customarily access such technological appliances. For example, the customers of the

---

96 One commonly practiced commercial activity and public entertainment in both villages is the “video theater,” as described in Chapter Two. The owner rents movies and screens them periodically on a television. Seasonally, the owner also screens television programs, such as sports games and soap operas. The customers range from primary school children to adults who are above the age of 50; they pay 10 to 25 KSH (12 to 30 US cents) for each occasion, depending on the program and the season. The theater facilitates a space for face-to-face public interaction and the extensive sharing of information.

97 We must note that the difference between the populations is not statistically significance.
“video theater” are largely comprised of male residents. While boys and men are attending the screenings after school and work, girls are expected to help their mothers with household chores. In Takaungu, however, a 39-year-old female resident suggested that girls go to video screenings as well as men. Therefore, perhaps we can conclude that relatively more survey respondents from Takaungu enjoy access to social activities that are mediated by technology. By contrast, Shirazi’s respondents—77 percent are women—might not have been as habitually involved in these social entertainments as the Takaungu’s.

How else can we understand the result indicating that Shirazi individuals are relatively more isolated from their community than Takaungu? Taking into account that Internet access is only available outside of the village, and also that it is often utilized as a means of long-distance communication, a possible interpretation is that Shirazis are keener than Takaungus on maintaining relationships with people who reside outside of the village. Touching on the progressive Internet usage among the Americans in the late 1990s, Putnam posits a question:

---

98 Shirazi people go to the “video theater” in the adjacent Barabarani village; due to the lack of electricity, this business has not been developed in Shirazi, except for the occasional small-scale operation—using electricity generated with a car battery—organized by a young male resident in Shirazi (See Chapter Two).

99 On the other hand, 48 percent of the respondents from Takaungu were women (See Table 3.1 in Chapter Three).

100 To clarify, the mobile phones that the general Shirazi population utilize do not have Internet applications. If people want to use the Internet, they usually visit Ukunda. Also, some of the Shirazi respondents who indicated that they surf the Internet “monthly” or “weekly” were women, who do not leave the village as frequently as men do. It is possible that these female respondents were referring to the case of their husbands. Also, since a majority of the respondents did not know of the “Internet,” it is also likely that they misinterpreted the term, i.e. as a mobile phone.
Will the Internet become predominantly a means of active, social communication or a means of passive, private entertainment? Will computer-mediated communication “crowd-out” face-to-face ties? (2000, 179)

Putnam’s recognition of technology’s multi-faceted nature is worth attention.

Referring to sociologist Barry Wellman and communication specialists, Putnam nevertheless submits that technology-mediated communication complements but does not substitute for frequent face-to-face contacts. In other words, the primary role of telecommunication is to reinforce already existing face-to-face relationships; it is not to replace or create the same interpersonal connectedness as that enabled by direct contacts (Putnam 2000, 179) Therefore technology can be regarded as the means of fostering preexisting traditional social ties, notwithstanding the importance of face-to-face contacts in intensifying connectedness between people.

This leads us to the following twofold view. On one hand, Shirazi’s greater sense of importance placed on telecommunication signals that the community is relatively more concerned with maintaining their traditional social networks in spite of a distance, than Takaungu. In a sense, this reflects tightness of bond between the

---

101 But to follow his approach, we must first acknowledge that the levels of socioeconomic advancement in both Shirazi and Takaungu are not comparable with that of the United States. Therefore, technological diffusion in the villages is not only lower in degree but might also be qualitatively different. This means that introduction of one television in the community might be relatively more significant than in America. For example, depending on the social circumstances, watching a television, listening to the radio, or communicating on the phone can be a social and interactive activity—rather than isolated and private.

102 Putnam posits, however, that computer-mediated communication nevertheless has the potential to allow America to recover from its declining social capital: “I conclude that the Internet will not automatically offset the decline in more conventional forms of social capital, but that it has that potential. In fact, it is hard to imagine solving our contemporary civic dilemmas without computer-mediated communication” (2000, 180).

103 In addition, if Shirazi’s Internet users individually, yet frequently keep in touch with say their family members who are away from the village, we might suggest that the users are maintaining their “traditional” networks.
people, thereby implying an abundance of social capital in Shirazi. On the other hand, if the residents only cared about maintaining social ties with insiders who are *not* physically present in the community, it implies that these residents are in turn underplaying their interpersonal social relationships with others who currently reside in the village.
CONCLUSION

MODERNIZATION AND VILLAGE SOLIDARITY: EXPLORING THE POSSIBILITY OF RECONCILIATION

*Umoja ni nguvu, utengano ni udhaifu [Unity is strength, disunity is weakness].*
—Swahili Proverb

The impetus for this project has been to seek a possibility for harmonization between the forces of social change and traditionally-maintained social relationships in Kenyan village life. My emotional perplexity about accepting the reality—that Shirazi was indeed “changing”—almost impulsively established a foundation for this project. I began by hypothesizing that traditional ties are more observable in communities that are less exposed to the modern economy. I have assumed throughout this work that social capital is more abundant in communities that keep traditional forms of solidarity alive, basing their social relationships on trust and reciprocity.

I must admit: My overarching view that interpersonal connectedness is often compromised in modern societies has not been changed by the findings throughout my project. It is unclear whether that view will ever change. But if someone asked me whether I have found a remedy, or at least a hope that village communities do not necessarily have to suffer the loss of interpersonal ties—that they are capable of finding means of development that endorse a sense of community—I would concur and say, “absolutely.”
Followed by empirical analyses, my surveys covered numerous topics that were meant to reveal the interconnectedness between social relationships and social structures like institutions and norms. Reflecting both the theoretical and practical complexity of the link between modernization and social capital, the analyses demonstrated that most responses, even the ones that complied with the initial predictions, were entitled to multiple expositions that propelled our eyes to new viewpoints.

I believe that the analyses have uncovered at least three facets that provide us with an alternative outlook for understanding social capital in modernizing village communities. First, the exploration of social relationships surrounding issues of education, health care and technology indicated that good education, modern medical treatment, and communication via phones and emails are all critical for the enhancement of villagers’ lives. Instead of being threats to traditional ties, they are capable of supporting pre-existing connections and promoting stronger association between people. Anthropologist Margaret Trawick captures this premise beautifully in her observation in a Tamil village: “Sometimes a change that might be expected to kill tradition revitalized it” (1992, 7).

Despite the fact that traditional forms of social capital are often understood to be “exclusive,” we saw that Shirazi often indicated greater acceptance of outside

---

104 Both Shirazi and Takaungu villagers likely consider access to modern health care institutions and education to be very important for their wellbeing. Linking this to the idea that “family” constitutes a large part of people’s happiness in both villages, we can suggest that children’s (both boys and girls) welfare both directly and indirectly contribute to a community’s empowerment.

105 When I state this, I particularly think of Durkheim’s conceptualization of mechanical solidarity and “segmentary” society as I described in Chapter One. Putnam, along with other renowned theorists, also suggests that the “dark side” of social capital is when the community
communities. The tight-knit community also exhibited tolerance for “outsiders,” notwithstanding the strength of ties “inside.” We also observed that the bond could exist not only within the community via face-to-face interactions, but also between individuals who are physically at a distance. With the help of technology and recurring opportunities to reconnect, these observations indicate a possibility that greater “bonding” can occur beyond the realm of physical contact.

The last dimension is that there is a possibility that mechanisms other than traditional social networks are contributing to Takaungu’s observed cohesion: for example, the tendency to cooperate. Even though I did not have adequate information to analyze the effect of institutional coordination on these villages, we have nevertheless discerned that certain institutional mechanisms were present to mediate the relationships between actors.

Whether or not institutional coordination adequately serves as a foundation for Durkheimean organic solidarity by replacing traditional ties is an important yet a different question, which I intentionally avoided in order to focus on the scope of my study. However, by incorporating a longitudinal perspective to examine the generational changes in a community, we can possibly draw a more comprehensive picture of how social capital might evolve over time. If modernization was a path for every community to experience by default, is there a possibility for formal, institutional mechanisms to retain and complement rather than replace the interpersonal social ties? Finding an answer to this question would alleviate the friction between development and culture.

---

is tightly connected based on ideologies and beliefs that not only exclude but also might harm others who do not comply with them (Putnam 2000).
One thing is clear: Everything changes in this world. Human connections are also susceptible to subversion, but we do not necessarily notice until we realize that the relationship with our neighbors and colleagues is no longer based on the mutuality of unmediated trust. I do think that the villages would consider my claims on connectedness and solidarity to be banalities; but I still believe that they embody a unity reminiscent of what many contemporary societies, including Putnam’s America, seem to have forgotten. Shirazi and Takaungu have opened our eyes to an idea coherent and important: That social capital is a strength in social relationships that can be harnessed to ensure that that very solidarity is not undermined in the midst of change. At the end of the day, the long-established networks in the Kenyan villages are something that all humanity could learn from and emulate.
Map I: Roadmap to Shirazi from Mombasa.
Map II: Roadmap to Takaungu from Mombasa and Kilifi
### Table I: Population by Sex, 5-Year Age Groups and Highest Level of Education Completed: Kwale District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Pre-Primary</th>
<th>Std 1-4</th>
<th>Std 5-8</th>
<th>Form 1-4</th>
<th>Form 5-6</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5-9 Male</strong></td>
<td>13,516</td>
<td>16,256</td>
<td>5,533</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,903</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14,844</td>
<td>14,313</td>
<td>5,276</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28,360</td>
<td>30,569</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>10,809</td>
<td>5,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10-14 Male</strong></td>
<td>6,583</td>
<td>4,619</td>
<td>18,802</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,898</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>14,763</td>
<td>3,917</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,481</td>
<td>7,870</td>
<td>33,565</td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15-19 Male</strong></td>
<td>4,109</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>6,905</td>
<td>11,245</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>26,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,694</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>5,378</td>
<td>9,868</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,013</td>
<td>28,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,003</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>12,283</td>
<td>21,133</td>
<td>4,047</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>54,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20-24 Male</strong></td>
<td>2,531</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>18,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,552</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>3,564</td>
<td>8,769</td>
<td>3,392</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>26,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,083</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>6,852</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td>6,937</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>44,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25-29 Male</strong></td>
<td>2,240</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>7,173</td>
<td>4,026</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>16,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,314</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>2,406</td>
<td>6,021</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>20,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,554</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4,670</td>
<td>13,194</td>
<td>6,783</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>36,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30-34 Male</strong></td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1,543</td>
<td>4,817</td>
<td>3,251</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>12,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6,914</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>12,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,027</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>7,602</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>25,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>35-39 Male</strong></td>
<td>2,493</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>3,579</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>10,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>12,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,697</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2,427</td>
<td>5,281</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>22,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>40-44 Male</strong></td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1,063</td>
<td>2,112</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>8,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,462</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>10,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,763</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,641</td>
<td>2,795</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>18,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45-49 Male</strong></td>
<td>3,973</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>7,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6,933</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,906</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>2,082</td>
<td>1,319</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>16,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50-54 Male</strong></td>
<td>3,675</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>6,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,922</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>12,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>55-59 Male</strong></td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3,876</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,071</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>8,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>60+ Male</strong></td>
<td>8,797</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>11,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,923</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>10,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,720</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>21,973</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Age NS Male | 39 | 5 | 15 | 17 | 9 | - | 2 | 9 | 96 |
| Female | 77 | 9 | 7 | 19 | 7 | - | - | 15 | 134 |
| Total | 116 | 14 | 22 | 36 | 16 | - | 2 | 24 | 230 |
| Total Male | 56,668 | 21,911 | 44,350 | 45,153 | 19,265 | 862 | 584 | 6,794 | 195,487 |
| Female | 103,813 | 18,575 | 35,317 | 34,796 | 11,483 | 278 | 223 | 6,216 | 210,700 |
| Total | 160,481 | 40,486 | 79,667 | 79,948 | 30,748 | 1,140 | 817 | 13,010 | 406,187 |

**Source:** National Population and Housing Census 1999, Vol. I.

**Notes:** Shirazi was part of Kwale District prior to 2007. The region overlaps the present-day Msambweni District, but the area covered is different. Kwale District nevertheless represents Shirazi’s demographic conditions.
### Table II: Population by Sex, 5-Year Age Groups and Highest Level of Education Completed: Kilifi District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14,153</td>
<td>16,307</td>
<td>30,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,559</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>9,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19,712</td>
<td>20,629</td>
<td>40,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5,559</td>
<td>4,322</td>
<td>9,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12,583</td>
<td>17,551</td>
<td>30,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,142</td>
<td>21,873</td>
<td>39,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,662</td>
<td>4,019</td>
<td>6,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,419</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>17,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,081</td>
<td>12,107</td>
<td>24,188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,709</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>3,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>11,114</td>
<td>6,697</td>
<td>17,811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,823</td>
<td>8,742</td>
<td>21,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>6,574</td>
<td>7,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,586</td>
<td>13,031</td>
<td>21,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,903</td>
<td>19,605</td>
<td>29,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,494</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8,678</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>9,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10,172</td>
<td>2,066</td>
<td>12,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>2,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9,688</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>10,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>1,028</td>
<td>12,628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2,583</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,167</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>10,295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,750</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>13,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,227</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,975</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,202</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>11,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6,915</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9,960</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>5,511</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8,261</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>8,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,297</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>20,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total     |        |        |       |
| Male      | 49,420 | 35,601 | 85,021 |
| Female    | 115,326| 21,887 | 137,213|
| Total     | 164,746| 57,488 | 222,234|

**Source:** National Population and Housing Census 1999, Vol. I.
Table III: Population by Sex, 5-Year Age Group and School Attendance: Kwale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>At School</th>
<th>Left School</th>
<th>Never Attended</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Male</td>
<td>21,147</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>13,358</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>38,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18,901</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>14,674</td>
<td>2,598</td>
<td>37,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40,048</td>
<td>1,944</td>
<td>28,030</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>75,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Male</td>
<td>24,664</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>6,530</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>34,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19,226</td>
<td>2,959</td>
<td>10,807</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>33,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>43,880</td>
<td>5,900</td>
<td>17,337</td>
<td>1,412</td>
<td>68,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Male</td>
<td>12,349</td>
<td>9,308</td>
<td>4,077</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>26,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,966</td>
<td>10,399</td>
<td>9,811</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>26,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,315</td>
<td>19,707</td>
<td>13,888</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>54,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 Male</td>
<td>1,395</td>
<td>14,241</td>
<td>2,505</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>18,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>9,472</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>25,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>29,541</td>
<td>11,977</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>44,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 Male</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>13,524</td>
<td>2,212</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>16,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>11,275</td>
<td>8,262</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>20,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>24,799</td>
<td>10,474</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>36,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 Male</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>9,965</td>
<td>2,096</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>12,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>5,685</td>
<td>6,862</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>12,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>15,650</td>
<td>8,958</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>25,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 Male</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>7,849</td>
<td>2,470</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>10,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3,808</td>
<td>8,149</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>12,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>11,657</td>
<td>10,619</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>22,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 Male</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4,968</td>
<td>3,285</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>8,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,814</td>
<td>8,392</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>10,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>6,802</td>
<td>11,677</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>18,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 Male</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1,184</td>
<td>6,892</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>8,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>4,993</td>
<td>10,846</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>16,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2,265</td>
<td>3,645</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>6,036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>5,882</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2,910</td>
<td>9,527</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>12,666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,352</td>
<td>3,183</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3,853</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>7,036</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8,831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ Male</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>2,285</td>
<td>8,735</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>9,844</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>10,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>2,847</td>
<td>18,579</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>21,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeNS Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Male| 60,324    | 73,510      | 56,066         | 5,547      | 195,467|
| Female    | 47,460    | 54,960      | 102,975        | 5,305      | 210,700|
| Total     | 107,784   | 128,470     | 159,061        | 10,852     | 406,167|

### Table IV. Population by Sex, 5-Year Age Group and School Attendance: Kilifi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>At School</th>
<th>Left School</th>
<th>Never Attended</th>
<th>Not Stated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-9 Male</td>
<td>23,751</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>13,989</td>
<td>3,416</td>
<td>42,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21,037</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>16,133</td>
<td>3,444</td>
<td>41,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44,788</td>
<td>2,054</td>
<td>30,122</td>
<td>6,860</td>
<td>83,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 Male</td>
<td>29,957</td>
<td>2,902</td>
<td>5,597</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>39,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23,773</td>
<td>3,002</td>
<td>10,488</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>37,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>53,730</td>
<td>5,904</td>
<td>15,985</td>
<td>1,411</td>
<td>77,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 Male</td>
<td>16,423</td>
<td>9,579</td>
<td>2,630</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>29,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10,589</td>
<td>10,681</td>
<td>9,345</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>30,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,012</td>
<td>20,260</td>
<td>12,175</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>50,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 Male</td>
<td>2,145</td>
<td>15,660</td>
<td>1,685</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>19,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>16,731</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>27,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>32,391</td>
<td>11,018</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>47,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 Male</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>14,005</td>
<td>1,262</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>15,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11,825</td>
<td>8,524</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>20,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>25,830</td>
<td>9,816</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>36,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34 Male</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10,399</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>12,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>6,215</td>
<td>8,545</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>15,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>16,614</td>
<td>10,015</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>27,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39 Male</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3,652</td>
<td>9,621</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>13,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>12,069</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>24,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44 Male</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>5,493</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,104</td>
<td>10,091</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>7,597</td>
<td>12,651</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>20,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49 Male</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4,333</td>
<td>3,201</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>7,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,204</td>
<td>7,921</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>5,537</td>
<td>11,122</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>16,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54 Male</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2,818</td>
<td>3,019</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>6,873</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3,599</td>
<td>9,892</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59 Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1,899</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>5,466</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2,374</td>
<td>8,602</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>11,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+ Male</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>8,190</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>12,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>11,939</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>13,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4,785</td>
<td>20,129</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>25,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeNS Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Male</td>
<td>73,327</td>
<td>80,214</td>
<td>48,898</td>
<td>5,629</td>
<td>208,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57,332</td>
<td>58,873</td>
<td>114,383</td>
<td>5,909</td>
<td>236,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>130,659</td>
<td>139,087</td>
<td>163,281</td>
<td>11,538</td>
<td>444,565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey I: Village Household Survey Sample

SUMMER 2010 VILLAGE SOCIAL NETWORK SURVEY
Mikako Tai

Village and subsection: Date:
Name: Starting Time:
Age: Ending Time:
Gender: M / F
Education level:
Marital status:
Number of children:
Age and gender of children:

Scale:
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6

[Definitely disagree/ generally disagree/ moderately disagree/ moderately agree/
generally agree/ definitely agree]

* * *

SECTION I: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

1. Compared to ten years ago, my life has become better because of the material
goods and opportunities that are available from the outside.
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6
2. My household is at an equal financial status as my relatives and neighbors.
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6

SECTION II: FINANCE

1. What percentage of household income comes from remittances?
0%-----------------25%-----------------50%-----------------75%-----------------100%
2. Father (husband) brings the most cash to my family. Yes / No. If No, who? ____________
3. Money lending is very important in this village.
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6
4. I can trust the borrower that the money will be repaid.106
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6
5. I can lend money without relying on interest and/or collateral.
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6
6. I trust borrowing from relatives and friends more than bank loans.
1-----------------2-----------------3-----------------4-----------------5-----------------6

106 I am confident that the borrower will repay the money.
SECTION III: POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

1. I am a member of a political party/group, ________________.

2. I believe that my political leader makes good changes to my community.
   1------------2---------3---------4---------5---------6

3. I attend the village meetings:
   Never------Rarely------Sometimes------Frequently------Often------Always
   1------------2---------3---------4---------5---------6

4. The village chairman is an effective leader.
   1------------2---------3---------4---------5---------6

5. My voice is reflected in political decisions made in the village meetings.
   1------------2---------3---------4---------5---------6

6. Today, educated people’s opinions are more valued than elderly people’s opinions.
   1------------2---------3---------4---------5---------6

7. I participate in village meetings because: (Select one.)
   a. It is villagers’ responsibility
   b. I am hoping for a change
   c. I see them as social gathering
   d. I want to hear others’ opinions
   e. My opinion will make a difference
   f. Others specify:

8. I do NOT participate in village meetings because: (Select one.)
   a. I am too busy with other chores
   b. My participation will not make any difference
   c. I would rather use the time for myself; it’s a waste of time
   d. I am too lazy
   e. Meetings are too complex to understand
   f. Others specify:

SECTION IV: LIFESTYLE

1. What do you do most frequently after having dinner and before bedtime? (Select one.)
   a. Chat and relax with family and friends
   b. Listen to the radio or watch TV
   c. Surf the Internet
   d. Do chores
   e. Go for a walk
   f. Others specify:

2. Which of these things are you doing less/more now than you used to, five years ago?
   a. Spending time at home Less------Same------More
   b. Spending time in the village Less------Same------More
   c. Going shopping Less------Same------More
   d. Attending religious services Less------Same------More
   e. Visiting relatives/friends who live nearby Less------Same------More
f. Visiting relatives/friends who do NOT live nearby
   Less------Same------More

g. Going out to places for entertainment
   Less------Same------More

3. In what ways do you get a real sense of belonging? (Select one.)
   a. Family
   b. Friends
   c. Co-workers
   d. Neighbors
   e. Mosques/Churches
   f. Local community
   g. Local newspaper
   h. Groups or Organizations
   i. Others specify:

4. What is a “good life?” (Select one.)
   a. Happy marriage
   b. Children
   c. Material luxuries and good technology
   d. A lot of money
   e. Job that contributes to the welfare of society
   f. Having meals everyday
   g. Others specify:

SECTION V: INTER/INTRAVILLAGE RELATIONSHIPS

1. I trust the people within the village more than the people outside of the village.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

2. People outside the village help make socio-economic improvements in this village.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

3. I am often involved with political, economic, or social group or organization outside of the village.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

4. I have more friends and relatives outside than inside the village.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

SECTION VI: WORK

1. Working physically close to my family and friends is important for the family to be united.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

2. What is the longest time-period you were away from the village for work?

3. There are more job opportunities than 15 years ago.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

4. I would rather travel far from my community to find a better-paying job than stay in the village and work for the community.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6

5. My colleagues and I cooperate more than compete.
   1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6
6. I am paid less than workers in Mombasa.

SECTION VII: HEALTH CARE

1. I am in good health condition (I have no major health issue.).

2. It is physically convenient to send an ill person to a medical institution for health care.

3. I listen to elderly people’s traditional knowledge and advice on health care.

4. What is the burden of accessing health care? (Select one.)
   a. Physical distance to the nearest medical institution
   b. Cost of health care
   c. I cannot trust the doctors and/or western medication
   d. There is no burden
   e. Others specify:

SECTION VIII: EDUCATION

1. I would send my children outside the village for a better secondary education.

2. Going to school is important today because: (Select one.)
   a. It is my right to do so
   b. Education helps one get a job
   c. Education helps one get very rich
   d. It will help the village develop
   e. It is where children get to know children from the outside
   f. Older generation lived a tough life without education
   g. Others specify:

SECTION IX: TECHNOLOGY

1. Phone, computer, television, and Internet are all very important for my daily village living.

2. I surf the Internet.

3. Communication in person can be trusted more than communication via technology.

4. I tend to be by myself when I use modern appliances for information and entertainment (radio, Internet, cell phone, movies, TV, etc.).
Survey II: Village Household Survey Sample - Kiswahili

Summer 2010 Village Social Network Survey

Section I:
1. Kulinganisha na miaka kumi iliopita, maisha yakao yamekua bora kwa sababu ya vifaa na uwezo upatikanae nje?
2. Nyumba yakao iko sawa kuichumi kama familia yakao na majirani?

Section II:
1. Ni asilimia ngapi ya mapato ya numbani ya nayo patipana kutoka nje?
2. Je mzee manaleta pesa kwa familia? Ndio / La. Kama la, nani?
3. Je naweza kumuamini muombaji anaweza kulipa?
4. Je naweza kukupesha pesa bila kutegemea marupurupu ama masharti?
5. Je unaamini kuomba pesa kutoka familia yako na marafiki zaidi kuliko benki?

Section III:
1. Ni mfuasi wa chama gani cha kisiasa:
2. Ninaamini mwana siasa wangu analeta mabadiliko, azuri kwa jamii yangu.
3. Ninaudhuria mikutano ya kijiji.
4. Mkuu wa kijiji ni kiungozi mzuri.
5. Sauti yangu inasikizwa kwa wamuzi wa kisiasa katika mikutano ya kijiji.
6. Leo, maoni wa wasomi ni bora kuliko maoni wa wa zee.
7. Ninashiriki kwa mikutano ya kijiji kwa sababu:
   a. Ni jukumu ya wana kijiji
   b. Ninatarajia mabadiliko
   c. Ninaona mikutano ni mjumisko wa jamii
   d. Ninataka kusikia maoni ya wingine
   e. Maoni yangu yataleta mabadiliko
   f. Wingine:
8. Siudhuri mikutano ya kijiji kwa sababu:
   a. Niko na kazi nyangi
   b. Kujumuika kwangu hakulete mabadiliko
   c. Ni kupoteza wakati
   d. Mimi ni mvivu
   e. Mikutano mingine haieleweki
   f. Wingine:

Section IV:
1. Unafanya nini kila mara badaa ya kula chakula cha usiku cha kabula ya kulala?
   a. Kuzumgumzo na kupumzika na marafiki
   b. Kusilikiza radio
   c. Kupeku kutaandao
   d. Kufanya kazi na familia
   e. Kutenda kutembea
   f. Wingine:
2. Ni vitu gani katiya hawa unafanya zaidi/kidogo saa hizi ukilinganisha na miaka kuni na tano iliopita? (Kidogo---kama kawaidia---zaidi)
a. Kutumia wakati wako nyumbani
b. Kutumia wakati wako kijijini
c. Kuenda madukani
d. Kuenda kuibada
e. Kutembelea ndugu na marafiki wanoishi karibu
f. Kutembelea ndugu na marafiki waliombali
g. Kuenda sehem za starehe

3. Utategemea nani katiya hawa?
   a. Familia yako
   b. Marafiki
   c. Fanya kazi wen zako
   d. Majirani
   e. Mskitini/kanisani

4. Ni maisha gani mazuri?
   a. Ndoa ya furaha
   b. Ya kuna watoto
   c. Ya kuna vitu vya starehe (teknolojia)
   d. Kuna pesa nyingi, utajiri
   e. Kazi inayochangia maendeleo ya jamii
   f. Kupata chakula kila siku
   g. Wingine:

Section V:
1. Unaamini watu wa kijijini zaidi kuliko wan je?
2. Watu nje ya kijiji wanasaidia kukuza uchumi na utamaduni wa kijiji hiki?
3. Najiusisha mara kwa mara na siasa, uchumi, na vikundi au mashirika ya jamii nje ya kijiji?
4. Una ndugu na marafiki wengi nje ya kijiji kushinda ndani?

Section VI:
1. Kufanya kazi karibu na familia na marafiki ni muhimu kwa familia kwa pamoja.
2. Ni wakati gani mrefu ulikuwa nje ya kijiji kwa kazi?
3. Kuna nafasi nyingi za kazi kuliko miaka kumi na tano iliopita?
4. Afadhali ni safari mbali na jamii yangu kutafuta kazi inayolipa vizuri kuliko kufanya kazi na jamii.
5. Marafiki na wewe mnashirikiana kuliko kushindana?
6. Unalipwa pesa kidogo kuliko wa fanyi kazi wa Mombasa au mji mkubwa?

Section VII:
1. Uko na afya nzuri.
2. Ni rahisi kupeleka mgonjwa kwa kituo cha kiafya kwa huduma.
3. Nasikiza usia na ujuzi wa wazee kuhusu huduma za afya ya kienyeji?
4. Ni mzigo (shida, tabu) gani wa kupata huduma za kiafya?
   a. Umbali
   b. Garama
   c. Huamini madakdari
Section VIII:

1. Utawapeleka watoto wako nje ya kijiji kwa masomo mazuri zaidi ya shule ya upili?
2. Kuenda shule ni muhimu kwa wakati huu kwa sababu:
   - a. Ni haki yako
   - b. Elimu inasaidia kupata kazi
   - c. Elimu inasaidia kupata utajiri
   - d. Elimu inasaidia maendeleo na kijiji
   - e. Ni mahali watoto wanapojua na watoto wingine kutoka nje
   - f. Wazee wa kitambo waliishi maisha ya tabu bila masomo
   - g. Wingine:

Section IX:

1. Rununu (simu), talakirishi (television), utandao (computer), na runinga (radio) ni muhimu sana kwa maisha yako ya kila siku?
2. Unaangalia Intanet?
3. Mawasiliano ya ana kwa ana yanaweza kuaminika zaidi kuliko mawasiliano kupitia teknolojia?
4. Unatumia vyombo vya kisasa, kama radio na television, peke yako?
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