ABRJ
American Based Research Journal
ISSN Online (2304-7151)

https://www.abrj.org/
Impact Factor 2.30
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8218873

Effect of Social Capital Integration on People's Socio-Economic Livelihood in Elgeyo Marakwet County

Author's Details:
[(1)] **Charles Kibet Kemboi** (PhD Candidate – Moi University)
[(2)] **Dr. Patrick Kere Maelo** (PhD Supervisor, Moi University)

Abstract
The concept of social capital has provided a better understanding of how best to achieve development goals through collaboration of a multifaceted society. Social capital integration has been popularly used in International Development (ID) parlance. Social capital is a key but hidden factor that can make a critical difference in productivity and subsequent poverty alleviation. Social capital is important in improving the livelihoods of rural people directly and indirectly through increase in access to goods and services. In order to achieve socio-economic development and to address the needs in a society, a multi-disciplinary approach must be applied, with due regard for the political, economic and social dimensions of development, links is seen as one of the key initiatives that is needed for attainment of Sustainable Development Goals. The ultimate goal of most development projects is to reduce poverty and improve social well-being. Infrastructure development projects of various types – such as roads, hospitals, and schools; large dams to supply water for drinking as well as agriculture; energy for growing industries - have provided improvements and benefits for many people's lives. Understanding how livelihoods are constructed and maintained can provide insight into ways that members of households make a living within their broader environmental context. Social capital is increasingly recognized as important in influencing economic development, establishment of safe neighborhoods and well-functioning communities.

Keywords: *Social Capital/ Effects of Social Capital/ Socio-Economic Livelihood/ Social Capital Integration/ etc*

Background of the Study

The evolution of the concept of social capital has provided a better understanding of how best to achieve development goals through collaboration of a multifaceted society in addition to production activities. According to Woolcock (1998), a common differentiation of types of social capital is into three basic forms:

i. bonding social capital, which refers to relations within or between relatively homogenous groups;
ii. bridging social capital, which refers to relationships within or between relatively homogenous groups; and
iii. linking social capital, which refers to relationships between people or groups at different hierarchical levels.

Social capital integration has been popularly used in International Development (ID) parlance. As with other organizations delivering projects, ID NGOs seem to be failing many stakeholders due to poor delivery of results. The term livelihood has attracted different definitions from many scholars. A prominent definition of livelihoods was provided by Chambers and Conway (1992) who framed a livelihood as "the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources), and activities for a means of living".

On the other hand, a rural livelihood is a 'means to a living' for households or individuals in rural areas like Elgeyo Marakwet County whereby the households and individuals' direct attention to the ways of obtaining a living rather than to the net results in terms of income received (Ellis, 2000).

The focus of development efforts has evolved from the building up of simple physical (financial resources and infrastructure) and human (education and technology transfer) capital to the creation of social capital (organizational/institutional development and trust/networks/norms among people). Social capital is a key but hidden factor that can make a critical difference in productivity and subsequent poverty alleviation (Munakata, 2020).

The Government of Canada (2003) emphasized that social capital was an important resource and a process in facilitating achievement of a broad range of major public policy objectives in areas of health, education, economy, labor markets, immigration management, poverty reduction, social exclusion, crime prevention and safety, neighbourhood revitalization and civic renewal. In Kenya, according to the documentation of social capital in Kenya is only very recent but the underlying concept can be traced to the activities of the *Mau Mau1* uprising in the 1950s and the *harambee2* self-help movement since 1960s (Sabatini, 2007). Consequently, Kirori (2009) identified four areas in which social capital played a critical role in the development of Kenya that is, education, rural finance, rural development, as well as democracy and political involvement.

Effects of Social Capital Integration on Socio – Economic Livelihoods

The term "livelihood" refers to a way of living to sustain one's life and provide basic needs (Khatun & Roy, 2012). The arrangement of activities that households choose to embark on to attain sustainable livelihoods is inspired by livelihood strategies (Ellis & Allison, 2004). The activities are differentiated on the basis of the situation of the activities: on-farm, non-farm or off-farm (OECD, 2011). In each location, diversification activities are differentiated according to the type of output, whether: agricultural produce (growing crops or raising livestock); continuance (processing of food or providing contracting services to other farmers); or involvement in other sectors by the household to acquire proceeds (OECD, 2011). According to Sisay (2010), households diversify because of the need to enhance their capabilities and assets, realization of economies of scope, liquidity constraints and to stabilize income flows and consumption risk. Households seek to diversify their livelihood to help reduce risks, particularly those associated with seasonality of rain-fed agriculture and termination of mineral extraction (OECD, 2011). Livelihood diversification can also help the rural inhabitants avoid environmental and economic trends and seasonality shocks, and hence make them less vulnerable (UN and NEPAD-OECD, 2011). They also use it as a strategy to combine activities that add to the accumulation of wealth in the household (Khatun & Roy, 2012). Therefore, the economic wellbeing of a household is inextricably dependent upon the set of livelihood diversification activities that it adopts.

Social capital is important in improving the livelihoods of rural people directly and indirectly through increase in access to goods and services. Ellis (2000), shows the significance of various asset-types, including social capital in underpinning the livelihood strategies of the individual and household. The access attribute of a livelihood, which includes rules and social relations subsumed under the asset-type, is important in determining the ability of people in the rural areas to own, control, claim, and make use of a resource as well as the ability to participate in and derive benefits from social and public services that are provided by the state such as education, health services, roads, water supplies, and among others.

It can therefore be argued that, in order to achieve socio-economic development and to address the needs in a society, a multi-disciplinary approach must be applied, with due regard for the political, economic and social dimensions of development, links is seen as one of the key initiatives that is needed for attainment of Sustainable Development Goals (Muller and Coetzee, 2012). However, the development strategies adopted by most developing countries have mainly focused on economic growth which does not capture the realization of sustainable development. This can be attributed to the fact that economic developments do not incorporate social capital considerations (Dale & Newman, 2010). Development actors therefore, need to consider how the development initiatives can integrate social capital initiatives to aid in socio-economic development in communities.

Bebbington (2007), opines that social capital is conceived as part of a system of social, economic and cultural structures which can only be understood in terms of the distribution of resources and power relationships. The argument is that socio-economic development and poverty reduction are about power, that is, who controls what resources and who has access to it and who does not (Molyneux, 2002). Additionally, politics shapes the lives of poor and marginalised people in the community in various ways and their interactions and experiences with formal and informal types of politics often exacerbate their vulnerability and diminish their sense of dignity (Hickey 2008). Examples of this include denying women access to farming land, or when specific groups are discriminated against. This is manifested when the poor struggle to organise or empower themselves, when actors in civil and political society fail to represent them, and when political elites fail to recognise those cast aside as deserving (Hickey 2008: 349). In support of this position, Hickey (2009), states that "politics closely shapes processes of both development and underdevelopment and the challenge of ensuring greater equity and social justice is essentially a political one". Politics therefore underlies the success as well as the failure of development (Moore 2003 in Hickey, 2008).

Espinoza (2001) considers the following variables for the measurement of social capital: First is Associativity, which is a variable that has to do with the interest of people to participate in the actions of the group. The second one is Density, which establishes belonging or considering themselves part of the community. The third variable is Centrality that has to do with the coordination that is maintained between internal and external relations. The fourth one is Mediation, which is a variable that has to do with the processes of recognition of a member as part of an organization. Lastly, is Fractions which is the level of conflict, that is present in the group, is measured.

Dhesi (2000), notes that all forms of capital including physical, human, natural, financial and social capital are essential for development but none of them is sufficient to ensure socio-economic development. There is need therefore for a holistic approach. He further argues that social capital cannot achieve everything or perhaps anything, on its own. If no economic opportunities exist, social capital will not make much of a difference. However, according to Woolcock (2002), when social capital is combined with other capitals (natural, physical and human) these can become more efficient and social capital can create the opportunity for links with other groups, and with authorities to systematically address socioeconomic development concerns, including reducing poverty. Hence, when considering socio-economic development alternatives, social capital has to be considered in how social capital can contribute, how it can be increased and how it should be considered in development initiatives to link state and society for optimal outcomes (Dhesi, 2000).

The term "livelihood" refers to a way of living to sustain one's life and provide basic needs (Khatun & Roy, 2012). The arrangement of activities that households choose to embark on to attain sustainable livelihoods is inspired by livelihood strategies (Ellis & Allison, 2004). The activities are differentiated on the basis of the situation of the activities: on-farm, non-farm or off-farm (OECD, 2011). In each location, diversification activities are differentiated according to the type of output, whether: agricultural produce (growing crops or raising livestock); continuance (processing of food or providing contracting services to other farmers); or involvement in other sectors by the household to acquire proceeds (OECD, 2011. According to Sisay (2010), households diversify because of the need to enhance their capabilities and assets, realization of economies of scope, liquidity constraints and to stabilize income flows and consumption risk. Households seek to diversify their livelihood to help reduce risks, particularly those associated with seasonality of rain-fed agriculture and termination of mineral extraction (OECD, 2011). Livelihood diversification can also help the rural inhabitants avoid environmental and economic trends and seasonality shocks, and hence make them less vulnerable (UN and NEPAD-OECD, 2011). They also use it as a strategy to combine activities that add to the accumulation of wealth in the household (Khatun & Roy, 2012). Therefore, the economic wellbeing of a household is inextricably dependent upon the set of livelihood diversification activities that it adopts.

Bebbington (2007), opines that social capital is conceived as part of a system of social, economic and cultural structures which can only be understood in terms of the distribution of resources and power relationships. The argument is that socio-economic development and poverty reduction are about power, that is, who controls what resources and who has access to it and who does not (Molyneux, 2002). Additionally, politics shapes the lives of poor and marginalised people in the community in various ways and their interactions and experiences with formal and informal types of politics often exacerbate their vulnerability and diminish their sense of dignity (Hickey 2008). Examples of this include denying women access to farming land, or when specific groups are discriminated against. This is manifested when the poor struggle to organise or empower themselves, when actors in civil and political society fail to represent them, and when political elites fail to recognise those cast aside as deserving (Hickey 2008:349). In support of this position, Hickey (2009), states that "politics closely shapes processes of both development and underdevelopment and the challenge of ensuring greater equity and social justice is essentially a political one". Politics therefore underlies the success as well as the failure of development (Moore 2003 in Hickey, 2008).

Dhesi (2000), notes that all forms of capital including physical, human, natural, financial and social capital are essential for development but none of them is sufficient to ensure socio-economic development. There is need therefore for a holistic approach. He further argues that social capital cannot achieve everything or perhaps anything, on its own. If no economic opportunities exist, social capital will not make much of a difference. However, according to Woolcock (2002), when social capital is combined with other capitals (natural, physical and human) these can become more efficient and social capital can create the opportunity for links with other groups, and with authorities to systematically address socioeconomic development concerns, including reducing poverty. Hence, when considering socio-economic development alternatives, social capital has to be considered in how social capital can contribute, how it can be increased and how it should be considered in development initiatives to link state and society for optimal outcomes (Dhesi, 2000).

Further, "Livelihood capitals" refer to the vital resource bases of communities and different categories of households FAO (2005). There is some international scientific consensus that livelihood capital comprises five categories: human, natural, financial, physical and social capitals Ansoms and McKay (2010). Generally, livelihoods approaches focus on the material value of household "capitals" rather than cognitive and social use values (Van Dijk, 2011) and poverty is defined as a lack of "capitals" (a condition) rather than as an absence of "entitlements" (a relation) (Van Dijk, 2011). However, it is very important to recognize the contemporary livelihoods approach which defines livelihood as the combination of capabilities, resources, and activities required to sustain a living.

According to the Sustainable Livelihood Approach (SLA) Human Capital represents the skills, knowledge, ability to labour and good health that together enable people to pursue different livelihood strategies and achieve their livelihood objective Sayer and Campbell (2003). Human capital must be seen as a keystone within the SLA, for the reason that the other capitals are, at the least, partly based on the human capital as a basic requirement. Especially for rural, resource dependent people the assessment of this capital implicates difficulties, as for example indigenous knowledge is difficult to evaluate (Kollmair 2002).

Social Capital includes informal networks, membership of formalised groups and relationships of trust that facilitate co-operation" (Clark and Carney 2008, Sayer and Campbell 2003). The nature of social capital is often determined by the social class of the stakeholder, often influenced by gender, age and/ or caste. The inclusion of stakeholders into a network or group implicates the exclusion of others which can result in an interference of development. The high local value of the social capital clearly derives of its capacity of compensating calamities or shortage of other capitals.

Physical capital is a measure for the existence of physical requirements needed to support livelihood in a sense of infrastructure. The role of this asset can be seen in the context of opportunity costs, where an existing accessible infrastructure releases either labour or provides time as a resource, for example education Ellis (2000). It comprises the productive assets that a household possesses which include transport, shelter and buildings, water supply and sanitation, energy and communications and producer goods needed to support livelihoods. (Mankiw & Taylor, 2015).

Natural capital describes especially for resource dependent communities the stock all livelihood activities are built on. This capital represents in particular for rural communities, with a high proportion for poor stakeholders, an essential value which in fact is prone to calamities. Not seldom these calamities are caused by natural processes e.g. floods, fires, seasonal storms, earthquakes. Natural capital can be accumulated from two different sources; one source is represented by available stock in the form of cash or equivalent available assets as livestock, the other source is characterised by the external inflow of money which originates from labour income, pensions, remittances or other types of financial liabilities. Within the five capitals, the financial capital enables people to adapt to different livelihood strategies. It sets the precondition for the creation or improvement of other capitals than financial capital. Complementing natural capital with human, physical, and social capital greatly increases its productive capacity (World Bank, 2012)

It refers to the financial resources that people use to achieve their livelihood objectives. It includes flows as well as stocks and it can refer to consumption as well as production. Finance is an important livelihood building block, that is, the availability of cash or equivalent that enables people to adopt different livelihood strategies (UNDP, 2015). Savings are the preferred type of financial capital because they do not have liabilities attached and usually do not entail reliance on others. They can be held in several forms: cash, bank deposits or liquid assets such as livestock and jewellery. Financial resources can also be obtained through credit-providing institutions. The most common types of inflows are pensions, or other transfers from the state, payments for environmental services and remittances. To make a positive contribution to financial capital these inflows must be reliable. Hence, from the above discussions, financial capital is probably the most versatile livelihood asset (UNDP, 2015).

Effects of Social Capital Integration on Social Economic Livelihoods

The concept of social capital is of great importance for countries other than businesses. Although the economic, political and social dimension of development is handled separately, the fact that it is treated as a whole is very important in terms of the sustainability of development. The planning of development without adding a human, human relations, networks and norms to the account, is no different from planning to eat without material (Derya *et.al.* 2017).

The ultimate goal of most development projects is to reduce poverty and improve social well-being. Infrastructure development projects of various types – such as roads, hospitals, and schools; large dams to supply water for drinking as well as agriculture; energy for growing industries - have provided improvements and benefits for many people's lives and both national and local economies (Cernea 1997a).

The livelihood definition provided by Chambers and Conway (1992:7) has been widely used in the development studies (Chimhowu and Hulme 2006). A livelihood comprises the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living. A livelihood is sustainable when it can cope with and recover from stresses and shocks and maintain or enhance its capabilities and assets both now and in the future, while not undermining the natural resource base (Chambers and Conway 1992:7).

According to these authors, understanding how livelihoods are constructed and maintained can provide insight into ways that members of households make a living within their broader environmental context. Although access to resources is an integral part of building livelihoods, livelihoods should not be viewed solely as access to material assets such as financial capital, but also involve access to a diverse set of assets including natural, physical, human, and 7 social capital, as well as the dynamic and complex strategies required to integrate these to make a living (Chambers and Conway 1992).

Social capital is a sociological concept which refers to connections within and between social networks. It refers to the social networks, linkages and trust that are utilized by individuals or groups in order to survive or get ahead (Portes, 1998). Bourdieu was one of the first scholars to propose the term social capital. Bourdieu (1985:248) defined social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition."

Coleman (1990) argued that social capital was defined by its function. For Coleman, social capital is not a single entity, but a variety of different entities with two elements in common. First, they all consist of some aspects of social structure. Second, they facilitate certain action of individuals who are within the structure (Coleman 1990:302). The concept has been modified and widely used across a variety of disciplines (Portes 1998; Putnam 2000; Schuller et al. 2000). Social capital is built among individuals, at community and at societal levels through formal and informal institutions to create stable linkages, networks and trust (Woolcock 1998).

It is worthwhile to consider the importance of personal relations and social networks with both governmental agencies and private business sector actors. Luttrell (2005), in her work on social networks in Vietnam, found that personal relations with government officials and private resource owners play a significant role in providing people access to natural resources. In the urban relocation context, such forms of social networks can create social capital through 10 increased access to information and resource (financial and natural), and social support.

Social capital (Kiboro, 2017) is increasingly recognized as important in influencing economic development, establishment of safe neighborhoods and well-functioning communities. There is growing evidence that communities with relatively higher stocks of social capital in form of grassroots associations appear to achieve higher levels of growth compared to societies with low stocks of social capital. The influence of social Capital on the livelihood outcomes to local level associations revealed that majority of the households that were affiliated to local level associations obtained essential services that influenced their livelihoods positively.

Social capital can best be understood as a means or a process for accessing various forms of resources and support through networks of social relations. Research has placed emphasis on the possible role of social capital as a resource and a process in facilitating achievement of a broad range of major public policy objectives in areas of health, education, economy, labor markets, immigration management, poverty reduction, social exclusion, crime prevention and safety, neighborhood revitalization and civic renewal (Government of Canada, 2003).

A rural livelihood is a 'means to a living' for households or individuals in rural areas whereby the households and individuals direct attention to the ways of obtaining a living rather than to the net results in terms of income received (Ellis, 2000).

In most developing countries, Kenya included, rural households adopt intricate and diverse livelihood strategies. Diversification is an important strategy for achieving survival and reflects the socio-economic dimensions of households. It is an important aspect for policy prescriptions about rural household income levels, farm productivity and rural poverty reduction. For many years, the dominant strategy for rural development and improvement of rural welfare was about the growth of output of the small farm (Kirori, 2015).

Social capital has important attributes distinguishing it as true capital. Views differ about whether matters referred to under social capital can sensibly be thought of as true “capital”. Economists have pointed out that social capital has many features of capital (Grootaert et al. 2004). Social capital requires resources to produce, especially time; and is subject to accumulation and depreciation. Stock of social capital can lead to a stream of benefits which can take many different forms including improved access to credit, improved access to education and health services, improved risk management, among others.

Woolcock (2001) argues that societies with high stocks of social capital are less vulnerable, and have greater capacity to resolve their own conflicts as well as take advantage of new opportunities for improvement. Hence the central idea of social capital is that networks and the associated norms have value (Putnam, 2000). Evidence is provided in the literature that social capital has positive effects on household welfare (Grootaert et al., 2002; and Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). These studies show that households (particularly the poor ones) draw additional resources that enables them meet every day needs through social connections; thus the reciprocal relationships serve as wells of financial, social, or political support from which they can draw during times of need. Research has also shown that social capital encourages co-operative behavior, thereby facilitating economic welfare through improved information sharing and reduction of opportunistic behavior (because of norms that sanction behavior) (Cummings et al., 2006).

Social capital is a resource that can be used for good or in a negative way; however, its image today is often seen in a positive manner and a theoretical and practical focus for social science (Adam & Roncevic, 2003 and Field, 2017). Through social capital networks, individuals can access information to access services or goods in the society (Field, 2017).

Lohmann & Lohmann, (2005), argue that the use of social capital is considered beneficial because the concept focuses on a community’s assets and may lead to the development of other forms of capital. He further notes that social capital is a form of assets-based development in which “community development practitioners and local citizens work together as partners in identifying available assets, connecting them in ways that multiply their power and effectiveness”.

When a community lacks assets, Binswanger (2007) believes that social capital is the one capital that is most needed. In this same line of thinking, Alston (2002) writes that social capital is key to development and he states that the “enhancement of social capital, the building of trust, networks and enriched interactions at the community level are considered key to rural revitalization” Additionally, Homan (2011) opines that the development of social capital is that a “community rich in social capital will likely undertake efforts to develop other forms of capital that may be in short supply in the community”. Boyd, Hayes, Wilson, & Bearsley-Smith (2008) further state that “two aspects of social capital – that is, sense of community and neighbourhood cohesion – are high in rural communities”.

According to Smith (2016), social capital building relies on creating and strengthening relationships at the individual and community levels. At the individual level, families and friends play a role in building strong ties that connect individuals to opportunities while at the community level, neighborhoods help to bring people together through both formal and informal events, strengthening both bonding and bridging social capital. Community organizations, thus, play a key role in promoting social capital by enhancing social networks. Organizations can help to foster positive relationships as a byproduct of the services they provide (Smith, 2016). This implies that if individuals are already involved with a community organization for other reasons, they will likely accrue social capital through their involvement. Organizations can also provide access to opportunities, such as providing participants information about job openings (Greenberg *et al.*, 2017). Local partnerships help to further enhance social networks through involvement in the local community and affiliated institutions. Studies by Liotta *et al.* (2018) and Imamura *et al.* (2016) found out that social capital have important effects on self-rated health (SRH), life satisfaction, depression, physical disease and even mortality among older adults.

Adam and Roncevic (2003) note that, through social capital, there has been a series of theoretical debates and empirical investigations which have stimulated reconsideration of the significance of human relations, networks, organizational forms for the quality of life and of developmental performance. Requena (2003) suggested that social capital brings together several important sociological concepts such as social support, integration and social cohesion. Rothstein (2003) who supported this view stated that the real strength of social capital theory is the combination of macro-sociological historical structures with micro-level causal mechanisms, a rare feature in the social sciences. Lyons (2000) opined that social capital is important in shaping regional development patterns.

According to Aldridge *et al*. (2002) and Halpern (2001), social capital is charged with a range of potential beneficial effects including: facilitation of higher levels of, and growth in, gross domestic product (GDP); facilitation of more efficient functioning of labor markets; lower levels of crime; and improvements in the effectiveness of institutions of government. Additionally, social capital is an important variable in educational attainment, community governance, and economic problems (Aldridge *et al*., 2002; Israel *et al.*, 2001 and Bowles and Gintis, 2002).

According to Woolcock (1998) and World Bank (1998), social capital is not always used for positive purposes: social relationships, networks and trust can act as a foundation for negative actions and exclusion or even oppression of particular social groups. Similarly, a society may be well-organised, with strong institutions and embedded reciprocal mechanisms, but be based on fear and power (think of feudal, hierarchical, racist societies).

Bonding social capital can have positive effects such as information sharing and enforcing common norms. Social capital also can have negative effects for example some groups bond and become inward such that they do not accept outsiders (Tonts, 2005; Walseth, 2008). Fields, 2008; Fukuyama, (1995) and Sciarrone, (2002) argue that this negative aspect of "bonding" social capital may encourage exclusivity within a group with examples including groups such as fraternities and the mafia. Bridging social capital can link individuals to groups or people outside of their networks "generating broader identities and reciprocity" as noted by Putnam, (2000). However, bridging might result in clique formation of dissatisfied individuals thereby undermining current organizational structures (Portes, 1998). Bourdeau noted the ability of networks to reinforce inequality where some members obtain a greater share of the "goods" than others (Bourdeau, 1986; Lee, Dunlap & Edwards, 2014).

According to Woolcock (1998) and World Bank (1998), social capital facilitates cooperation because people have the confidence to invest in collective activities, knowing that others will also do so. They gave the following summary on the benefits and adverse effects of the sustainability of natural resources.

The benefits conferred by social capital include:

i. Risk management and social insurance (social capital – for example the ability to call down support from kin – can act as a buffer against the effects of shocks and adverse trends);
ii. Better management of common and shared resources, through group action;
iii. Reduced costs of conducting business, including lowering transactions costs and increasing the ability to exploit economies of scale;
iv. Increased capacity to innovate (e.g. through membership of farmers' research groups which are well connected to research agencies) and to sustain activities beyond the life of projects;
v. Improved access to information and services (including better overall links between external organisations and the poor, resulting in greater empowerment of the poor); and
vi. Greater influence over policies and legislation.

vii. Adverse effects of social capital upon the sustainability of natural resources

viii. Does membership of certain groups allow over-extraction of natural resources (e.g. irrigation or drinking water, forest products) to the detriment of non-members and the resources themselves?

ix. Do formal rules and norms trap some people within harmful social arrangements (e.g. tenancy/landlord? Relations that prevent tenants from investing in land improvement

x. Do existing associations act as obstacles to the emergence of sustainable livelihoods (e.g. by encouraging conformity, perpetuating inequity, and allowing some individuals to coerce others)?

xi. Maintenance of social capital is costly (time, labour, etc.) – who bears the main burden? Women often rely disproportionately on social capital to gain access to basic resources (e.g. through marriage or reliance on male kin) and often bear more of the responsibility for maintaining it.

Generally, social capital supports economic development, primarily by enabling transactions among individuals, households, and groups. Participation of individuals in social networks increases the availability of information and reduces their cost. An example of such information is information about the prices of certain products on the market, the emergence of new markets, financial resources, new jobs, the reliability of a particular dealer, etc. Participation in local networks and mutual trust allow certain social groups to make decisions and implement collective action.

Şavkar, (2011) alludes that when societies are examined in a sociological sense, the level of social capital of societies is positively and significantly related to the level of development of societies. He further asserts that social capital is seen as a society in which higher societies are safer, cleaner, healthier, and cultured, whereas societies with lower social capital levels have inverse characteristics with constant political, ethnic, religious and sectarian conflicts and that these scarce resources are wasted.

Ring, Peredo & Chrisman (2010) express their concern that social capital can be negative if it leads to excluding others, and Shortall (2008) states that the "social capital debate neglects considerations of power and social inequality" (p. 454). Unfortunately, this is not the only concern that is associated with the concept of social capital; Vermaak (2009) believes that there are "four negative consequences of social capital: exclusion of outsiders, excessive claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedom and downward leveling norms". Lastly, as studies have shown, social capital is difficult to measure (Vermaak, 2009, p. 401).

Potential downsides of social capital include: fostering behavior that worsens rather than improves economic performance; acting as a barrier to social inclusion and social mobility; dividing rather than uniting communities or societies; facilitating rather than reducing crime, education underachievement and health-damaging behaviour (Aldridge *et al*., 2002). Social capital can become a constraint to individuals' actions and choices. For example, there is a particularly high risk of negative social capital in urban poverty situations (Small, 2002)

The challenges of utilizing social capital to study the development of a community include a lack of empirical evidence that social capital will lead to increased development, confusion about the concept of social capital, potential negative impacts of building social capital and difficulty in measuring social capital (Deller & Deller, 2010).

It can be argued that the level of social capital can benefit a community in a multitude of ways, including a low rate of crime. However, Deller & Deller (2010) noted that "social capital is necessary but not sufficient to deter crime" which makes one wonder if social capital is all that influential in a community's health (p. 269). Additionally, as observed by Bolton (2011), social capital has become a confusing concept because people mention their 300 friends on Facebook when referring to a high level of social capital. In the same way that individuals relate social capital with a number instead of relationships built on trust, groups within may focus on participation rather than relationship building in the development of social capital.

Although social capital has been cited as an asset to facilitating community development and uniting groups to further a cause, the concept has also been criticized for ignoring the differences between groups. Arneil (2006) writes that social capital gives power to some over others and that a lack in social capital stems from growing inequality among different groups and “the historical reality of exclusion, assimilation and eradication in the civic life of America”. In addition, Anderson *et al.* (2002) opine that enhanced social capital can improve environmental outcomes through decreased costs of collective action, increase in knowledge and information flows, increased cooperation, less resource degradation and depletion, more investment in common lands and water systems, improved monitoring and enforcement.

Effects of Social Capital Integration of Socio-Economic Livelihoods.

This objective was to evaluate the effect of social capital on people’s livelihood and therefore, the use of social capital is considered beneficial because this concept focuses on a community’s assets and may lead to the development of other forms of capital.

Table: Effects of Social Capital on Social Economic Livelihoods.

	Mean	**Std. Deviation**	**Skewness**	**Kurtosis**
Risk management and social insurance	3.5779	1.11052	-0.561	-0.244
Better Management of shared resources	3.5411	1.18664	-0.488	-0.676
Reduced cost of conducting business	2.2521	1.24152	-0.094	-0.997
Increased Capacity to innovate	3.5465	1.28093	-0.111	-1.107
Improved access to information	3.4079	1.16197	-0.327	-0.637
Influence over policies	2.7989	1.35546	0.08	-1.19
Membership over extraction of resources	3.532	1.25287	-0.342	-0.846
Formal rules and norms	3.1105	1.2139	-0.127	-0.944
Do existing acts as obstacles	3.068	1.26622	-0.027	-0.998
Maintenance of social capital	3.3144	1.31436	-0.332	-0.982

Source: Field Survey, 2021

The findings show that Risk management and social insurance had (Mean=3.58,SD=1.11,Skewness=-0.56,Kurtosis=-0.24). This indicates that social capital for example the ability to call down support from kin can act as a buffer against the effects of shocks and adverse trends.

The findings further show that on management of resources (Mean=3.54,SD=1.19,Skewness=-0.49,Kurtosis=-0.68).This implies that there is better management of common and shared resources, through group action.

Further, on cost of conducting business (Mean=2.25, SD=1.24, Skewness=-0.94,Kurtosis=-0.99), there is no reduced costs of conducting business through lowering transaction costs or in increasing the ability to exploit economies of scale. Stańczyk, (2007) opines that high levels of trust in a society may also translate into economic benefits through decreased transaction costs. In addition, according to Isham, (2002) one of the most striking arguments in favor of common resource management lies in that social capital guarantees social cohesion and improves trust among members of the community, so it helps to reduce transaction costs (Isham, 2002).

On increased capacity to innovate (Mean=3.55,SD=1.28,Skewness=-0.11,Kurtosis=-1.11).The findings imply that through membership of farmers’ research groups which are well connected to research agencies, there is increased capacity to innovate and to sustain activities beyond the life of projects.

Similarly, the results also indicate that the (Mean=3.51,SD=1.16,Skewness=-0.33,Kurtosis=-0.64) which shows that there is improved access to information and services in the community which can be attributed to better overall links between external organisations and the poor which further results in greater empowerment of the communities. Organizations can help to foster positive relationships as a byproduct of the services they provide (Smith, 2016). In other words, if individuals are already involved with a community organization for other reasons, they will likely accrue social capital through their involvement. Organizations can also provide access to opportunities, such as providing participants information about job openings (Greenberg et al., 2017). Local partnerships help to further enhance social networks through involvement in the local community and affiliated institutions.

Consequently, the findings on influence of policies and legislation, (Mean=2.80,SD=1.36,Skewness=-0.08,Kurtosis=-1.19). These results show that the community does not have any influence on policy making and legislation.

On membership over extraction of resources, (Mean=3.53,SD=1.25,Skewness=-0.34,Kurtosis=-0.85), the results indicate that membership of certain groups allow over-extraction of natural resources to the detriment of non-members and the resources themselves.

The results regarding formal rules and regulations, (Mean=3.11,SD=1.21,Skewness=-0.13,Kurtosis=-0.94), indicate that formal rules and norms do not trap people within harmful social arrangements. Regarding the relationship between existing associations and emergence of sustainable livelihoods (Mean=3.07,SD=1.27,Skewness=-0.03,Kurtosis=-0.99), the findings clearly show that the associations do not act as obstacles to the emergence of sustainable livelihoods.

Lastly, the results on maintenance of social capital (Mean=3.31,SD=1.31,Skewness=-0.33,Kurtosis=-0.98), indicate that social capital maintenance is a costly activity in terms of labour intensity and time consumption. From the interviews conducted, a majority of the respondents pointed out that social capital integration had both positive and negative effects on socio-economic livelihoods in Elgeyo Marakwet County. Out of the total aggregates, 70 percent narrowed down on the following positive effects;

i. Source of social insurance,
ii. Cushioning one another in social development,
iii. Incubation of enhanced socio-economic livelihoods, and
iv. Improved harmony despite socio-political persuasions.

The remaining 30 percent however, considered that mixed positive and negative effects emerged from social capital integration initiatives. Some negative effects included misuse of pooled resources, failure to repay loans leading to disassociation and loss of trust.

The study sought to examine social capital integration and its role in enhancing socio-economic livelihoods in Elgeyo Marakwet County, Kenya. It came clear that the role of social capital integration is crucial in social cohesion, sharing knowledge and technology and pooling resources towards increased and efficient productivity and much to Elgeyo Marakwet County as in other environments.

As highlighted by Nicholson & Hoye, they aver that the fundamental notion of social capital is to incorporate socio-cultural factors to explain social economic development outcomes. Furthermore, the study suggests that the key aspects of the relational dimension of social capital are trust and trustworthiness, norms and sanctions, obligations and expectations, and identity and identification. Again, social capital integration enhances the capacity of groups to access resources, ideas and information. Observation from interviews conducted revealed a majority of the respondents pointing out that social capital integration had both positive and negative effects on socio-economic livelihoods in Elgeyo Marakwet County where positive effects outweighed the negative effects.

Conclusions: Effects of social capital integration on Socio-Economic Livelihoods in Elgeyo Marakwet County.

The study found out that through group action, there was better management of common and shared resources. Women who belonged to groups had to ensure that the required contributions were always promptly done. Similarly, individuals are already involved with a community organization had access to opportunities, such as providing participants information about job openings which would be sources of income.

Additionally, the findings intimate that individuals, particularly farmers who were members of groups got connected to research agencies that provided increased capacity to innovate and to sustain their productive activities. In the same vein, residents who partnered in businesses witnessed reduced costs of conducting business through lowering transaction costs and increasing the ability to exploit economies of scale. Stańczyk, (2007) opines that high levels of trust in a society may also translate into economic benefits through decreased transaction costs.

Finally, a majority of the respondents pointed out that social capital integration had both positive and negative effects on socio-economic livelihoods in Elgeyo Marakwet County. Out of the total aggregates, the following positive effects were noted;

i. Source of social insurance,
ii. Cushioning one another in social development,
iii. Incubation of enhanced socio-economic livelihoods, and
iv. Improved harmony despite socio-political persuasions.

Some negative effects included misuse of pooled resources, failure to repay loans leading to disassociation and loss of trust.

The study points notable effects of social capital integration on socio-economic livelihoods in EMC to be; access to information, better management and sharing of common resources, social insurance, and unity.

REFERENCES

i. Adam, F and Roncevic, B (2003). Social Capital: Recent Debates and Research Trends.*Social Science Information,* 42: 155-183

ii. Aldridge, S., Halpern, D., and Sarah, F. (2002). Social Capital: A Discussion Paper. London, England: Performance Innovation Unit.

iii. Anderson, R. and Sarah., J. (2002). "The Articulation of Social Capital in Entrepreneurial Networks: A Glue or a Lubricant?" *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 14(3):193–210.

iv. Arneil, B. (2006). Diverse Communities: The Problem with Social Capital. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

v. Bebbington, A. (2007). Social Capital and Development Studies II: Can Bourdieu Travel to Policy? *Progress in Development Studies*, 7(2):155-162.

vi. Binswanger, H. (2007). Empowering Rural People for their Own Development. *The Journal of the International Association of Agricultural Economists*, 19th December, 2007

vii. Bolton, D. (2011). *Social Capital in Rural Southwest Kansas.* (Doctoral dissertation).Retrieved from ProQuest. (3472799)

viii. Bourdieu, P. (1985). The Forms of Capital. In Richardson, J (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York: Greenwood Press.

ix. Bowles, S and Gintis, H. (2002). Social Capital and Community Governance. *The Economic Journal*, 112, F419 – F436

x. Boyd, C., Hayes, L., Wilson, R., & Bearsley-Smith, C. (2008). Harnessing the Social Capital of Rural Communities for Youth Mental Health: An Asset-Based Community Development Framework. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, *16*(4), 189-193.

xi. Cernea, Michael M. (1997a). "The Risks and Reconstruction Model for Resettling Displaced Populations." World Development, 25: 1569-1588.

xii. Chambers, R. and Conway, R. (1992). Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century. *IDS Discussion Paper,* No. 296. University of Sussex: Brington.

xiii. Chimhowu, Admos and David Hulme (2006). "Livelihood Dynamics in Planned and Spontaneous Resttlament in Zimbabwe: Converging and Vulnerable." World Development. 34: 728-750.

xiv. Clark, J. & D. Carney. (2008). A review of DFID's experience with sustainable livelihoods, Evolution of livelihoods approaches within DFID. Eldis.

xv. Coleman, James S. (1990). Foundations of Social Theory, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

xvi. Cummings, S., Heeks, R.; and Huysman, M. (2006). "Knowledge and learning in online networks in development: a social-capital perspective", *Development in Practice*, Vol 16, No.6, 570-586.

xvii. Dale, A. and Newman, L. (2010). Social Capital: A Necessary and Sufficient Condition for Sustainable Community Development? *Community Development Journal* (January), 45(1):5-21.

xviii. Deller, M. & Deller, S. (2010). Rural Crime and Social Capital. *Growth and Change*, *41*(2),221-275. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2257.2010.00526.x

xix. Derya, T., Ayşe B, Filiz Ç. (2017). A Study on Social Capital Concept, Development and Importance. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration*, Volume 4, Issue 1, November 2017, Pages 52-56

xx. Dhesi, A.S. (2000). Social Capital and Community Development. C*ommunity Development Journal*, July, 35(3):199-214

xxi. Ellis, F. (2000). Rural Livelihoods and Diversity in Developing Countries. Oxford: Oxford University Press, U.K.

xxii. Ellis, F., and Allison, E. (2004). Livelihood Diversification and Natural Resource Access. University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK. Overseas Development Group. 40(4):1-30.

xxiii. FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization). Rapid Guide for Missions: Analyzing Local Institutions and Livelihoods; FAO: Rome, Italy, 2005; pp. 15–32.

xxiv. Field, J. (2008). Social Capital (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.

xxv. Field, J. (2017). Social Capital (3rd Ed.). London: Routledge.

xxvi. Fukuyama, F. (1995). Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

xxvii. Government of Canada. (2003), Social Capital as Public Policy Tool, *Policy Research Initiative*, Canada.

xxviii. Greenberg, D., De La Rosa Aceves, A., Karlstrom, M., Quiroz-Becerra, A., Schell, S.,Yang, E., & Yu, A. (2017). Network Effectiveness in Neighborhood Collaborations. Retrieved from MDRC website: https://www.mdrc.org/sites/default/files/CCN_Report_ES_Finalweb.pdf

xxix. Grootaert Ch., Narayan D., Jones V.N., Woolcock M., (2004). Measuring Social Capital:An Integrated Questionnaire. *World Bank Working Paper*, No. 18. The World Bank, Washington

xxx. Halpern, D. (2001). Moral Values, Social Trust and Inequality: Can Values Explain Crime? *British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 41, Issue 2, pp. 236-251, 2001

xxxi. Hickey, S. (2008). The Return of Politics in Development Studies I: Getting Lost within the Poverty Agenda? *Progress in Development Studies*, 8 (4):349–358.

xxxii. Hickey, S. (2009). The Return of Politics in Development Studies II: Capturing the Political Progress Report. *Progress in Development Studies*, 9 (2):141–152.

xxxiii. Homan, M. S. (2011). Promoting Community Change: Making it Happen in the Real World, (5th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.

xxxiv. Israel, G Beaulieu, L, Hartless, G. (2001). The Influence of Family and Community Social Capital on Educational Achievement. *Rural Sociology 66*, 43-68

xxxv. Khatun, D., and Roy, B. C. (2012). Rural Livelihood Diversification in West Bengal: Determinants and Constraints. *Agricultural Economics Research Review*, 25(1):115-124.

xxxvi. Kiboro, Christopher Nkonge (2017). Influence of Social Capital on Livelihood Outcomes for the Internally Displaced Persons in Kenya: A Social Capital Approach. European Scientific Journal 13(26), DOI:10.19044/esj.2017.v13n26p266.

xxxvii. Kirori, G. N. (2018). Social capital as a strategy for promoting rural livelihoods: case for Kenya. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development* , 9(12):64-74.

xxxviii. Lee, K., Dunlap, R., & Edwards, M. (2014). The Implication of Bourdieu's Theory of Practice for Leisure Studies. *Leisure Sciences*, *36*, 314–323. doi:10.1080/01490400.2013.857622

xxxix. Liotta, G.; Inzerilli, M.; Palombi, L.; Madaro, O.; Orlando, S.; Scarcella, P.; Betti, D.; Marazzi, M. (2018). Social Interventions to Prevent Heat-Related Mortality in the Older Adult in Rome, Italy: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health 2018*, 15, 715

xl. Lohmann, N., & Lohmann, R. A. (2005). *Rural Social Work Practice*. New York: Columbia University Press. doi:10.7312/lohm12932

xli. Luttrell, C. (2005). "Invisible Institutions: Informal Means of Gaining Access to Natural Resources in Coastal Vietnam." Pp. 116-144 in Modernization and Social Transformation in Viet Nam: Social Capital Formation and Institution Building, edited by Mutz, G., Klump, R. Institute fur Asienkunde, German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Hamburg.

xlii. Mankiw, G., & Taylor, M. P. (2015). *Economics*. Boston: Cengage Learning EMEA

xliii. Marcus, A. (2017). Determinants of Social Capital: New Evidence on Religion, Diversity and Structural Change. *Br. J. Political Sci.*

xliv. Molyneux, M. (2002). Gender and the Silences of Social Capital: Lessons from Latin America. *Development and Change*, 33:167-188.

xlv. Muller, J and Coetzee, T. (2012). Social Capital and Socio-Economic Development in Developing Political Economies. *African Journal of Public Affairs*, Volume 5, Number 1

xlvi. OECD (2011). The Well-being of Nations. The Role of Human and Social Capital. Centre for Educational Research and Innovation. Paris, France: OECD

xlvii. Portes, A. (1998). Social Capital: Its Origins and Applications in Modern Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1-25.

xlviii. Putnam, R. (2000). Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Renewal of American Community. New York, NY: Touchstone-Simon & Schuster.

xlix. Requena, F. (2003). Social Capital, Satisfaction and Quality of Life in the Workplace. *Social Indicators Research*, 61. 331-360

l. Ring, J., Peredo, A., & Chrisman, J. (2010). Business Networks and Economic Development in Rural Communities in the United States. *Entrepreneurship:Theory & Practice*, *34*(1), 171-195.

li. Rothstein, B. (2003). Social Capital, Economic Growth and Quality of Government: The Causal Mechanism. *New Political Economy 8*, 49-71

lii. Sayer, J. & B. Campbell. (2003). The Science of Sustainable Development Local Livelihoods And the Global Environment Cambridge University Press

liii. Şavkar, E. (2011). Elements of Social Capital and Its Relationship with Economic Development. (Master Thesis) University of Afyon Kocatepe, Afyonkarahisar

liv. Sciarrone, R., (2002). The Dark Side of Social Capital: The Case of Mafia. *Workshop on Social Capital and Civic Involvement*, Cornell University, September 13-14, 2002

lv. Schuller, T., Baron, S., Field, J., (2000). "Social Capital: A Review and Critique." Pp. 1–39 in: Social Capital: Critical Perspectives, edited by Baron, S., Field, J., Schuller, T. New York: Oxford University Press.

lvi. Shortall, S. (2008). Are Rural Development Programmes Socially Inclusive? Social Inclusion, Civic Engagement, Participation, and Social Capital: Exploring the Differences. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 24(4), 450-457.

lvii. Small, M. (2002). Culture, Cohorts and Social Organisation Theory: Understanding Local Participation in a Latino Housing Project. *American Journal of Sociology 108*,(1): 1-54

lviii. Smith, S. (2016). Job Finding among the Poor: Do Social Ties Matter? In D. Brady & L.M. Burton (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook Of The Social Science Of Poverty* (pp.438–461). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

lix. Tonts, M. (2005). Competitive Sport and Social Capital in Rural Australia. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *21*, 137–149. doi:10.1016/j.jrurstud.2005.03.001

lx. Vermaak, J. (2009). Reassessing the Concept of 'Social Capital': Considering Resources for Satisfying the Needs of Rural Communities. *Development Southern Africa*,*26*(3), 399-412. doi:10.1080/03768350903086770

lxi. Walseth, K. (2008). Bridging and Bonding Social Capital in Sport: Experiments of Young Women with an Immigrant Background. *Sport, Education and Society*, *13*,1–17. doi:10.1080/13573320701780498

lxii. Woolcock, M. (2002). Social Capital in Theory and Practice: Reducing Poverty by Building Partnerships between States, Markets and Civil Society. In: Social Capital and Poverty Reduction – Which role for the Civil Society. *Organizations and the State?* United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,pp. 20 -38.

lxiii. World Bank. (2012). Inclusive growth: The pathway to sustainable development Washington DC: The World Bank

lxiv. World Bank. (1998). Initiative on Defining, Monitoring and Measuring Social Capital: Overview and Programme Description. Social Capital Working Paper No. 1. Washington DC: The World Bank, Social Development Family, Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Network.