The Global Exchange Forum

Social Capital: A policy tool for North and South?

Conference Report

On March 29th 2004, The Foreign Policy Centre, commissioned by the Barrow Cadbury Trust, convened a conference to discuss the potential of social capital as a policy tool for Northern and Southern policymaking communities. Participants included representatives from governments, NGOs and the academic world in Europe, Latin America, the Middle East and Africa, as well as senior officials from both the Cabinet Office and Home Office in the UK. The aim of the conference was to improve channels of communication between these communities and create networks between Northern and Southern policy practitioners.

Sessions explored ways in which social capital has been understood in different contexts and how it has been applied in key policy areas. In particular, the event focused on three areas: the empowerment of women, conflict resolution and diversity.

Speakers ranged from political figures such as Barbara Roche MP and the Brazilian Minister for Race Relations, Matilde Ribeiro, to leading experts such as Anthony Giddens, Ted Cantle, Michael Woolcock and David Halpern, among others.

BARROW CADBURY TRUST

The Foreign Policy Centre

Foreword

There is still a prevailing view that the countries of the North have the monopoly on legitimate knowledge of development and progress. However, projects supported by the Barrow Cadbury Trust around the world indicate that there is much to be gained from exploring approaches from Southern countries and sharing practice.

In our new programme **Global Exchange**, we are interested in drawing on good practice from around the world to promote innovation and alternative forms of development within the UK. Social capital is one concept that has been widely used in explaining poverty and opportunity in countries of the South, and is now increasingly used to explore social exclusion and disaffection in the North. The idea of social capital has the potential not only to unify the experiences of projects operating in both the North and South but also to provide a tool for the analysis and development of appropriate policies.

In association with The Foreign Policy Centre, we therefore designed our 2004 Global Exchange Forum to bring together project leaders, academics and world class policy officials to discuss the practical applications of social capital. The debates were structured around three of the key areas supported by Barrow Cadbury – ethnic diversity, communities in conflict and gender.

Case studies presented by speakers and the deliberations of leading practitioners are brought together in this short compilation. The introductory essay by Phoebe Griffiths from The Foreign Policy Centre sets the scene and sheds some light on the policy applications of social capital that emerged from the workshops. Her comments are drawn from experiences of projects from Northern Ireland, the Middle East, Sri Lanka and Latin America. Details of how social capital can be used to improve service delivery are outlined in the contributions from Michael Woolcock of the World Bank and David Halpern from the Strategy Unit. The former augments notions of bonding and bridging capital with the important element of 'linking capital' and demonstrates its salience in international development. Meanwhile, David Halpern explores how social capital influences the efficacy of government in the UK. Both Anthony Giddens and Maxine Molyneux add a healthy note of scepticism arguing that the use of social capital as a policy tool requires a much more nuanced and sophisticated approach.

It became clear from the Forum that social capital will become increasingly more influential in the analysis, design and delivery of policies in the UK. While the Forum provided some opportunity for those working at the grassroots to understand and comment on its practical applications, there needs to be wider dissemination of the concept among front-line workers. This will ensure that those who feel the impact of policies are able to contribute more effectively to their development.

Another significant outcome of the Forum was the value of bringing together highly experienced individuals from the very different worlds of academia, policy and local practice. The challenges and experiences of those working in communities of conflict, among ethnic diversity and with women set real life limitations on the visionary and dynamic thinking of others. As a result, we hope that policy development might become far more practically orientated.

Overall, the Forum has proved valuable in helping to identify emerging thinking and explore ways in which it might impact at community level. At Barrow Cadbury, we will respond in three ways:

1) Inform the groups we support in the UK about social capital and establish a mechanism to gather their insights on its practical applications.

2) Seek new projects from overseas (or UK based linked which operate internationally) which demonstrate or

Anthony Giddens (UK), Barbara Roche MP (UK), Erica Cadbury, Barrow Cadbury Trust (UK), Minister Matilde Ribeiro (Brazil) and Fiona Macaulay (UK)

develop the applications of social capital. Address the issues of gender and of ethnic diversity in greater detail, to identify further ways in which social capital can be used as a policy tool.

3) Continue to develop networks of academics, policy makers and practitioners to refine and develop social policy.

We at the Barrow Cadbury Trust are extremely grateful to all the participants of the Forum, especially the speakers, many of whom travelled to London from far flung parts of the world. We are also grateful to the people who contributed their knowledge and ideas, particularly Maxine Molyneux and Rowena Young who offered much advice in the run-up to the conference. We are indebted to the Canadian High Commission for hosting the Forum, in particular High Commissioner Mel Cappe, Gillian Licari, Gail Tyerman and Ian Napier. Finally the Forum would have been impossible without The Foreign Policy Centre's team, lead by Phoebe Griffith and supported by interns, particularly Noel Carver.

Sukhvinder Stubbs
Director
Barrow Cadbury Trust

Contents

* These chapters are based on remarks delivered orally.
** This chapter is based on an essay previously published in Development and Change (Volume 33; Number 2; April 2002)

The policy applications of social capital

Phoebe Griffith

The social capital debate has continued to grow steadily more complex and diverse. Research institutes specialising in the subject have proliferated, measurement techniques become a science in themselves and academic papers have multiplied (according to David Halpern, more than 300 were written in 2003 alone). More importantly, the debate has broken out of the sociologist circle and been appropriated by activists and policymakers from across the political spectrum. Robert Putnam, the chief architect of social capital discourse, is a regular visitor to the White House and Downing Street. The British government has integrated measurements of social capital into its annual general household survey and will record the groups people belong to, whether they volunteer, whether they think their views count, how often they see friends or relatives and whether they like their area. Likewise, the World Bank has established a unit for the study of social capital and has integrated social development into many aspects of its work.

The aim of the conference was to take a step back from this process of adoption and to explore to what extent social capital thinking is shaping thinking and policy development in three areas: diversity, conflict and gender. This section sets out some of the issues debated at the working sessions and the conclusions which were drawn out from these discussions.

What is social capital?

Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. A narrow view of social capital regards it as a set of horizontal associations between people, consisting of social networks and associated norms that have an effect on community productivity and well-being by, for example, reducing the costs of doing business. Broader definitions of social capital account for both the positive and negative aspects by including vertical as well as horizontal associations between people. This view recognizes that horizontal ties are needed to give communities a sense of identity and common purpose, but also stresses that without "bridging" ties that transcend various social divides (e.g. religion, ethnicity, socio-economic status), horizontal ties can become a basis for the pursuit of narrow interests, and can actively preclude access to information and material resources that would otherwise be of great assistance to the community. The broadest and most encompassing view of social capital includes the social and political environment that shapes social structure and enables norms to develop. This view not only accounts for the virtues and vices of social capital, and the importance of forging ties within and across communities, but recognises that the capacity of various social groups to act in their interest depends crucially on the support (or lack thereof) that they receive from the state as well as the private and non-governmental sector.[1]

Is social capital a useful tool for meeting the challenges of growing ethnic diversity?

Debates about the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital are deeply contested and often misguided. Analyses that set out to show whether levels of trust or community involvement, for example, are higher or lower in ethnically diverse communities inevitably ignore some of the complex dynamics which define the experience of ethnic minorities, including incidences of discrimination or inequality. However, social capital frameworks, particularly those which are guided by principles of bonding and bridging social capital, can help us understand some of the factors which drive minority ethnic under-performance, as well as the dynamics which can drive growing ethnic tension within communities. First, social capital frameworks can be helpful when it comes to explaining why certain groups perform better than others in certain areas such as the labour market. Socially

isolated groups will, almost by definition, lack bridging social capital. Studies in the US have shown for example that some groups are better than others at using their networks and contacts to get on in the work place. While only 5% of black people use personal networks to access the labour market, 80% of white people will turn to these resources and therefore enjoy a high advantage when it comes both to accessing the labour market and getting on professionally. Similar trends can be found in the UK. Bridging social capital is likely to be of considerable importance in both entering the job market and in career advancement.

Second, high levels of bonding social capital can act as a mixed blessing for ethnic minority communities. In the first instance, bonding social capital can be crucial in helping new migrants through the adaptation process. Likewise, the creation of entrepreneurial ethnic enclaves have been at the heart of so-called "ethnic economic success stories" in sectors such as catering, in this way compensating to some extent for their lack of bridging social capital. However, in the long-term, strong ties of family and kin may act as a source of disadvantage. Individuals who seek opportunities outside their communities may either not be encouraged to develop their skills and aspirations or in the more extreme, face resentment and disapproval should they decide to move away. In these instances therefore, high levels of social capital may act as a deterrent for development.

"In certain areas of Britain ethnic groups live entirely separate lives with no contact between each other at all. Lack of contact and lack of knowledge allows myths to develop, leading to separate groups fearing and demonising one another."
Ted Cantle, IdEA

Finally, social capital analysis can help us understand the dynamics of communities facing high levels of ethnic tension. The creation of close-knit groups in highly concentrated areas with little contact outside their communities has been identified as one of the key problems driving ethnic segregation, not least in the case of the run up to the riots in the UK cities of Oldham, Bradford and Burnley in 2001 where communities operated along "a series of parallel lives". Existing or perceived intolerance, injustice or discrimination drives communities to retreat further into themselves, thereby enhancing these divisions.

In all of these cases there is an important role for imaginative policy interventions aimed at drawing people out of segregation and increasing the links between communities promoting interaction between groups. Some of the programmes which have been put in place by the Canadian government hold lessons on how interventions can be made in order to promote horizontal linkages between host communities and new migrants (see page 13). They include the creation of sponsorship and host programmes designed to facilitate bridging relationships between recent immigrants and Canadian citizens at the community level.

Can social capital be rebuilt in communities under stress?

Social capital frameworks have been identified as a useful tool in understanding the dynamics of the outbreaks of violence within communities, including civil war. In the words of the World Bank: "social capital can be constructive and support social cohesion and the mitigation of conflict, but it can also be perverted to hasten social fragmentation and the onset of violent conflict."

As in the case of race, bridging and bonding frameworks can be helpful in guiding our understanding of the way in which diverse communities manage conflict. Three key drivers have been identified. Firstly, the presence of strong exclusionary bonds within groups; secondly, a sense of exclusion or disempowerment within groups; thirdly, a lack of mechanisms – formal and informal – which can facilitate horizontal links between communities.

Once these dynamics are present groups become very vulnerable to ethnic incitement and manipulation. Representatives from the Rwandan NGO Never Again International, for example, highlighted that while Rwanda had always been a country divided along ethnic lines it was only as a result of external incitement, namely by means of incendiary radio programmes, that people were mobilised into conflict and ultimately genocide. The Rwandan experience reflects how existing social capital can be perverted and differences manipulated in the pursuit of narrow interests.

The fact that social capital can be used for narrow sectional interests as well as for the public good therefore suggests that caution is needed when designing interventions. For this reason, interventions to promote the accumulation of social capital need to be designed to

ensure that increments of social capital enhance economic and social welfare for all. General drives to increase bonding social capital in conflict-ridden communities might do as much harm as good in the absence of attempts to increase bridging social capital.

"The task societies face is to develop diverse but inclusive identities as opposed to the diverse but exclusive ones which we have seen develop within places like Sri Lanka and Northern Ireland. That's the challenge – to develop shared identities that can trump the exclusive identities."

Anthony Heath, Oxford University

The Northern Irish experience offers some interesting lessons in terms of the interventions which have been made in order to generate more linkages between groups in post-conflict societies (see page 10). Programmes have been set up by neutral partners and have focused primarily on issues which have resonance with citizens regardless of whether they are Protestants or Republicans, such as education or healthcare. By means of creating common spaces to discuss these issues, programmes like these have acted as a catalyst for greater understanding between groups and therefore increased tolerance. Breaking down these barriers is the key to rebuilding trust.

Is social capital a vehicle for the empowerment of women?

Social capital can be both a tool and an obstacle in the empowerment of women. This is particularly the case in developing countries where women's networks and associations play an important role in providing care in very poor communities in the absence of a state welfare system, particularly at times of extreme hardship.

Networks have rightly been identified as an important source of female empowerment. Membership of an organisation is a means of socialising, fighting domestic isolation and securing emotional support particularly in cases of domestic or other forms of violence. Networks can also deliver practical benefits. By becoming responsible for the running of organisations, women can develop management and leadership skills, and in the case of microfinance projects, potentially achieve economic advancement. Lastly, networks offer women the opportunity

Albert Nzamukwereka, Never Again International (Rwanda) and Raja Dharmapala, The Dharmavedi Institute (Sri Lanka)

to become politically active. In the words of Cecilia Blondet: "These are truly schools of citizenship; for it is by participating in the organisation that these women become subjects of rights and obligations. As social capital, women's organisations are also part of articulated networks of organisations that grant them access to even larger networks where they would otherwise never have had the chance to participate."

However, policies which aim to tap into female social capital need to be aware of some of the potential downsides. As argued by Maxine Molyneux, the over-reliance on women as agents for the delivery of care may create a set of expectations about their role in development projects leading to them ultimately being taken for granted. Putting women who are already overburdened with responsibilities into these positions may even be counterproductive in the long-term. If one of the aims of women's networks is to act as catalysts for wider social change, then women need to be given the time and resources to understand the issues that affect them. Networks in and of themselves won't necessarily provide this stimulus.

External interventions are therefore needed in order to ensure that women's networks can act as a forum for empowering women in the true sense of the word. As explained by Marcia Lewinson, Director of the Birmingham-based NGO WAITS: "the challenge is to get

such women to use their social capital in more 'formal' situations… and putting forward solutions to issues such as Working Families Tax Credit and the Criminal Justice Bill, on a national level." (see page 16)

Intermediaries such as NGOs and local government agencies play a crucial role in this process. In the first instance, the role of intermediaries is to teach women about their rights and point them towards the issues that matter to them. However, external actors need also to act as intermediaries within groups, helping to solve disputes which may arise among group members and providing institutional mechanisms for resolving internal conflicts. Finally, external actors are an important mediator in the relationship between networks and the state. Whether it is the delivery of refugee support or providing regular meals to school age children, many non-profit groups are rightly jealous of their independence and wary of government collaboration. Intermediaries are therefore vital brokers in these relationships, ensuring that non-governmental groups are able to establish productive collaboration with governments while maintaining their ability to set their own agendas.

Conclusion

Social capital could be described as a tool in the development of policies to tackle some of the most important challenges facing communities, rich and poor alike. It can help us understand the obstacles facing groups which are excluded or are under-performing in our societies, including ethnic minorities and women, allowing us to identify the areas where interventions need to be made. However, the pursuit of higher levels of social capital should not be identified as a goal in itself. In fact, in certain cases actions may indeed be required to dilute kinship bonds which may either be isolating individuals or dividing communities.

[1] This description is based on the World Bank's definition which can be found on http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/scapital/whatsc.htm

Phoebe Griffith manages The Foreign Policy Centre's Democracy and Development Programme.

Why social capital matters in international development

Michael Woolcock

My job at the research department of the World Bank is to be a bridge between the world of ideas and the world of empirical evidence. And I guess part of what I want to talk about today is the importance of learning from experience and learning from existing policies and projects which we have many decades worth of behind us – many of which were not framed in terms of social capital but were consistent with an emerging theory of it, and can subsequently be a useful source of input into how we think about these issues.

There are I think three different ways in which the policy issues get framed, and how we should be thinking about them.

One is to distinguish between social capital as means and social capital as ends. Social capital as means debates are about how we can improve what we're already doing, whether it be healthcare, service delivery, trash removal.

The way it is usually talked about though, is social capital as ends, in terms of what we can do to enhance the social capital of society to make ourselves more engaged, make our institutions more trustworthy, etc. But even within that sort of distinction of social capital as ends, we can distinguish between the ends that are intrinsic and the ends that are instrumental. The ends that are intrinsic are to do with the questions of identity. It's a key issue in this whole question about how people's identities are very powerfully shaped by

the community context within which they live. And much of the energy which surrounds the social capital agenda is because at its best, it is speaking to these questions of identity which are so crucial to how we understand ourselves. The more instrumental ends of social capital policy are about how it links to broader questions of job opportunities and economic growth and other outcomes.

"Trusts like Barrow Cadbury look for innovation and for ideas that are grounded on good practice in the voluntary sector. Groups come to us that work with communities that are marginalised, under pressure, in conflict or emerging from conflict. Our role is to advise the groups that we fund about how we can improve their effectiveness. Out of this has grown an awareness of the gap between the kind of work that they do and the kind of thinking that is going on amongst policymakers and in academia – amongst those that are defining and writing about this subject. However, social capital is an excellent academic construct which I think can help us explore both the practice and the policy of civil society."

Erica Cadbury, The Barrow Cadbury Trust

The third component though, and this is perhaps the more radical, is actually trying to use social capital to critique the very idea of policy. Much of the debate taking place around the issues which we care most about gets framed as a policy debate. When services don't work, it's seen as a function of flawed policy. An example of this is the globalisation debate where the tendency has been to frame discussion about the World Bank in a "my policies" vs. "your policies" manner. I want to suggest that we need a different way of thinking about policy. We need to unpack the defining features of policy and distinguish it from something which is actually different, which is "programme" or what I will call a "practice". To distinguish between the two we need to work in a way which is more relationally intensive. When you think of education, for example, you can have an education policy, which is essentially what children will learn in school, and an education programme, which is essentially trying to provide the right number of textbooks and the right numbers of chalkboards and teachers to match up with the right number of students in a particular area. But most of us frankly care about education practice which is to say

whether the teacher who looks after our kids everyday actually cares and is able to tailor an educational programme that is suitable to the diverse range of students in their classroom. It's a practice issue. It's a question of an activity that is fundamentally, inherently, necessarily relational in terms of what it takes to deliver. It takes 12 years, 6 hours a day, 200 days a year to turn a six-year old into a moderately functional citizen. There's no fast-tracking that process. It's just something that's done in and through relationships with people.

If the social capital agenda is largely about putting the social agenda back into the way in which we think about issues, we've got to try and create a conceptual space for these things and ensure that they don't get them subsumed under a broader question of policy. The actual distinctive and comparative advantage of a social capital discussion to the things that we care about – like education, like health care – are the result of their relational components. This is a whole other space of highly discretionary, highly transaction-intensive activities which I call practices.

This was more or less the theme of the latest World Development Report which came out in September 2003. In this report we explicitly look at questions like healthcare in Bangladesh, for example, where 75% of doctors don't show up for work everyday. Is that a policy issue? Is this happening because of a flawed policy on the part of Bangladesh, or because of imperialism by Western corporations, or Structural Adjustment Programmes by the World Bank? I would suggest to you that it's to do with relationships of accountability. This is important because the gains to be had for poor people by getting that 75% number down to 50% would be enormous. But while we continue to have the debate at these very abstract levels of my policy vs. your policy all of these kinds of relational intensive tasks (like ensuring that teachers and doctors and nurses and other front-line service providers are held accountable and made responsive to the communities in which they work) gets lost.

So, I've talked about rethinking some of these policies in terms of distinguishing between programmes and practices. Let me come back quickly to the questions of theory and the popular manifestations of them. The orthodox split in terms of getting from this generic category called social capital into something more disaggregated makes the distinction, which of course

Putnam has popularised, between bonding and bridging social capital. Bonding are the connections to people that are essentially like us in a demographic way and bridging are those with people who are not like us in some demographic way.

But if you look at these issues in developing countries, particularly when you start thinking about service delivery, that distinction fails.

For example, in parts of Eastern Europe, Uganda or other parts of the developing world where people have no confidence that they can go to the police when a crime is committed, women giving childbirth are extorted by doctors, and 75% of the teachers don't show up for work, simply having a bonding/bridging distinction misses a huge realm of issues. Those elements of service delivery that necessarily require some form of social exchange and interaction between people are simultaneous relationships across huge power differentials – whether it's between teacher and student, between police and citizen, or between lawyer and client. All these kinds of inherently social relationships seem to me to require a different label, and that's why the notion of linking social capital is helpful.

Linking social capital goes beyond just horizontal demographic differences and tries to look at a more vertical dimension of relationships that are crucial in thinking about how we can respond to the challenges facing service delivery in developing countries.

Conclusion

The aim of my talk has been to show how we change organisations – whether it's the British government, the World Bank, international aid agencies, or any other big structure which has so many imperatives towards breaking down problems into ones that either a few smart people can address or an army of bureaucrats can solve, to try and bring back into that the space for thinking about social dimensions of our work.

That will only be possible if our aims are projected through an engaging story that speaks to people, is based on a sensible theory and builds on a body of evidence that speaks also to the concerns of the day. And as long as we can keep the arrows going back and forth between those two things I think that's a final big value-added for the social capital debate. And as long as ultimately we have a nice dialogue going across those different chains of expertise, then I think we're actually reinvigorating social science, we're making it rigorous and relevant at the same time, and making it have a real impact on the kinds of concerns all of us share.

Michael Woolcock is a Senior Social Scientist with the World Bank's Development Research Group, and an Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

David Halpern, Strategy Unit (UK), Michael Woolcock, World Bank (Australia), Sukhvinder Stubbs, Barrow Cadbury Trust (UK), Jean Pierre Voyer, Policy Research Initiative (Canada)

The Cullyhanna Women's Group

(Northern Ireland)

Community IT training projects bring people together

Cullyhanna is a small village located in southern County Armagh – a community which has been deeply scarred by political violence. The Cullyhanna Women's Group provides an example of how bonding social capital can gradually evolve over time into bridging social capital. The group, which had initially begun by supporting the mainly republican community, has now developed a number of innovative programmes of work including a Rural Health Partnership which focuses on community well being with a special emphasis on mental health. This is a particularly important resource for communities which have experienced extreme stress as a result of conflict.

Initially the group operated mainly within its own community, but has now moved on to include the neighbouring Protestant community – providing an example of how 'bonding' can be extended to 'bridging' social capital. The Cullyhanna Women's Group now has a wider geographical remit as well as a very credible track record with statutory organisations including the college of further and higher education through outreach training; and the health and social services trust through its community well being programmes. It has developed strong 'linking' social capital with a view to establishing itself as a serious service deliverer in the local community.

The learning from the experience has built confidence in what was otherwise untapped potential. It has enabled the group to successfully address some of the problems in the locality, including the under-funding of health services, and to do this in a way that has empowered many people from the two main traditions, whilst simultaneously establishing credibility with local government.

Having gained experience of handling funding, the Cullyhanna Women's Group were able to prove a track record in fund management and accessed further support from the Peace and Reconciliation Programme to develop locally-based IT education and training for the benefit of the wider community.

The programmes developed by the Cullyhanna Women's Group have enjoyed success by way of sustainability. However the real test is their capacity to influence change at the national level – something that remains to be seen as influencing policy happens in an ad-hoc way and quite often by accident. Other challenges include documenting exactly how these community processes work at the local level to build social capital, and adjusting the use of social capital as a policy tool for communities under stress given the recent growth of ethnic minorities in Northern Ireland.

The policy applications of social capital in the UK

David Halpern

Research shows that social capital appears to have a relationship, if not an entirely proven causal relationship, with almost every significant policy outcome. It appears to have a relationship with economic growth, from the macro right through to the very micro level. It appears to have a relationship with health and life expectancy, certainly at the micro level. In the UK and US, social networks seem also to have an impact on education. Crime and even efficacy of government appear to be influenced by levels of social capital.

In order to understand the links between policy and social capital one can analyse its dynamic on three levels which interrelate.

The first is the micro or individual level. Having a healthy level of social capital at your disposal allows you to reach out to new networks and have access to a richer set of opportunities. It can impact on the amount you earn and give you a wider range of job opportunities. The second is the community level. This can relate to, for example, levels of crime and involvement in local politics. The third is the macro or national level. This is measured by the levels of trust between people and has an impact on larger outcomes such as economic growth.

However, from where I stand the key question in my case is whether governments are in the position to generate greater levels of social capital. For example, can their actions be designed to support relationships and networks? Can they make people more trusting?

The answer is that there are things that governments can do.

At the micro level, well-designed government sponsored schemes can be extremely effective. Work experience is a good example. Bursaries for people from disadvantaged backgrounds are useful in terms of network building and in enabling careers guidance. This is particularly important for young people living in deprived communities who may not have exposure to inspirational role models within their social network and are therefore unable to grasp the full range of options accessible to them.

"It's interesting how in working with people who have had such specific and differing experiences of racial discrimination, one still finds commonalities in terms of the obstacles they face and the policy responses they suggest."

Matilde Ribeiro,
Minister for Racial Equality (Brazil)

Mentoring programmes are also a good example. However, lessons on mentoring need to be learnt. Studies of mentoring programmes in the US have shown that they have been very successful. One of the key concerns has been to avoid picking people out by targeting whole classes of school children. In the UK programmes have failed to do so and had less success as a result. UK mentoring has been targeted at so-called 'under-aspirers' – children who are gifted but have taken the decision to leave school at an early age. Unlike the US however, the children who have taken part in the UK schemes have ultimately performed worse than their peers. The problem has been that they have been mistakenly singled out. As a result the participants have failed to benefit from any changes in their peer group and have suffered in terms of their self-esteem. The lesson from this is that while schemes can be very successful, the details of implementation will decide whether programmes aimed at generating social capital work.

Finally, volunteering programmes are also a useful social capital building tool. But as in the case of mentoring much depends on the experience and the design of these programmes. Research shows that short experiences of volunteering can have a transformative effect on individuals. However, levels of engagement do tend to tail

off and disengagement creeps in. The straightforward explanation for this is that after a long period as a volunteer people sometimes get jaded and start feeling used. So in the case of volunteering it may be a case of less is more.

"While we sometimes regret the passing away of strong local communities in Britain, we must also remember the insularity and exclusion that often existed within those communities in the past. People that did not fit the mould of their local communities' shared values often found them suffocating, rather than invigorating. Far from coming together in the past few decades, we now live in communities that are geographically much further apart. The differences between where young and old, rich and poor, settled people and immigrants live are now very great indeed. We are leading very separate lives."

Barbara Roche MP

Programmes are also being targeted at the community level. Devolution of power to communities is as clear an example as is community-asset based welfare – a system whereby assets are allocated directly to communities to own themselves, such as community centres or parks – and is something which we should be doing more of.

Redesigning the built environment is a key policy in this respect. 'HomeZones' are one example. This is a very small programme which tries to redesign the streetscape to create car free areas where members of the community can relate with each other. Likewise, policymakers continue to intervene to ensure that high levels of housing mix are maintained. This is very important as one of the advantages which the UK has over the US in this area is that in Britain the rich and the poor generally live together. Housing policy continues to recognise this as important and that social housing is not segregated. The redevelopment of the Thames gateway is also seen as a good opportunity for this.

At the macro level there are also things that we can do. Developing a certain kind of public discourse and creating forums where we can negotiate values is important. Things like the BBC therefore matter greatly. Tackling inequality and other strains on our social fabric is also central.

One specific example is community service credit schemes. In Japan, for example, there is a scheme that allows people to get credits for caring for the elderly, and these credits can then be given away for use by others. Hence, if you are living in Tokyo but your parents or grandparents live five hundred miles away, you can't care for them. However, you can care for somebody in Tokyo and can then give the credits to your own parents or grandparents 500 miles away, who then get looked after by another volunteer. Interestingly, the care is more gratefully received (it feels right), you get higher quality of care, and you get no displacement (i.e. volunteering doesn't fall elsewhere). Such credit schemes have also been used in the developing world where cash is short, but goodwill high.

All of these examples contain lessons and warnings for policymakers.

The first is that one needs to watch out for the downsides. If the design of the programmes is not given the attention that it deserves it can in fact do more harm than good, even when it comes to seemingly harmless work experience programmes.

The second lesson is that we need to understand the dynamics and impacts of social capital better. Finding solid measuring techniques and mounting ambitious measurement exercises is the key to this. There is quite a lot of work going on in that area in the UK. Even though this may seem dry it is important that we understand what is going on here better than we do now.

The third lesson is that while keeping one and two in mind, it is important to be able to experiment in order to be able to learn. Ultimately, what counts is that you go out and do it and show that it works. This process needs to be accompanied with good studies. Putting it very crassly, even if we were half right about the potential which social capital holds the positive consequences will speak for themselves.

David Halpern is a Senior Policy Advisor in the UK Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (PMSU).

Case Study 2

Hosting new migrants
(Canada)

The management of immigration, integration and ethnic diversity in Canada provides important lessons for the application of social capital to a specific policy domain.

Canada is one of the most ethnically diverse nations in the world. Over 200 ethnic origins were reported in the 2001 Canadian census. Of all immigrants who arrived in the last decade, 73% were non-European or "visible minorities". Immigration now accounts for more than 50% of Canadian population growth, and is likely to increase in the future. The Government of Canada is very concerned that new immigrants are able to settle and integrate successfully regardless of country of origin. More broadly, the government is concerned that members of all ethnic communities in Canada, recent or long-established, are able to fully participate in Canadian society.

Canada is now seeing concerning trends in the economic performance of recent immigrants, including a decline in entry earnings and increasing poverty rates. Much of the policy debate on the determinants of successful economic integration for new immigrants has focused on the role of human capital. But a network-based approach to social capital can also help address these issues. Some potential benefits of membership in a social network include material goods and services, information, reduced transaction costs, emotional support, reinforcement of positive norms, and service brokerage.

There are many examples of Canadian policies that take into account the growing realisation of social capital's importance. Multicultural school liaison

Jean Pierre Voyer, Policy Research Initiative (Canada), outlining Canadian policies for building social capital

officers build bridges between immigrant students, their families, school staff and the wider student body. Canada's immigration selection criteria reward applicants with existing social capital connections in Canada.

Through the Private Sponsorship Scheme families, local communities, and faith groups can commit to providing sponsored refugees with basic assistance in the form of accommodation, clothing, food, and settlement assistance for up to twelve months. Sponsors also help refugees find jobs, make friends, and learn an official language. Groups applying for the sponsorship role must have detailed plans for the refugees in question, and are required to be residents of the neighbourhoods in which the refugees are expected to settle.

The Federal Government has developed the "Host Program" to facilitate bridging relationships between recent immigrants and Canadian citizens at the community level. It matches new arrivals with Canadian individuals as well as representatives from non-profit groups, businesses and educational organisations. Their role is to welcome them, introduce them to services in their community and help them "overcome the stress of moving into a new community".

Challenging social capital

Anthony Giddens

The concept of social capital tends to polarise people. The enthusiasts think that social capital is a way of repairing problems of trust and social disintegration. However, I tend towards the sceptical end of the debate, even though I acknowledge that some very interesting and innovative work has come out of the study of social capital.

One of my central objections is the way in which social capital is used in an all-embracing way. Students of social capital often fail to differentiate between the dynamics of trust between communities, and networks and trust in large institutions and the state.

In both developed and developing countries, trust in large impersonal institutions is at least as important as networks of trust in particular communities. For example, networks of trust in communities do little to improve levels of trust in impersonal institutions like banks or the judicial system. Therefore to suppose both of these dynamics can be incorporated in a single notion doesn't make a great deal of sense.

My second concern is that social capital is exclusionary as well as inclusive. Although notions of bridging and bonding social capital have been developed, the schismatic aspects of social capital need to be studied more rigorously. In fact, often the biggest exclusionary devices are between the closest communities. Anyone wanting to build bridging social capital between Arsenal and Spurs fans, for example, would have a problem on his or her hands even though the communities that they represent are technically very close and similar.

Furthermore, students of social capital tend to ignore that it is always a means of stratification and power, intrinsically and ineluctably. In other words, the networks you build are employed by you to gain advantage. Middle class people in the UK are particularly good at doing this for example, with regard to securing the best schooling for their children. It's an almost inevitable feature of social capital.

Linked to this is the fact that social capital is always translated into economic and cultural capital, providing a further means of stratification and power. Public schools in the UK are a classic example of how what starts out as social capital becomes cultural and financial capital through, for example, the creation of old boy networks – a perfect example of exclusionary social capital.

Thirdly, Robert Putnam's interpretation of the decline of social capital in America is open to substantial criticism. Although his research is empirically rigorous and there is no doubt that the trends he documents are real trends in the United States, I would see the results more as a picture of transformation as opposed to decline. The period from the 1950s through to the present time, which he identifies as a period of moral and cultural decline, is in fact a period of the advancement of political rights. It is a period of the advancement of the rights of women and ethnic minorities when people have been getting used to living in a much more cosmopolitan and global society than before.

What is happening in developed countries is that we are leaving behind a more localised society and learning to live in a cosmopolitan one. This is the condition, perhaps, of functioning more effectively in a global age. Cosmopolitanism requires a balance between individualism and solidarity. And it's not just solidarity which is the loser. You can have new forms of solidarity that go along with new forms of individualism. In effect, individualism is not a bad thing. More individualism means the chance to take control of your life, to break away from the world that is given to you and enter new and puzzling settings. It's something positive, not negative.

I would like to make four points in conclusion. Firstly, a new balance between the individual and the community is even more important in developing countries than it is in developed ones. The problem in developing countries is getting people to make the transition from a local life to a more universalised life in which people can move between different communities and learn to trust and talk to strangers.

Some of the comparative polls of trust in different countries clearly reflect this. Norway is the country which reports highest levels of trust with 75% of people saying that they trust strangers. In Brazil, however, only 8% of people say they trust strangers. My interpretation of these findings is that this discrepancy relates to people's capabilities to interact with other people in such a way that you're not simply dependent on localised networks and ties but to transcend those ties. My interpretation would therefore be that in developing countries the priority needs to be promotion of greater individualism.

This is particularly important in terms of the position of women. As Maxine Molyneux argues, to empower women you need more individual capability. This includes the ability of self-assertion and self-respect. These things don't just come through networks and community ties, even though these may help. You need to develop these capabilities so you have more individualism alongside more community.

Second, it is important to make a clear distinction between social capital as an individual capacity and social capital as a social phenomenon of actual networks and ties. Social capital as an individual capacity seems to me to be more precise and more akin to human capital and financial capital. It represents the capacity of a person to network with people, and especially, to be comfortable with people who come from different contexts from their own.

Third, social capital is no substitute for institution-building in developing countries. If you look at almost all developing countries, the problems tend not to be local communities. The problem is the state. States are corrupt, overly bureaucratic and in need of radical reform. Institution building means developing quite different mechanisms of trust from those involved in local communities and there is no simple extension from one to the other.

Furthermore, informal networks can often prevent this process of institutional rebuilding. An example of this is the phenomenon of 'blat' which dates back to the Soviet era and continues to operate in Russia today in a different form. Blat was a complex and informal system of networks and connections which allowed people to exchange favours as a means of gaining access to scarce resources and public services. The blat system came about due to the acute inefficiency of the orthodox bureaucratic procedures. People who needed to get things done could only do so if they had personal networks, and blat allowed them to get things done using these networks within the Soviet system. But blat was also a way of keeping the Soviet system going because it didn't subvert the Soviet system. Significantly, after the transition to Russia, the blat networks were one of the main reasons for the emergence of the oligarchs and the hindrance of the transformation of Russian society. What you had in the Soviet Union was not an absence of informal ties. On the contrary, you had a massively developed system of blat social ties combined with a lack of a civil society and intermediary organisations. If you lived in a Soviet city outside of Moscow there were no bars, there was no public life, there was nowhere to go where you could actually build an intermediary set of associations, which is very different from networks of ties and connections.

Finally, stratification and power are central when building ties and connections in local communities. If you're not alert to those issues you can simply subvert the forms of solidarity that you're trying to create. The position of women in developing countries is an excellent example of that.

Let me conclude by saying the endless search for Magical Remedies for Development should be called off. There are no MRDs. However useful social capital might be I think you have to have a much more nuanced and sophisticated approach to it than many of its proponents would assert.

Anthony Giddens is a sociologist and the former Director of the London School of Economics (LSE).

Women Acting in Today's Society

(UK)

Women Acting in Today's Society (WAITS) supports women in developing community based groups at the grassroots level that work on issues that affect them, their families or their communities. It works on empowering women to have a voice in decision making processes and public debates. Its approach focuses on building community organisations that are rooted in the experiences of people, believed in by the people, and owned by the people.

The women WAITS works with come from disadvantaged backgrounds. They may be under-educated, single parents, or the victims of abuse. With the help of WAITS, women research their issues, identify solutions and raise awareness, while at the same time developing their own skills, confidence, and self esteem. By supporting women in developing their organisations WAITS has raised awareness and put forward solutions to issues such as the Working Families Tax Credit, Criminal Justice Bill, and CSA on a national level. At the local level it has developed services such as Saturday schools, summer schemes and advice drop-in centres.

In developing social networks, WAITS's groups have been successful in developing their own community services. For example Imaan, a Somalian women's group, has set up an advice centre giving Somalian women support on welfare, benefits, and immigration issues, and is currently setting up a Saturday school to give added support to Somalian children in the English school system. WAITS's community organising approach links closely with the type of social capital that enhances individuals' capacity to join together in collective action to resolve common issues. Disadvantaged women possess social capital which they sometimes

The issue of domestic violence in the Asian community is tackled at a WAITS conference

exercise 'informally' through neighbourhood based community groups – by working in after school clubs, Saturday schools, drop-in centres, residents associations, etc. The challenge is to get such women to use their social capital in more 'formal' situations such as ward committees, community empowerment networks and local strategic partnerships. They report that they do not readily participate in these arenas because they are uncomfortable with the culture of the meetings, their male-dominated language, and unhelpful scheduling. But progress is made when these women realise that their 'informal' social capital is transferable to these settings and can be used to engage with policy makers.

The action groups under WAITS have helped women organise around specific issue areas, using women's social networks as a launch pad for raising awareness, campaigning, and helping policy makers implement real and lasting change. The networks that are created or strengthened in this process can then share information and skills with other community groups, thereby redoubling the positive effects of leveraging the social capital of disadvantaged or marginalised women. Other positive follow-on effects include raising the self-esteem of the women involved.

Gender and the Silences of Social Capital

Maxine Molyneux

Gender is both present and absent in troubling ways in the literature on social capital. On the one hand, much of the literature all but ignores gender relations, and focuses in the main on men's networks. On the other hand, where gender relations are acknowledged, they are often encoded in assumptions about women which misrepresent their lived relations and lead to policies of questionable merit.

"Sometimes I wonder whether as an NGO working on women's issues we ask young women to take on too many responsibilities. They work hard and look after families, so it seems unfair to expect them also to take responsibilities for solving social problems. To an extent, by doing so, could we be pushing women into a situation of further subordination?"
Samah Eghbarieh, Trust of Programmes for Early Childhood, Family and Community Education (Israel)

A gender-aware approach to social capital has to begin not just by recognising but also by problematising the fact that women are very often central to the forms of social capital that development agencies and governments are keen to mobilise in their poverty-relief and community-development programmes. The evidence shows across a range of countries that women among low-income groups are frequently those with the strongest community and kin ties; many such women do network, they do engage in reciprocal

supportive relations, they are often those who support church activities and participate in local forms of associational life. They are to be found too, at the heart of voluntary self-help schemes whether in health, education or neighbourhood food and housing programmes. In Argentina, for example, the government-supported poverty assistance programme Plan Vida (Life Plan), in the province of Buenos Aires, involved a million beneficiaries and was administered by 22,500 unpaid residents, mostly women, in the target zone. In such cases, women undoubtedly help to sustain the social fabric. Yet it is not always so and comparatively little attention is paid to situations where such ties are weak. Moreover, where there is recognition of women's contribution to the social fabric, it has helped to create a set of expectations about their role in development projects that have had some perverse effects.

In the first place there is the familiar assumption that women are naturally predisposed to serve their families or communities either because they are less motivated by a self serving individualism or, more materially, because of their social 'embeddedness' in family and neighbourhood ties due to their responsibility for the domain of social reproduction. The latter view carries some force in countries where neighbourhood mobilisation around basic needs provision frequently involves women. In Latin America gendered divisions of labour are strongly reinforced by cultural norms which, under the influence of Catholicism, signify motherhood as a powerful referent in the construction of identity. The naturalisation of women's supposed 'disposition' for social capital maintenance thus receives a certain ideological sanction, but one which does not question the terms on which women are incorporated, or the power relations involved in situating women in this way. This can all too easily make the responsibility for community projects, family health, or environmental protection (women are 'closer to nature') come to be seen as the preserve of women.

A consequence of naturalising the work that women do in these domains is that they are often targeted for voluntary (that is, unpaid) work. Self-help projects and voluntary sector work imply a considerable, often unacknowledged dependency upon women's unpaid or poorly paid labour. Such work, seen as a natural extension of their responsibilities for the family/community is consequently taken for granted and is assumed to be cost-free to the women and to the project. Evidence from studies of NGO

Helen O'Connell, One World Action (UK), Rachel Briggs, Demos (UK), Sharon Wellington, Barrow Cadbury Trust (UK), Jude Howell, LSE (UK), Samah Eghbarieh, T-Pec (Israel) and Cecilia Blondet, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (Peru)

programmes in Latin America illustrates this point. One UNICEF project in Guatemala mobilised women as volunteers in an urban development project where they were responsible for a range of tasks such as home visits and maintaining health records, involving an average of eight hours a week. No support was given in the form of childcare and the volunteers soon found it necessary to withdraw from the scheme. This example is unfortunately typical of many, even though the underlying assumptions have been widely criticised by gender theorists and practitioners. Projects which assume that women are free and available for unpaid work, and those which are designed to increase women's labour productivity or intensify their caring responsibilities, have been shown to fail time and again because they overload exhausted women without offering them adequate remuneration, any support in the form of childcare, or any training in skills that many need to obtain a paid job – still the most effective way of tackling poverty among women.

Maintaining social capital then can come at a high, if unacknowledged, cost to women.

A second perverse effect of these assumptions concerns the way in which social capital can be treated as the panacea for poverty, as if this alone can substitute for resources and policies. This has clear gender implications. It has been argued by feminist analysts that the effects of the poverty into which millions fell in the 1980s would have been far more devastating had it not been for the efforts of women to secure survival strategies. Recast as evidence of the importance of social capital, we hear much about how poverty is alleviated by community and kin co-operation among the poor. No-one disputes that this can be and often is the case: indeed studies carried out across Latin America show how essential these social resources were to the survival of the poor, and how they were mobilised mainly by women – sometimes on a massive scale in a collective. In Peru in the conditions of economic crisis in

the 1980s and 1990s, tens of thousands of neighbourhood associations organised around basic survival strategies such as glass of milk campaigns for school children and popular kitchens. Work in these projects was carried out by women, and in the absence of other alternatives, they represented a collectivised responsibility for survival. These examples can be seen as evidence of the importance of social capital understood as a collective resource in poverty relief; but to view it in these terms alone avoids confronting the fact that this was a form of co-operation that developed in response to what might otherwise be seen as a crisis in social reproduction. If we omit the background indicators on poverty, unemployment, malnutrition and child mortality, we get a too rosy picture of associational life in which social capital – in this case the unpaid labour of women – is mobilised as the safety net for irresponsible macro-economic policies and poor governance.

Social capital, as Robert Putnam has emphasised, thrives best where material conditions permit the development of a rich associational life; trust thrives where civic norms prevail. Research in the United States has confirmed a tradition of sociological theory that suggests that a decline in 'social capital' or social solidarity clearly correlates with the worsening position of the disadvantaged. What then of the conditions that prevail in poorer developing countries? Are they necessarily any different? Studies of low-income communities show that, as in the Peruvian example, poverty can generate social capital where kin ties are strengthened in times of shared adversity; but poverty also erodes the fabric of social life. As assets and employment possibilities decline, the poor cease to engage in exchange relations and avoid dependencies such as borrowing for fear that they cannot repay. In such circumstances, kin relations become strained as demands for support from vulnerable relatives grow. Broader community forms of solidarity and reciprocity weaken as households turn inwards and exhibit the traits associated with 'asocial familism'. Crime and gang warfare in poor neighbourhoods exacerbate these trends, adding fear and deepening mistrust of others.

A number of points can be reiterated here. First, the building, sustaining and undermining of social capital are critically dependent upon wider policies that help to determine the resources available to people. Second, social capital is highly variable in its forms of existence, in its presence or absence, strength or weakness, negative or positive forms. Third, in conditions of poverty, 'coping strategies' might be a preferable and less value-laden description than social capital to denote the forms of co-operation that arise.

In sum, social capital approaches might have the potential to render visible the importance of the reproductive or survival economy, but this activity should not be taken for granted and instrumentalised in ways that might be detrimental to the poor. Policies work best when, through redistributive and capacity-building measures, they strengthen the capabilities of agents to enter into voluntary and mutually beneficial association, sustainable over time, rather than simply being short term and parasitic on the ties of solidarity that may exist.

Maxine Molyneux is Professor of Sociology at the Institute of Latin American Studies, London University.

Matilde Ribeiro, Minister for Racial Equality (Brazil) and Fiona Macaulay (UK)

The agenda

Plenary Session 1

Social Capital – a policy tool for North and South?

Chair: Erica Cadbury, Trustee, the Barrow Cadbury Trust

Speakers: Professor Anthony Giddens (UK), Barbara Roche MP (UK) and Matilde Ribeiro, Minister for Racial Equality (Brazil)

Workshop 1:

Is social capital a vehicle for the empowerment of women?

Chair: Maxine Molyneux, Professor of Sociology, Institute of Latin American Studies (UK)

Speakers: Cecilia Blondet, former Minister for the Advancement of Women and Human Development (Peru) and Marcia Lewinson, Director, Women Acting in Today's Society (UK)

Workshop 2:

Can social capital be rebuilt in communities under stress?

Chair: Cheryl Kernot, Director of Learning, School for Social Entrepreneurs (UK / Australia)

Speakers: Raja Dharmapala, Director, Dharmavedi Institute (Sri Lanka) and Ann McGeeney, Barrow Cadbury Trust (Northern Ireland)

Workshop 3:

Is social capital a useful tool for meeting the challenges of growing ethnic diversity and migration?

Chair: Anthony Heath, Professor of Sociology, Oxford University (UK)

Speakers: Matilde Ribeiro, Minister for Racial Equality (Brazil) and Ted Cantle, Chair of Government Advisory Panel on Community Cohesion (UK)

Plenary Session 2

What are the policy applications of social capital?

Chair: Sukhvinder Stubbs, Director, the Barrow Cadbury Trust

Speakers: Michael Woolcock, Senior Social Scientist, Development Research Group, World Bank; David Halpern, Senior Policy Advisor, Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (UK); Jean Pierre Voyer, Executive Director, Policy Research Initiative (Canada)

Concluding remarks

Phoebe Griffith, Programme Manager – Democracy and Development, The Foreign Policy Centre

The speakers

Cecilia Blondet is chief researcher and member of the Steering Committee of the Institute of Peruvian Studies. She held the position of Minister of State in charge of the Ministry for the Advancement of Women and Human Development in 2002.

Erica Cadbury is a Trustee of the Barrow Cadbury Trust and Lead Trustee of the Global Exchange programme.

Ted Cantle leads the IDeA's Performance Support work, having established a team that is now working in around 20 authorities in England and Wales and chaired the UK Community Cohesion Review Team, which was set up to review the causes of the summer disturbances in a number of northern towns and cities.

Raja Dharmapala is the founder of the Dharmavedi Institute, which aims to enlighten Buddhist monks, nuns and social leaders for peace making according to Buddhist teachings through conducting classes and workshops.

Anthony Giddens is by common agreement the most widely cited contemporary sociologist in the world and was the Director of the London School of Economics.

Phoebe Griffith manages The Foreign Policy Centre's programme on Democracy and Development.

David Halpern is a Senior Policy Advisor in the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (PMSU).

Anthony Heath FBA is Professor of Sociology at the University of Oxford and Fellow of Nuffield College.

Cheryl Kernot is Director of Learning at the School for Social Entrepreneurs.

Marcia Lewinson is the Manager of Women Acting in Today's Society (WAITS).

Anne McGeeney runs the Barrow Cadbury Trust's development work in Northern Ireland.

Maxine Molyneux is Professor of Sociology at the Institute of Latin American Studies, University of London.

Matilde Ribeiro is the Minister for Race Equality in Brazil.

Barbara Roche MP has been Labour MP for Hornsey and Wood Green since 1992 and is the former Minister of State in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Sukhvinder Stubbs is the Director of the Barrow Cadbury Trust.

Jean Pierre Voyer is the Executive Director of the Policy Research Initiative in Canada.

Michael Woolcock is a Senior Social Scientist with the Development Research Group, and an Adjunct Lecturer in Public Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

The participants

Adam Couts, Cambridge University

Adeela Rashid, Muslims Women's Helpline

Albert Nzamukwereka, Never Again International

Ana Perez, Brazilian Embassy

Ann McGeeney, Barrow Cadbury Trust (Speaker)

Anna Christiansson, The Foreign Policy Centre

Anna Southall, Barrow Cadbury Trust

Anthony Giddens, Professor of Sociology (Speaker)

Anthony Heath, Oxford University (Chair)

Audrey Bronstein, Oxfam

Barbara Roche MP (Speaker)

Brian Rockliffe, VSO

Carole Milner, VSO

Catriona Bass, Forest People's Programme

Cecilia Blondet, Instituto de Estudios Peruanos (Speaker)

Cheryl Kernot, School for Social Entrpreneurs (Chair)

Christian Petry, Freudenberg Stiftung GMBH

David Halpern, Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (Speaker)

Dinah McLeod, Prime Minister's Strategy Unit

Emmanuel Ruhara, Never Again International

Erica Cadbury, Barrow Cadbury Trust (Chair)

Fadia Faqir, Centre for Middle Eastern Women's Studies

Fiona Macaulay, Centre for Brazilian Studies

Flavia Kamar, Trust of Programmes for Early Childhood, Family and Community Education

Gail Tyerman, Canadian High Commission

Ghayasuddin Siddiqui, Muslim Parliament of Great Britain

Gurchand Singh, Home Office

Hayati Segal, VSO

Helen Cadbury, Barrow Cadbury Trust

Helen O'Connell, One World Action

Huda Jawad, Civility

James Goodman, Forum for the Future

Jean Pierre Voyer, Policy Research Initiative (Canada) (Speaker)

Jeremy Corbyn MP

Joseph Nkurunziza, Never Again International

Jude Howell, Centre for Civil Society, LSE

Kathleen Duncan, Lloyds TSB Foundation for England and Wales

Liz Twyford, VSO

Lucy Burns, Fishburn Hedges

Maggie Baxter, Womankind

Marcia Lewinson, Women Acting in Today's Society (Speaker)

Marian Hodgkin, Never Again International

Martin Woollacott, The Guardian

Matilde Ribeiro, Ministry for Racial Equality, Brazil (Speaker)

Maxine Molyneux, Institute of Latin American Studies (Chair)

Melissa Wadams, British Red Cross Society

Michael Woolcock, the World Bank (Speaker)

Monica Janowski, NRI

Nicola Cadbury, Barrow Cadbury Trust

Nicole Piche, UK All-Party Parliamentary Human Rights Group

Nina Boeger, European University Institute

Owen Barder, DfID

Paola Grenier, LSE

Paolo de Renzio, ODI

Pedro Ramos Pinto, Cambridge University

Peer Baneke, ECRE

Phoebe Griffith, The Foreign Policy Centre

Poppy Sebag-Montefiore, Never Again International

Pritha Venkatachalam, Financial Consultant to World Bank

Rachel Briggs, Demos

Raja Dharmapala, the Dharmavedi Institute (Speaker)

Regina Ingabire, Never Again International

Riaz Rahman, Home Office

Richard Gowan, The Foreign Policy Centre

Richard Moore, Children in Crossfire

Rushanara Ali, Home Office

Saleemul Huq, International Institute for Environment and Development

Samah Eghbarieh, Trust of Programmes for Early Childhood, Family and Community Education

Sarah Lapsley, Children in Crossfire

Selvin Brown, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Sharon Robinson, Commonwealth Foundation

Sharon Wellington, Barrow Cadbury Trust

Stephen Pittam, Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust

Sukhvinder Stubbs, Barrow Cadbury Trust (Chair)

Susan Forrester, Directory of Social Change

Suzanne Long, United Nations Association

Ted Cantle, UK Government Advisory Panel on Community Cohesion (Speaker)

Tim Shaw, Institute of Commonwealth Studies

Tina Hyder, Save the Children Fund

William Davies, The Work Foundation

Zandra Pauncefort, Institute for Citizenship

The Barrow Cadbury Trust

The Barrow Cadbury Trust is a foundation that seeks to encourage a just, equal, peaceful and democratic society. We use the income generated from our endowment to make grants to support groups, usually registered charities, working to achieve such objectives. We make grants to groups operating from a position of disadvantage to support projects that get to the heart of the matter at the community level.

The Trust has consolidated a portfolio of three programmes: Inclusive Communities, Offending and Early Interventions and Global Exchange. This new portfolio is focused on working in partnership with projects at a local level aiming to act as a bridge between community-based projects, policymakers and practitioners at all levels.

For more information visit www.barrowcadbury.org.uk

The Foreign Policy Centre

The Foreign Policy Centre is a leading European think tank launched under the patronage of the British Prime Minister Tony Blair to develop a vision of a fair and rule-based world order. Through our work we aim to develop innovative policy ideas which promote:

– Effective multilateral solutions to global problems

– Democratic and well-governed states as the foundation of order and development

– Partnerships with the private sector to deliver public goods

– Support for progressive policy through effective public diplomacy

– Inclusive definitions of citizenship to underpin internationalist policies

For more information on our activities visit www.fpc.org.uk