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The theory of social capital has been well discussed within the field of Political Science. This paper aims to study how social capital is gender related within gender divided groups in Babati, Tanzania. The study maps out the distribution of social and political trust within these groups. The material consists of 50 interviews with men and women that participate in informal, voluntary groups in Babati. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods has been used to analyze the trust distribution between men and women. The data that is analyzed through the theory of Robert Putnam and trough) Gidengil and O’Neill’s criticism of Putnam, claiming that social capital is imbued in gender patterns, inequalities and hierarchies.

The result shows small variety between men and women’s social and political trust, with the exemption of women possessing stronger trust towards court judges than men do. Gender patterns can be found in the motivations for trust and distrust among the respondents, which suggests that, the assumptions of Gidengil and O’Neill are valid.
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1. Introduction

1.1 Introduction

The importance of a vigorous civil society has been well debated within the field of Political Science. The concept of social capital was introduced in the 1830s when Alexis de Tocqueville emphasized the role of associations and club activities for the functioning of American democracy. Tocqueville argued that when citizens cooperated in social, economical and political matters they developed a strong collective capacity that enabled them to work together for common goods. Therefore, the importance of associations contributed to a vigorous democracy, and this is what later was distinguished as a society with strong social capital (Hadenius 2006:40, 41).

Pierre Bourdieu launched the concept of social capital in the 1970s as a resource that can be distinguished in different forms of capital, such as cultural, symbolic and social capital. The different forms of capital are what explains societal power relations and reproduce class structures (Bourdieu 1977). In the 1990s, Putnam redeveloped Bourdieu’s concept and defined social capital as the features in societal organizations like trust, norms and networks that improve societal efficacy through facilitating operations. Putnam argues that trust is the determining component in social capital (Putnam 1993:201, 205, 206). Face-to-face interactions in organizations, associations and groups are what are seen as creating social capital because of the socialization effects on democratic and cooperative values and norms (Hadenius 2006:40, 41, 43, 195).

The impacts and effects of strong social capital have been discussed and pressure has been put on developing countries to increase the amount of social capital to improve their democracy. Tanzania, in East Africa, is a male-dominated society where women have a subordinated position and men and women carry out different tasks and varying functions (UI 2007:31). Babati is a rural area in central Tanzanian and a good example of a context that gives great opportunities to study social capital according to gender. Babati is also an area where the social capital could be predicted as strong seen to the importance of its civil society in organizing daily life tasks.

This raises questions regarding the distribution of social capital among men and women because of the gender division in society. Do men and women possess similar and equal
amount of trust, or is there any variation of social capital? What generates social capital among men and women? And what are obstacles that hinder social capital in the Babati? These issues raised my interest for studying social capital according to gender in the Tanzanian context of a strong civil society with a clear gender division of labor and responsibility.

1.2 Aim and Questions

The aim is to study how social capital is gender related. The question formulations are:

• How is social and political trust distributed between men and women in Babati, Tanzania?
• What reasons do the respondents state for trust and distrust?

1.3 Delimitations

The study is delimited to focus on social capital only as trust, in the way that Fukuyama equates trust with social capital (Fukuyama 1995) and distinguish social capital as the components of social and political trust (see definitions in section 2.2.1.). When studying social capital according to gender, gender refers to the biological distinction between sexes and not to the socially construction of gender.

Social and political trusts have been studied at the micro level through interviews. Data has been gathered from 50 interviews from ten different groups in civil society, consisting of 25 male and 25 female respondents. Five members were interviewed from each group and there were five female groups and five male groups. It is an extensive study, with a large-n of cases (interview respondents) with gender as the variable. It is a cross-sectional study with non-experimental selection of interviewees that aims at mapping out the distribution of social and political trust among men and women within the ten groups. All interviews were held in Babati and no other data was collected from any other area.

1.4 Choice of Location

Babati is a town in the Manyara region in central Tanzania, between Arusha and Dodoma on 4°4’S and 35°45’E with a population estimated to about 65 000 people (Babati Town Council 2008:1). Tanzania is a male-dominated society where women have a subordinated position. In most villages, it is common that women work on the fields and look after their family and households, whilst political life is male-dominated. Tanzanian life has a comparatively clear gender division and traditional approach to female and male spheres in society (UI 2007:31).
The public sector carries out a small number of tasks compared to Scandinavian welfare programs. Instead of comprehensive public sector tasks, people organize daily life in networks, groups and organizations, in an informal way of cooperation. This is where, according to Putnam’s arguments, civil society would be rigorous and dense with strong social capital. The intension was to carry out the study in a setting where the civil society has a great importance and where clear gender division in society exists. Therefore, Babati is an interesting location to study social capital according to gender.

2. Methodology

2.1 Qualitative and Quantitative

The material for this study was gathered during a minor field study in Babati, Tanzania in November and December 2010 and was supported by Internationella Programkontoret. The study is based on qualitative and quantitative methods in combination to get a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena of social capital according to gender. The data consists of 50 interviews held with men and women in gender divided groups. The interviews combined closed yes- and no questions with open questions to let the respondent motivate its answer to the previous question. The closed yes- and no questions aimed to quantitatively measure social and political trust and the open questions to qualitatively study motivations of answers. Through combining statistical analysis with analyzing the answers to the open questions, the empirical analysis gives a broad and comprehensive understanding to describe the phenomenon (Bjereld 2002:16, 114).
The quantitative method is claimed to determine a quantity, and to measure something whilst the qualitative method aims to describe the quality of a phenomenon. The qualitative part seeks to understand the interviewees’ reality from their own perspective (Teorell & Svensson 2007:11, 264).

The quantitative method is used to measure social and political trust through structured interview questions. The qualitative element of this is seen when interpreting the respondents’ answers of the open questions as to why the respondent answered yes or no (Bjureld 2002:24; Teorell & Svensson 2007:265). Other methodological alternatives were difficult to carry out due to practical circumstances, time limits and local conditions.

The study focuses on the micro level of social capital and there is no intention to generalize the result on a bigger population than to the specific context of the ten groups in Babati. The phenomenon of gender divided groups in a male dominated society has to be studied within its unique prerequisite and context. To enable generalization the sample selection has to be representative for a bigger population. In this case, the sample selection is intentional to find specifically gender divided groups and do not represent a general condition that can be applied for a greater phenomenon outside of these specific groups.

The study is based on the approach to knowledge that all statement should be critically revised and that facts and information that is scientifically assured can be used to conclude general statements, such as statistic. When concluding, a deductive method is used to understand the distribution of men and women’s trust. Though, if the conclusions are correct and correspond with reality, does not have to be accurate (Thurén 2006:15, 16, 23).

2.2 Material

The study is mainly based on 50 interviews aiming to study the distribution of social and political trust among men and women. The interviews are primary sources of information. Additionally, various literatures are used to get background information about Babati and Tanzania, such as the political system and societal organization. The literature is gathered to get a contextual understanding of local conditions to inform the reader of the context of the respondents’ environment. The information is collected from Utrikespolitiska Institutet (2007), the Economist Democracy Index (2007), a brochure from Babati Town Council
(2008) and Hadenius (2006) to get varied and comprehensive information of local and national conditions. Criticism can be raised towards lack of information about Babati and the rural area of Tanzania and the limited range of sources, though the information gives reasonable comprehensive background information.

2.2.1 Operationalizing
Putnam defines social capital as features in societal organizations like trust, norms and networks that can improve the societal efficacy through facilitating operations. Putnam argues that trust is the determining component in social capital (Putnam 1993:201, 205, 206). Fukuyama even equates social capital with trust and contends that trust is a better interpretation of social capital because trust is the main component in social capital (Fukuyama 1995). Other scientists that apply trust as the indicator of social capital are Cox and Caldwell (2000), Glaeser et al (2000), Hooghe and Stolle (2003) and Kolankiewicz (1996).

Grootaert (2001) divides trust into social and political. In this study, the operationalizing of social capital is based on previously mentioned scientists’ distinction of social capital as trust, and Grootaert’s division of trust into two components; social and political. Therefore, the measurement of social capital among men and women is based on trust, such as social and political trust.

2.2.2 Interviews
The study is based on 50 short interviews held between November 25 and December 5 in 2010. The interviews were made to quantitatively measure social and political trust among men and women and to collect qualitative data to analyze the motivations of answers. Each individual interview took approximately 15-20 minutes and the total interview time is estimated to 15 hours.

First, 10 pre-interviews were made to test the interview questions in the Tanzanian context and later a few questions were changed. To exemplify, the question “do you read the newspaper regularly?” was not applicable in Babati, where some respondents answered “yes” in reference to that they read the newspaper when visiting town every second week. The interviews were intended to be in-depth interviews, but were changed to shorter interviews aiming to both a quantitative and qualitative measurement when the in-depth method was not
possible to carry out. The primarily reason to the change of interview style was because of difficulties to get in-depth informative answers when using an interpreter.

There were, in total, 50 interviews conducted with 25 female and 25 male respondents from 10 different groups. All groups were gender divided. Each group was first interviewed together to collect background information of the group, followed by individual interviews, held separately from the other members, to guarantee no influence of responses from present group members or potential group pressure. The interviews were held where the group meets or in a nearby located place. For example, when interviewing the men’s group in Mamire, the interviews were held in the chairman’s house. All interviews were recorded and transcribed.

All interviews followed an interview guide with semi-structured questions including both closed yes- or no-questions, and open-ended questions to let the respondents motivate their answers. It was sometimes possible to get informative answers from the follow-up questions, but in some cases the respondents were not able to explain or motivate its answer. All interviews were interpreted from English to Swahili by Mwanamisimo Hussein.

The groups were chosen to represent gender divided voluntary organizations in civil society, to best apply the conditions of how Putnam has been studying social capital. The sample selection was strategic and intentional to interview men and women that participate in gender divided groups in Babati. The interviewees within the groups were stratified sampled, depending on willing participants and what group members who were present when meeting up with them. The groups were selected with help from three Tanzanians from Babati, Ally Msuya (business man), Mwanamiso Hussein (interpreter) and Elias Iyo (headmaster), who provided information of existing gender divided groups. Some groups were also found and contacted through information provided from Babati Town Council officers and Hussein was helpful in contacting these groups.

The groups of men consist of two fishing groups, one garden group, one dance group and one village community bank group. The women’s groups are one gardening group, two dance groups and two village community bank groups. All groups are located within Babati town council, and are examples of informal and voluntary organization in the civil society. For information about the interview groups see appendix 2.
2.2.3 Procedure for Measuring Social Capital

The interview questions were chosen with regard to previous research to measure social capital and combined from different scientists. Grootaert, who divides trust into social and political trust, uses indicators such as “extent of trust in village members and households” and “extent of trust in government” (Grootaert 2001). To measure social trust, questions from De Hart and Dekker and Putnam were used when asking “do you agree upon that most people can be trusted?” (De Hart & Dekker 2003:160; Putnam 2006:306). Additionally, questions about trusting group members and gender related trust were added to map out social trust. Questions regarding political trust were asked about trusting politicians, the president and the Member of Parliament from the Manyara region that Babati belongs to. Questions about trust towards political institutions included the police, the doctors and court judges. The choice of political institutions was based on institutions that were in Babati where there is a police station, a small hospital and district court. The interview questions are attached in appendix 1.

To classify and distinguish the amount of trust, a scale of weak and strong is used as a tool to compare men’s and women’s responses. This is concluded through dividing the total number of yes-responses by the number of questions within the study. The accumulated trust for men and women is calculated to 341 of 450 possible yes-answers (nine questions times 50 respondents). The total number yes-sayers for men and women for all questions is 341 (341/9 questions/2 gender=18,94 yes-answer). The average trust among male and female responses is 18,94, which indicates that accumulated trust below is categorized as weak and over 18,94 as strong trust. This distinction aims to give a clear limit for what can be seen as either strong or weak trust among the respondents. Other ways of distinguish strong or weak trust would have implicated further control group or index for what can be estimated as average trust. The amount of trust as weak or strong trust is commented at each question separately and also compared gender-wise in the summary for trust distribution in the empirical analysis.

2.3 Validity and Reliability

The fundamental questions for research valuation are the reliability of data and validity of used methods. When estimating reliability, accurateness in measurements and eliminating sources of error is of importance. The reliability also values the data accuracy (Thorén 2006:22; Johannessen & Tufte 2003:28). The validity refers to how the study measures what it is supposed to study (Bjureld 2002:109).
The validity and reliability of the study is estimated to be fairly good. The following considerations should be taken to account when valuing the reliability of the study. The use of an interpreter and the language barrier might have affected the accuracy when translating from Swahili to English. That resulted in the inability to check if the respondents had correctly understood the questions. Another dimension of using an interpreter is how accurate the respondents’ answers were translated to English and if all information was translated or only summarized. On top of that, all respondents were not able to explain why they answered yes or no, which made the information vary between different interviewees. There was no way or possibility to make sure that the respondents were honest and truthful; they could have given incorrect answers, which affect the outcome result. Though, this complex of problems occurs in all studies regarding trust and personal values. Because of the small number of interviews, the measurement cannot be classified as highly reliably compared to a greater extent of the study, though the selection was constrained by the time limit and resources.

Another aspect of reliability is intersubjectivity, which refers to the possibility for other researchers to replicate the study and to conclude the exact same result. The study is replicable, but if the interviewees would give the same answers is unknown depending on personal values. Possible intersubjectivity increases the reliability (Thorén 2006:22), and therefore it would be beneficial to carry out the interviews once again to ensure the results, but this was not possible due to lack of time.

The study’s validity and methodological considerations relate to the choice of using interviews to measure social capital. The data gives a good measurement of the social capital and interviews gives satisfying information to answer the aim and question formulations. Methodologically, other techniques could increase the validity; for example through combining statistics with a larger number of interviews. Criticism towards the method is the unclearness of concepts when the respondents freely determine if they evaluate that they either trust or distrust. For example, on the question “do you agree upon that most people can be trusted?”, the respondent herself has to determine both what “trust” and “most people” mean. This can give a variety of answers depending on how respondents understand the questions (Teorell & Svensson 2007:56). The meaning of trust can be personal and individually vary. Also, the definition and inclusion of concepts might differ between respondents and between cultural contexts. That makes their result possibly not correspond
with the concept that Putnam used in his studies in Italy and America. The chosen groups are good examples and coincide with informal, voluntary organizations in the Tanzanian society.

An alternative method would be to carry out a greater number of interviews, or combining interviews with statistics, which could give to a more reliable and valid result. Also, to carry out interviews with a third, gender mixed group for a control group, or an index from similar African studies, which would make the result comparable. Though, the study has a fairly good reliability and validity and gives a relevant depiction of the phenomena. Other methodological alternatives were difficult to carry out due to restrictions such as time limits, resources and practical arrangements in Babati.

2.4 Previous Research
Many scientists have studied how social capital is generated and its societal effects. There is considerable debate and controversy over the possibility and practicability of measuring social capital. Social capital is created through norms for reciprocity, but many scientists have different views on what mechanisms create, destroy and change social capital, for example Putnam (1993), Schneider et al (1997), Ostrom (1994), Lam (1996), Falk and Kilpatrick (2000) and Sabel (1994).

Rothstein measures social capital through multiplying the amount of contacts by the trust in the contacts (Rothstein and Stolle 2003). Another common used method in the field is an index for social capital with six indications; the number of members in organizations, participants in public meetings, participants in organizations, number of common activities, social interaction, and trust between neighbors.

Research has been done to better understand the scope of social capital. Hooghe and Stolle distinguish two sub-descriptions, structural and attitudinal trust. Structural components refer to networks, and attitudinal components refer to trust, reciprocity and civic attitudes. Uphoff (1999) categorize social capital as structural and cognitive. The structural social capital is found in formal structures that consolidate values, whilst cognitive social capital focuses on norms and trust that is somewhat subjective and untouchable (Putnam 2006:7-11). This concludes that there is no uniformity or mainstream understanding within the field of social capital, which motivates further studies and research of social capital according to gender. This study intends to contribute to the scientific lack of information and research of gender
patterns, hierarchies within social capital, and in this case specifically the understanding of the trust distribution between men and women in Babati, Tanzania. This will hopefully contribute to a better understanding of the relation between gender and social capital.

3. Analytical Context – Social Capital and Gender

First, the theory of Robert Putnam will be presented, followed by Gidengil and O’Neill’s criticism towards Putnam’s gender blindness. Gidengil and O’Neill have a Feminist approach when looking at social capital.

3.1 Social Capital explains democracy and economic growth

Putnam published the book “Making Democracy Work” in 1993 as the result of a study conducted in Italy about a decentralization program and its democratic affects. The study showed great democratic and economic variation between the northern and southern parts of Italy (Putnam 2006:8). Putnam explains the democratic and economic differentiation of regions with varying amount of social capital. Putnam argues that civic attitudes and social capital are the foremost components for successful democracy and economic growth. Putnam defines social capital as features in societal organization like trust, norms and networks that can improve societal efficacy through facilitating cooperation (Putnam 1993:201).

A later study of social capital in America was published in 1995 with the name “Bowling Alone”, as a continuation and further theorizing of social capital. Putnam shows how new generations of Americans bowl alone compared to previous generations that bowled together in groups or clubs. Putnam means that the American civil society is in crises because of less voluntary organizational engagement, which will eventually danger the democracy (Putnam 2000:8).

3.1.1 Trust as main component for social capital

Putnam argues that trust is what makes transactions between people possible and what facilitates cooperation. The more trust, the better cooperation that reproduces trust (Putnam 1993:205, 206). Trust occurs in voluntary participation in civil society through face-to-face interaction that enables citizens’ cooperation to build on trust towards each others. You are able to cooperate with others because you trust in the other person to cooperate too. In voluntary associations, social norms of trust and reciprocity facilitate the kind of cooperation that democracy is built on (Putnam 2000:8). Civic attitudes are strengthened through activities
like organizational engagement, where people learn how to cooperate and take responsibility for collective projects and goods. Through participation and cooperation in groups or organizations, the members learn how to cooperate and compromise, which create the important norms. Organizational participation also has an important socializing effect when taking place in democratic ways and contributes to democratic attitudes and values as well as developing political skills (Hadenius 2006:195). Putnam claims that the kind of organization or group has little importance (Putnam 1993:111).

Putnam strongly emphasizes the importance of a flourishing civil society. Civil society is defined as the networks and relations in the sphere between the family and the government where voluntary, non-governmental collective activities take place. If there are many networks and organizations, the civil society is said to be strong (Hadenius 2006:40,41). Therefore, the more people are organized in voluntary associations and networks, the better democratic outcome (Putnam 2000:8).

Putnam says that voluntary organizational participation and social connections engage into a political interest. Political Science literature shows a broad agreement that social capital facilitates mutually beneficial collective actions. According to Putnam, if much social capital exists within a country, it contributes to a better well-functioning democracy. Vice versa, Putnam says that if trust and reliance do not exist, the function of democracy is unsuccessful. The theory points out that there is a correlation between the amount of social capital and the function of democracy, due to that social capital is the foundation for democracy (Putnam 1993).

Social capital can be studied at micro-, meso-, and macro levels. Micro is the most common level to study social capital when focusing on relations between individuals in civil society. Putnam says that one way to measure civic engagement is through active participation in public matters where common public good is emphasized (Putnam 1993:108). Putnam argues that a society with an active associational life and well-informed citizens that read the newspaper and vote in elections is close to the civic ideal. Therefore, Putnam means that one way to measure social capital can be studied through measuring the number of active organizations and networks, patterns for social interaction, and norms for trust and reciprocity between households.
3.1.2 Criticism towards Putnam

The criticism towards the theory of social capital is comprehensive, both methodologically and in regards to its content. The idea that social capital contributes to a better functioning democracy does not always have to be correct, because of the dark side of social capital. Participation in voluntary organization contributes to and creates trust and reliance between members, but that does not have to be good for democracy. For example there are networks and groups with strong interpersonal trust that can strengthen and empower non-democratic norms, such as groups like Hells Angels or the mafia. The groups could, for example, have strong trust within the group but strong distrust towards other citizens, like ethnic or religious groups (Putnam 2000:11). A strong civil society receives benefits for the democracy only if it works democratically (Hadenius 2006:44).

Other researchers point at the potential for political institutions in society and the absence of corruption and power abuse within the public sector, which can also generate trust and increase the democratic efficacy (Rothstein & Kumlin 2001). Criticism has also been approached towards Putnam’s way of measuring social capital in the American study presented in Bowling Alone. Just because the number of memberships in American associations has declined, that does not have to mean the interpersonal trust is weaker (Putnam 2000:10). The criticism is also approached towards the positive effects of voluntary organizational life are incorrect. Because of voluntary participation in groups, the trust between members does not have to increase, and neither does the members’ trust towards people in general have to increase.

Others criticize that the concept of social capital is abstract and requires subjective interpretation when translating into operational measurements (Grootaert and van Bastelaer 2002; Narayan and Cassidy 2001). The choice of indicators to measure social capital affects the scope and units of observation. Social capital is such a complex concept that it is not likely to be represented by any single measure or figure. Instead, multiple dimensions require sets of indicators to be effective (Cox and Caldwell 2000). Another criticisms is directed towards the idea that social capital can be measured at an individual and community level.

Criticism has been given towards the inclusive concept that social capital can both include formal or informal networks as well as psychological factors and interpersonal trust (Putnam 2000:10). Also, in the liberal view of social capital, local actions and individuals are seen as
actors with power to impact the democracy as a whole. In this analysis, poverty and oppression are neglected when looking at the individuals’ responsibility and ability to change situations and the democracy, and instead lay the responsibility on individuals and their ability to cooperate. That neglects structural explanations and power relations like poverty and oppression that could hinder the function of democracy in a country.

3.2 Feminist Approach to Social Capital

The studies of O’Neill and Gidengil have a Feminist approach and criticize Putnam’s studies for being gender blind and neglecting gender. Putnam states that the economy, democracy, health and happiness depend on the amount of social capital in a society. O’Neill and Gidengil critically point at the lack of explanation of ways in which gender inequalities and asymmetric power affect social capital (O’Neill & Gidengil 2005:2).

Gidengil and O’Neill point at within the theory of social capital and within the results in Bowling Alone there is a distinct male bias. An example is Putnam’s choice of gender specific patterns of activities. Men are more likely than women to spend leisure time in sports’ activities and to engage in voluntary work related to sport and recreation. Women undertake voluntary work related to health, social services, and education and devote more time to visiting friends than men. Within Putnam’s studies of social capital, there has been a biased selection of chosen items. For example, when measuring men-based organizations and not female childcare networks. Gidengil and O’Neill argue that social capital is imbued with gender inequalities and gendered hierarchies, and focus their study on what a gendered analysis can tell about social capital.

Comparisons of amounts and types of social capital available to men and women highlight inequalities in accessing social capital. Once a gender perspective is applied, it becomes clear that social capital is imbued with gender inequalities and gendered hierarchies. A gendered analysis of social capital directs attention to power relations and casts lights on gendered patterns of social capital. The contribution of a gendered analysis of social capital would focus on questions of distributions of social capital, differences in the nature of social capital and in the way that social capital is used (O’Neill & Gidengil 2005:6). The mere existence of significant gender gaps in political interests and political knowledge suggests that the connection between social capital, gender and political engagement is anything but automatic.
The theories of Putnam, Gidengil and O’Neill are used when analyzing the study’s results, by using Putnam’s idea that cooperation leads to trust. And central for applying the gender perspective is looking for gender inequalities, gender hierarchies, and gender patterns within the interview material of social and political trust.

4. Empirical Analysis

The empirical analysis consists of background information about Tanzania and Babati, and the empirical result of the interview answers. Finally, the distribution of social and political trust is summarized and compared gender-wise.

4.1 Background

Tanzania has a total population of 40 million people from 120 ethnic groups with many local languages. The main religious groups are Christians and Muslims and the official languages are Swahili and English. Tanzania was colonized by Germany in 1884 and became later a British protectorate until independence in 1961. The transition from colonization to self-determination resulted in a one-party state system with President Nyere in power for 20 years. Nyere, representing the party Chama Cha Mapinduzi (CCM), practiced an African Socialistic policy that gained strong support by the people (Hadenius 2006:180). Not until 1993 was the constitution changed and a multiparty system introduced. CCM has been in power since 1964 and has still today a dominant position in Tanzanian politics. In the elections held in November 2010, Jakaya Kikwete from CCM was reelected for President.

Since the multiparty system was introduced, the judicial system has become more independent but it is still highly ineffective and struggles with corruption. Democracy in Tanzania is ranked as number 99 out of 167 countries and classified as a hybrid regime by the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Index for Democracy (Economist 2007:4).

Tanzania is a republic and the parliament has the legislative power. The members of parliament are chosen through direct elections and appointments by the president. The president has the executive power and appoints the Prime Minister and Cabinet of Ministers (UI 2007:3-5, 10-13, 30-31). The political levels are the parliament, regions, districts, towns, wards and sub-wards.
The public sector carries out services like health care, education, the judicial system and the police force, but its size is narrow compared to Scandinavian welfare regimes. Due to the minimum tasks carried out by the state, many other functions are organized in voluntary networks and groups, which have an irreplaceable function in the Tanzanian society. Churches and unions also have a both social and societal importance (Hadenius 2006:200).

The government administrates restrained social services and pensions with low compensation levels. Instead of comprehensive public sector services, people organize daily life in informal cooperation like networks, groups and organizations where family, relatives and local community are the Tanzanians’ most important safeguard. Most Tanzanians have no formal employment and cultivation or work in the informal sector are common occupations (UI 2007:30).

Tanzania is a male-dominated society where women generally have a subordinated position. Women do not have equal legal rights to inheritance or the right to own property in the way that men do. Polygamy and female genital mutilation exist in some ethnic groups. In most villages, it is common that women work on the fields and look after the family and households whilst political life is male-dominated. Tanzanian life has a comparatively clear gender division and traditional approach to female and male spheres in society (UI 2007:31).

Babati is a town located in the Manyara region in central Tanzania, which is a rural area of the country. The economic sector is dominated by agriculture, crop production, fishing, livestock keeping, small scale industries, manufacturing industries and business activities. Babati town is the economic center for the nearby area and wards (Babati Town Council 2008:1, 5, 9).

4.2 Social trust
Social trust is here divided in to three subgroups; group trust, interpersonal trust and gender trust. The question “do you trust everyone in the group?” measure trust within the group. “Do you agree upon that most people can be trusted?” refers to interpersonal trust. The question “who do you trust most, men or women?” aims to study gender trust. The accumulated trust for men and women is evaluated as either weak or strong, see definition in 2.2.3.
4.2.1 Trust towards group members

The measurement of trust for group members is presented in figure 4.2.1, showing the trust towards group members. The number of respondents and percentage of yes- and no sayers are presented in the figure below. Group 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups.

The statistic indicates strong trust towards group members among men and women. 23 men and 20 women trust everyone in their group and the gender difference is small. Group number 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 are homogenous in their answers, which indicates group uniformity of preference.

Cooperation generates trust. The result indicates strong trust between group members; in groups 2 to 6, everyone states that they trusts all of the group members. There is a small variation between women and men, where men have stronger trust towards the group members compared to female respondents. Respondents attribute their trust to the group members to the long time experience of cooperation together, that they spend time together, personal experience of faithfulness among the group members, and that they share life together. These motivations are mentioned by both female and male respondents as examples of the reasons given to why they trust their group members:

“I trust them because we have worked together for a long time, we spend time together and we cooperate and share everything” (female respondent from group 6).

“I trust them because they are faithful and all of us cooperate in both sadness and happiness” (male respondent from group 2).
This supports Putnam’s theory that face-to-face interaction and cooperation generate trust towards others, and in this case to group members. As the motivations indicate, they trust each other because they know each other and have been cooperating for a long time together. It is unclear if the trust has occurred through the cooperation or if the group members knew each other from before participating and that the trust could derive from earlier friendships. But the face-to-face interaction and participation in informal and voluntary groups confirm strong social trust within the groups.

**Money involvement and gossip hinder social trust.** Among the respondents that do not trust everyone in their group, their distrust is motivated by bad experiences from money involvement in the group and money circulation, or gossip among members. The reason for economic involvement is stated by men and women that do not trust all group members; no gender differences exist among this hinderance for social trust among group members. The citations exemplify female and male respondents’ motivations for not trusting everyone in their group:

“I do not trust all members because of the money circulation. All group members have not given back money that they were supposed to and they have changed their behavior and someone else failed to give back money when the business did not succeed. The group members love you if you have money and if you do not, they do not love you” (female respondent from group 8).

“Many members like the group because of money and everyone is not faithful. Someone took a loan and should pay it back within three months time but he did not so we had to use force and chase him away. I do not think they are honest, they participate only because of money and they are not hard working” (male respondent group 1).

The citations imply that conflicts and problems exist about money involvement in some groups, and that both women and men find this as a hinderance for trusting the members. Among the women disagreeing upon trusting everyone, ther is one reason and motive that is mentioned by women and not by men. Some women argue that their mistrust is because of gossip and that everyone does not keep their word. The criticism is directed to some members and not everyone in the group. This reason does not occur among the male respondents. Two women explain gossip as an obstacle for trusting their group members as follows:

“some are talkative and tell others secrets that belong to the group” (female respondent from group 10)

“some members discuss secrets of the group with others” (female respondent from group 8)
Gossip either does not exist within the male groups or does not occur as a problem for trusting each other among men. This gender difference of what is seen as hindering social trust is a gendered pattern, and indicates that men and women have different obstacles for trust. The citations for distrusting all group members criticize Putnam’s theory that face-to-face interaction leads to trust and cooperative behavior. This supports, oppositely, that all cooperation does not have to generate trust. Rather, these respondents have found out that they cannot trust their group members that they cooperate with, because of negative experiences from participating in the group.

### 4.2.2 Interpersonal trust

The measurement of so-called interpersonal trust, trust to unknown people is presented in figure 4.2.2 and show how many respondents that answered yes and no upon the question “do you agree upon that most people can be trusted?” The number of respondents and percentage of yes- and no sayers are presented in below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men’s groups and 6 to 10 are women’s groups.

![Figure 4.2.2 Agreeing upon if most people can be trusted](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>men: respondents and %</th>
<th>women: respondents and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 60%</td>
<td>16 64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 40%</td>
<td>9 36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpersonal trust is weak among female and male respondents, 15 men and 16 women agree upon that most people can be trusted and 10 men and 9 women disagree with the statement. The answers show a balance between trusting and mistrusting respondents. The gender difference for interpersonal trust is minimal. Group nr 2, 7 and 10 are homogenous in their answers.
Weak interpersonal trust hindered by skepticism, corruption and criminality. The motivations for not trusting other people are identical among men and women. What are seen as reasons for distrust are skepticism towards others, that people are different and that everyone thinks differently or needs to first live with people before trusting them. Other hinderances among the respondents to trust people is the existence of corrupted behavior. In addition, criminality is stated as hindering interpersonal trust when some people are thieves and unfaithful. The citations exemplify obstacles to trust in others among the respondents:

“Everyone has its own heart so you do not know if they are trustworthy. Everyone thinks differently and people change so you can not trust them” (male respondent from group 3)

“I only trust people that I share life with so I know them. Therefore I do not trust people without having been living with them” (female respondent from group 9)

“Some people are corrupted” (male respondent from group 5)

“Some people are thieves and unfaithful” (female respondent from group 6)

The three reasons for weak interpersonal trust, skepticism towards others, criminality and corruption, are mutual hinderances stated among men and women as obstacles for social trust.

4.2.3 Gender related trust

The measurement of gender related within social trust refers to look at the trust distribution among men and women to see potential gender patterns of trust. The figure 4.2.3 presents whether the respondents trust men or women most by answering the questions “who do you trust most, men or women?”. The number of respondents and percentage of yes- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups.
The figure shows that men and women trust women more than men; 18 men and 17 women state that they trust women most. The gender difference of answers is minimal and indicates mutual notions of that woman are trustworthy. Both men and women have stronger trust towards women. Groups number 8, 9 and 10 are homogenous in trusting women most, which all are female groups.

The nature of women is trustworthiness. The motivation behind both men ans women respondents’ answers was a belief that it is the nature of women to be trustworthy. This was reported to be the main motivation to trust them. The explanations for trusting women argue that women’s trustworthiness make them faithful, helpful and responsible. These characteristics are not seen in descriptions and motivations for trusting men. Both male and female respondents state that it is in the nature of women to be trustworthy; this argument is exemplified with the following citations:

“Women are faithful and honest but men are not. I think it is in the nature of women to be faithful and that makes them more trustworthy than men” (male respondent from group 3)

“Women are honest, it is in their nature and they help you if you have a problem. It is women's nature to listen to other peoples problems and they are helpful when you have a problem” (male respondent group 1)

“Women are responsible and take care of the families. Women keep things without stealing, their nature is to be afraid so therefore they do not steal things” (male respondent from group 1)

“Women are trustworthy, it is in their nature whilst men are not faithful. Women take care of the family, they pay for the school fees and you can trust them if you borrow money” (female respondent from group 5)

“Women are responsible in the community and the families, they are usually the ones that solve problems. Women can not lie but men can so women are more honest then men” (female respondent from group 8)

Gender trust indicates a gender pattern of the nature of men and women where women are understood as trustworthy because of female characteristics. Some say that the tasks of women, such as taking care of the families, paying school fees and solve problems, are reasons for understanding them as trustworthy. These are tasks and function that figure and describe the understanding of women, but not for the understanding of men. This shows how the view of what is the nature of men and women follow gender patterns.
Gender hierarchy and female jealousy affect social trust. Among the respondents that trust men more than women, the motivations incorporate an understanding of male dominance and female jealousy as reasons to trust men and that hinder trust in women. Both female and male respondents mention that female jealousy makes them distrust women. There seems to be a mutual understanding that women are more jealous then men, which occurs as an obstacle for trusting them. The citations exemplify the reasons to trust men and not women because of female jealousy:

“I trust men because women are jealous, if someone develops something women feel jealous about it. Women do not want others to develop because of jealousy” (male respondent from group 7)

“Men have peace in their lives but women are jealous, there is no real love between women and women” (female respondent from group 10)

The jealousy among women is a gender pattern within social trust that affects who the respondents trust, both men and women state distrust towards women because of the pattern of jealousy. The other motivation stated is male dominance as reason to trust men more then women. This argument figured among both female and male respondents; that means that men have better thinking capacity, give perfect and strong suggestions and have a strong standing. These reasons indicate a mutual understanding of existing gender patterns of characteristics among men and women, as mentioned by some of the respondents. Male dominance gives stronger trust towards men and that the understanding of female characteristics does not generate as strong trust as it does in men’s characteristics. Some motivations for trusting men more than women because of male superiority are:

“Men have better thinking capacity then women” (male respondent from group 2)

“Men can give a perfect and strong suggestion whilst women's suggestions are not that good because they are jealous of each other” (female respondent from group 8)

“Men have a strong standing so they do not change the way that women do” (male respondent from group 3)

This supports Gidengil and O’Neills assumption that social capital is imbued in gender patterns and hierarchies that impacts social trust. The statistics for gender related trust are similar between men and women, both trust women more them men, but the motivation of answers implies gender patterns and unequal comprehensions of gender positions.
4.3 Political trust

Political trust is divided into two subgroups; trust to politicians and to political positions. The Trust to politicians contain the questions “do you trust politicians?”, “do you trust the President Jakaya Kikwete?” and “do you trust the Member of Parliament Kisyieri Chambiri?”. Trust towards political institutions are measured through the questions “do you trust the police?”, “do you trust the doctor?” and “do you trust the court judges?”.

4.3.1 Trust towards politicians

The measurement of trust for politicians in general is shown in figure 4.3.1 showing the result for the question “do you trust politicians?”. The number of respondents and percentage of say- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Group 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups.

![Figure 4.3.1 Trust towards politicians in general](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>men: respondents and %</th>
<th>women: respondents and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>12 52%</td>
<td>15 60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13 48%</td>
<td>10 40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trust towards politicians is weak, 12 men and 15 women state that they trust politicians and 13 men and 10 women do not trust politicians. The gender difference is small, but the majority of men distrust politicians and majority of women trust them. Women express stronger trust towards politicians, but the difference is small. Groups number 1, 2, 5, 7 and 10 are homogenous in answers that indicate uniformity of preferences.

**Widespread view that politicians lie and are corrupted.** The result indicates a generally negative view of politicians because of the weak trust among the respondents. The motivations are similar among men and women for distrusting politicians and are foremost the view that politicians lie, are corrupted, and that politicians change and do not keep what
they promised. It is the distrustful behavior among politicians that are stated to hinder political trust. The notion of bad behavior among politicians exist both among female and male respondents. Citations from respondents exemplify the view of politicians as bad people, with that reason forming respondents’ distrust towards politicians:

“Politicians do not tell the truth, they lie and change what they have promised, or do not fulfill the promises. Politicians are corrupt and they use money to get power. They do not tell us what they have done with the money” (female respondent group 7).

“The nature of politics is lying so politicians lie. They lie and promise things without keeping them. They have the behavior of changing, they can promise something and then change it. They have a behavior of not keeping secrets” (male respondent group 3).

The politicians’ behavior of lying, corruption and changing are obstacles for trusting politicians, as cited by both men and women. This is the main reason for weak trust towards politicians, the belief that they act with distrustful behavior.

The measurement of trust for the President is presented in figure 4.3.2 showing the result for the question “do you trust the President?”. The number of respondents and percentage of say- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups. Reasons to trust and distrust the President and MP are merged and summarized after figure 4.3.3.

Figure 4.3.2 Trust towards President Jakaya Kikwete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>men: respondents and %</th>
<th>women: respondents and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 88%</td>
<td>22 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3 12%</td>
<td>3 12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trust towards the President is strong, 22 men and 22 women trust the President. There is no gender difference within the trust towards Jakaya Kikwete and a similar apprehension of a trustworthy president exists among both men and women. Group number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 indicate uniformity of preference and they are almost homogenous in their answers.
The measurement of trust for the MP is presented in figure 4.3.3 showing the result for the question “do you trust the MP?”. The number of respondents and percentage of say- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men’s groups and 6 to 10 are women’s groups. The MP is the local representative from the Babati constituent in the Manyara region and represents CCM. Chambiri was elected in the general elections held in November 2010.

The trust towards the MP is weak, 15 men and 17 women trust the MP. Men and women have a similar view that Kisyiero is distrustful and the gender difference is small. There is a big variation between the groups’ answers; uniformity can be seen in groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9 and 10. For example among the men, group 2 and 3 have the opposite opinions but everyone in the group express the same opinion. Among the women, group 6 and 7 show the same result.

**Distance and non-familiarity are obstacles for trusting politicians.** The trust towards the President is strong and the trust towards the MP is weak. The amounts of trust are similar among men and women towards both positions. This implies that the President has extraordinarily strong trust because he denotes an exemption from the general distrust towards politicians in general, as shown in figure 4.3.1. The motivations of answers infer that distance and non-familiarity cause distrust towards politicians. Both men and women state that distance is reason for not trust the President and MP. Citations from a female and male respondent exemplifies why distance is an obstacle for political trust. Their motivations are:

“The President is far from here so I do not trust him. He and the government are in Dar es Salaam so I can not see what they are doing so I do not trust them” (female respondent group 7)
“The MP is from another district and came here without knowing anyone. He seems to have a bad background and bad history so I do not trust him” (male respondent group 1)

“Kissyero Chambiri lies and has bad motives so I think he is a bad person. He did not deserve to be MP and he is not from here, he is corrupt and a newcomer in the Manyara area” (male respondent group 3).

The distance to Dar es Salaam and that the MP is from another area hinder female and male respondents’ trust. One gender pattern appears among the motivations from women to not trust the MP or President that mention non-familiarity. Some female respondents mean that they do not trust the MP or President because they do not personally know the persons. The citations come from three women that do not trust the MP, President and politicians because of perceived non-familiarity:

“The MP is from far away, I do not know him and he has not visited us” (female respondent from group 8)

“I do not trust the President because I do not know him” (female respondent from group 8)

“I do not know about politicians” (female respondent from group 7)

It is unclear if the gender pattern within motivations for political distrust relates to men; that is, whether men do not see non-familiarity as an obstacle or if men are more familiar with the politicians than women.

4.2.2 Trust towards political institutions
The measurements of trust toward political institutions are presented in three figures, presenting the trust towards the police, the doctors and the court judges. Initially is the trust towards the police presented in figure 4.2.2.1., which shows the result of the question “do you trust the police?”. The number of respondents and percentage of say- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups.

![Figure 4.2.2.1 Trust towards the police](image-url)
Summary responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>men: respondents and %</th>
<th>women: respondents and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12 48%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trust towards the police is weak, 13 men and 17 women trust the police. There is a small gender difference where women have a stronger trust then men towards the police. Group number 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10 are homogenous in their answers and it differs among the groups if almost all of the members either trust or distrust the police.

**Associations of policemen as bad people.** The motivations for distrusting the police are similar among men and women. What is stated as reasons for distrusting the police are the apprehension that policemen are bad people that lie, are unfaithful and corrupted or that they do not care. Male and female respondents reveal their motivations for their opinion in the following citations:

“I do not trust them because of corruption. Policemen are unfaithful, they can catch you without any reasons. They are bad people and they are corrupt, money decides” (male respondent from group 1)

“Because of corruption. They lie and change information and only help you if you got money. They do not care. They are in Babati town and not here, I do not know them” (female respondent from group 7)

“They lie and because of the poverty conditions they need money so I do not trust them” (female respondent from group 6)

The motivations contain a mutual understanding among men and women of the prevalence of corruption among the police. Corruption can therefore be seen as an obstacle for trusting the police.

The measurement of trust for the doctors is presented in figure 4.2.2.2 showing the result from the question “do you trust the doctors?”. There is a small hospital in Babati where a small number of doctors work. The number of respondents and percentage of say- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups.
Figure 4.2.2.2 Trust towards doctors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary</th>
<th>men: respondents and %</th>
<th>women: respondents and %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21 84%</td>
<td>20 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4 16%</td>
<td>5 20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The trust towards the doctors is strong, 21 men and 20 women trust the doctors. The gender difference between men and women is minimal. Group-homogenous answers can be seen in groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 10.

Skepticism towards corruption at the doctors. The trust towards doctors is strong. Among the few respondents that do not trust the doctors the stated reasons that are similar between men and women. It is the skepticism towards corruption among the doctors that cause some respondent to distrust them. Some respondents state that bribes and money involvement hinder them from trusting the doctors. The following citations motivate a male and female respondent to not trust the doctors:

"they take bribes and are corrupt. They deal with money and are corrupted" (male respondent group 3)

"money and corruption are involved" (female respondent group 10)

Corruption hinders trust towards the doctor in the same way as towards the police. The motivations for distrusting the doctors indicates that corruption hinder the rural population to trust doctors in case of illness. Corruption as phenomenon block trust towards political institutions, in the case of the doctors and police.

The measurement of trust towards the court judges are presented in figure 4.2.2.3 showing the result from the question “do you trust the court judges?”. There is a court located in Babati. The number of respondents and percentage of say- and no sayers are presented below the figure. Groups 1 to 5 are men groups and 6 to 10 are women groups.
The trust towards court judges is weak among men and strong among women, 13 men and 21 women trust the court judges and 12 men and 4 women do not trust them. This is a clear gender difference of trust where women possess a stronger trust towards court judges than the men. Groups number 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are homogenous in their answers.

**Women trust court judges but men find them corrupted.** There is a clear gender difference seen to the amount of trust between men and women. Among the motivations mentioned by men and women, the same reasons are stated. The gender difference occurs within the numbers of respondent that trust and distrust the court judges. But among the distrusting respondent, corruption is mentioned as the reason to not trust them. Corruption is what hinders respondents from trusting court judges, and a general negative attitude is found among citations, some refer to personal experience of corrupted behavior in the courts. Some respondents stated following citations:

- “the judges are corrupted” (female respondent group 9)
- “because of corruption. The judges are corrupted, when I had a land problem the judges needed money to solve the problem” (male respondent group 2)
- “they are corrupted, for example they postpone cases due to money” (male respondent group 1)

That corruption exists among the court judges and hinder political trust is a mutual understanding between the male and female respondents. Though, women have stronger trust then men. Corruption can be seen as an obstacle of trust within all political institutions and as well towards politicians and social trust.
4.4 Summary of Trust Distribution

The result can be summarized and compared gender-wise as follows, notice that the question of gender trust is not specified as weak or strong.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to group members</td>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal trust</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusting men or women</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Political trust        |           |           |
| to politicians         | Weak      | Weak      |
| to the President       | Strong    | Strong    |
| to the MP              | Weak      | Weak      |
| to the police          | Weak      | Weak      |
| to the doctors         | Strong    | Strong    |
| to the court judges    | Weak      | Strong    |

The result both confirms and disconfirms the assumptions of Putnam, Gildengil and O’Neill. The trust towards group members are strong because of cooperation and familiarity with each other. This supports the idea that informal and voluntary organizations generates trust. However, a few respondents stated that they do not trust each other because of bad experiences, for example money involvement that has made them distrustful of some members. That proves that cooperation can exist without trust. This implies that voluntary participation does not have to generate trust or foster democratic values. Even if the trust towards group members is strong among men and women, the trust is not spread to other people in general or to unknown people, the so-called interpersonal trust. The trust from face-to-face interaction does not spread to strong trust to other people. There exists much social capital in the groups, but the link to outside of the group is not clear except with strong trust towards the doctor and the President.

The distrust towards politicians, the MP, the police and court judges, rather, supports Rothstein and Kumlin’s (2001) criticism of Putnam that the absence of corruption in the public sector can generate trust. Corruption among politicians and political institutions seem to be the main obstacle for trust, and corruption is also mentioned as hinderance for social trust.

In many cases, uniformity of answers can be seen within the groups. For example, when the group members’ answers are clearly similar to the other group members’ regarding trusting
the MP, the police and gender related trust. This indicates that social capital could be formed through the group and to other members’ preferences.

**Small gender variation of trust but gender patterns and hierarchies exist.** Gidengil and O’Neill criticize Putnam for being gender blind. No clear difference of social capital according to gender can be seen, rather there is in general, gender similarities within the trust distribution. This disconfirms Gidengil and O’Neill’s statement that social capital is differing between men and women. The only precise difference shows that women have stronger trust towards the court judges then men.

Confirming Gidengil and O’Neill is that, from the motivation of answers, gender inequalities and gender hierarchies can be found imbued in social capital. Gender patterns can be found in mutual understanding that the nature of women is trustworthiness. There is also a mutual idea that it is a female characteristic to be jealous, which is a hinderance of trust for both men and women. Some women state that they do not trust all group members because some do not keep secrets and gossip, this motivation does not exist among the men. Gender hierarchies are found in motivations for trusting men more then women because they have a better thinking capacity then women and their suggestions are perfect whilst women’s suggestions are not as good.

### 5. Conclusions

The study’s result does not find many specific gender differences of social capital. The trust distribution among men and women is highly similar. One clear variation exists where women possess stronger trust towards the court judges then men. Among the motivations for trust and distrust of social and political institutions, gender patterns and gender hierarchies can be seen. This confirms Gidengil and O’Neill’s argument that social capital is imbued in gender inequalities.

The distribution of social trust between men and women are similar. Strong trust is expressed towards group members. Men and women state reasons of trust as the members have worked together for a long time, and that they spend time together and cooperate in everything. Reasons for distrust towards group members are bad experience from money involvement within the group. Some women state that gossip hinders them from trusting all members. Male respondents do not mention gossip as reason for distrust.
The interpersonal trust is weak among men and women because of skepticism towards other people, corruption and criminality. Men and women both have stronger trust towards women. There is a mutual understanding that it is the nature of women that makes them trustworthy and that women possess characteristics such as faithfulness, helpfulness and responsibility. Trusting men and not women is based on opinions regarding female jealousy and male superiority, such as the idea that men have a stronger standing and better thinking capacity than women.

The trust towards politicians is weak among men and women, even though women express slightly stronger trust than men. Politicians are seen as distrustful because of lying and corruption. Both men and women have a strong trust toward the President but the trust towards the MP is weak. The distrust is motivated by corruption, distance and non-familiarity. The reason of non-familiarity was only given by female respondents. The trust towards the doctors is strong, though a few respondents find the doctors distrustful because of corruption. The trust towards court judges is weak among men and strong among women. The distrusting respondents all attribute their answers to the belief that the court judges are corrupted.

The result supports Putnam’s theory of occurring trust because of cooperation, such as in the informal, voluntary groups, though strong trust is restricted to group members, to women, the president and doctors. The varying amount of social trust corresponds with varying amount of political trust. The strong social trust is restricted to group members and does not reflect interpersonal trust or spread to trust towards politicians or political institutions, with the exception of the President and doctors.

The result disconfirms Gidengil and O’Neill’s statement that social capital differs between men and women. The only precise difference that exists is that women have stronger trust towards the court judges than men. However, the criticism that Putnam is gender blind and that social capital is imbued in gender patterns and hierarchies are supported in some of the findings of motivations for trust and distrust. Confirming Gidengil and O’Neill, gender patterns can be found in that both men and women trust women because of the mutual understanding that the nature of women is trustworthiness. There is another mutual understanding that it is a female characteristic to be jealous, which is seen as a hindrance to trust by men and women. Some women state that they do not trust all group members because
some do not keep secrets and gossip. This motivation does not exist among the men. Gender hierarchies are found in motivations that trusting men more than women because they have a better thinking capacity than women and that their suggestions are perfect whilst women’s suggestions are not as good. The measurement shows no statistical gender differences but gender patterns and hierarchies are found among motivations of trust and distrust.

The study contributes to a better understanding of social capital according to gender and what men and women state as motives for trust and distrust for social and political trust.

5.1 Proposing Further Research
The corruption in Babati and Tanzania seem to block both social and political trust among men and women, and it occurs as the main obstacle for trust. Corruption could be a structural obstacle for trust in society. Even if people participate in voluntary, informal groups in civil society, that does not necessarily generate strong social capital or democratize Tanzania. The theoretical link between face-to-face interaction, democracy and economic growth might not be as simple as desired. What would be of interest for further study is how institutional corruption hinders social capital, as seen from a gender perspective. That would contribute to a better understanding of the link between social capital, corruption and gender and extend the understanding of what affects social capital acquisition in Babati and Tanzania.
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Jamilia
Asia Hussiam
Monaibi
Halimia
Monica

**Group 8.** Dance group in Babati town. Interviews held November 29. There are 20 women that dance traditional Tanzanian dance.
Howa
Mwana
Farida
Salma
Mwana
Fredrika
Magdalena
Widas
Jamilia
Christina

Group 10. Dance group in Babati town. Interviews held December 5, 2010. The name of the group is Bagara Msanja group. Msanja means the name of the one who dance. They are 20 women that dance and play music together.
China
Halima
Majuma
Mamusof
Amina
Appendix 1, Interview Guide

Background
- Name?
- Educational level?
- Position in the group?
- Duration of participation in the group?
- What other groups, organizations and networks are you part of?
- Did you vote in the elections?
- Are you interested in politics?
- Are you politically engaged?
- Do you feel that you have power to impact in politics?

Social trust
- Do you trust your neighbors?
- Do you agree upon that most people can be trusted?
- Do you agree upon that most people are honest?
- Who do you trust most, men or women?
- If you have a social problem, who do you go to?
- If you have a political problem, who do you go to?

Trust in politicians and political institutions
- Do you trust politicians?
- Do you trust President Jakaya Kikwete?
- Do you trust the Member of Parliament, Kisiyeri Chambiri?
- Do you trust the Ward Councilor?
- Do you trust the police?
- Do you trust the doctors?
- Do you trust the court judges?

Group related trust
- Do you trust everyone in the group?
- Do you trust your group members more than men in general?
- Do you trust your group members more than women in general?
- Since you started in the group, has your trust towards the members increased or decreased?
Appendix 2, Group Information

Men groups

Group 1, fishermen by the pond in Bonga ward, Babati. The group has a fishing project together since eight months ago. They are a group of 30 men that breed fish in a pond with the goal to later sell the fish and earn money when the fish is fully grown. It is a collective project where everyone contributes and works together to enable the project. The goal for the group is to make the project sustainable so that it can benefit the members economically and collected money is used to give loans to group members when someone is in need. The project was started as an attempt to change their life through increase the standard of living. The group meets once a week and decisions are made collectively in democratic order. The chairman leads the group and the position is chosen through voting. The reason no women participates is because women have a lot of work to do in the household, and if they are married their husbands might not give them permission to participate.

Group 2, the male village community bank in Bonga, Babati, the group’s name is Thendeleze, that means x in Swahili. They are seven members and the group started one year and two months ago when a government civil servant trained and encouraged them to run a community bank because there had earlier only been female village community banks. The idea of a community bank is that members put money weekly in a locked box from where members can loan money. The goal is to improve their living standards and to be empowered. Meetings are held once a week and decisions are made democratically. Who will be included as a group member is decided collectively.

Group 3, gardening group in Bonga, Babati, the name is Umoja. They are 15 men under the age of 33 years that cultivate vegetables and fruits that they sell to get a profit. The cooperation started one year ago with the goal to empower themselves. Earned money is split equally, and they have rotate work tasks and help each other, for example there is only one water pipe so they work collectively to get one more. Meetings are held once a week and decisions are made as a group. The chairman and secretary lead the group. They are only men because it is a hard job and it takes a lot of time, instead women take care of the household and the family and therefore they cannot be part of the group.
**Group 4**, dance group in Mamire, Babati, the name of the group is Qwariye Masonba Mtuka, that means “powerful men fighting against enemies” in Swahili. They are nine men that perform dance and drama and rehearse three hours a week. The group has existed for 11 years and no members have changed. It started as a way of entertainment but has become a way to earn money for the group’s goat project. Recently the group invested in goat-keeping and they own collectively one goat. When the goat give birth, they will all share the profit. Decisions are made collectively and democratically. Women are responsible for the household so they do not have time for taking part or being involved in such things as a dance group.

**Group 5**, fishermen at Lake Babati in Bonga, Babati, group name is Umosa and consists of 20 men that meet every day to fish in the lake. The fish is sold in the afternoon at the market in Bonga. The group has existed for three years, and started with three members and has since then grown and grown. They fish in teams because of lack of canoes. The profit goes to equally divided pocket money to the members and the rest is saved for common group expenditure or is given to someone that has a problem like illness that the members agree upon. The goal is to change their lives and empower themselves. Meetings are held three times a month, and decisions are made democratically. The reason they are only men are because women are afraid of water, instead they wait on the fish on land. Women are weak and it is a heavy and hard job for men.

**Women groups**

**Group 6**, gardening group in Bonga, Babati, the name of the group is Mkombozi. They are 29 women that together run a vegetable garden. The group started two years ago with the goal to get money and improve their living standard. The vegetables are sold on at the market in Bonga. They also put money from the sales in the village community bank where the interest of the account makes a profit. They decide together how to use the interest, for example to someone in the group that is sick. The money are divided equally between all members accept the account interest. Meetings are held once a week and decisions are made collectively. The reason no men participate is that women play an important role in the families, therefore they have to do something to have a good position as family responsible and get extra income to the families.

**Group 7.** Women village community bank in Bonga, Babati. All member puts money to the community bank account and the stock enable them to give loans to others and take loans
themselves. The amounts they put weakly to the account varies from 2000 to 10 000 Tanzanian shillings. The money is kept in a locked box and their goal is to change their living standard. Meetings are held once a week and decisions are made in the group in a democratic order. They together vote leaders and decide who they want to take in as a member.

**Group 8.** Dance group in Babati town. They are 20 women that dance traditional Tanzanian dance and have been a group for 15 years. All members are the same, and there has not been any changes or recruits. Meetings and rehearsals are held once a month. The reason they started as a group was to empower themselves and change their living standards, the goal is to promote their culture and to earn money. All profit is split equally between members. Decisions are made democratically and there is a document for rules and regulations. The reason they are only women is that it is a cultural dance performed by women.

**Group 9.** Women village community bank in Halla, Nangara, Babati, the name of the group is Mshikamano. They are 12 women and started 1 year and 2 months ago. They put and take loans through the community bank. When they meet everyone puts money in the box, from 2000 to 5000 Tanzanian shillings. If someone has a problem they help each other to solve it and support each other. They started because they want to change their lives, change ideas and to discuss when they meet. Decisions are made as a group collectively. They are only women because women understand the economics better and they are more aware of the commitment to a bank.

**Group 10.** Dance group in Babati town, the name of the group is Bagara Msanja group, msanja means the name of the one who dance. They are 20 women that dance traditional Tanzanian dance and play music together. They dance traditional Tanzanian dance and play horns, drums and sing. The group started in 1988, some members have changed over time. Money earned from performance is split equally. The goal is to empower themselves economically. Decisions are made as a group. The reason they are only women is that the specific traditional dance is only practiced by women.