

The Impact of Private Development Initiatives on the Lives of Women

A Case Study in Mpongwe, Zambia



SDC-80736

MSc International Development Studies Thesis

July 7th, 2023

Student: Rosalie van der Strate

Registration number: 1033194

Supervisor: Lotje de Vries

Second examiner: Han van Dijk

Wageningen University & Research

Abstract

This thesis analyses the long-term impact of private development initiatives on the lives of two women groups, living in rural Zambia. This thesis is a case study as I researched the impact of the interventions of a Dutch private development initiative (PDI) called 'Geef de Kinderen van Mpongwe een Toekomst' on the lives of two women groups, called Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. I used the concepts 'sustainability' and 'resilience' to analyse the impact of this private development initiative. The data were collected by conducting individual interviews with eighteen women from Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe group, three interviews with GKMT and GCMF board members, one focus group discussion with the Tubombeshe board, and three participant observations during Nchembwe Twesheko meetings.

The research shows that even when the sustainability of PDIs interventions could be improved, the resilience outcome of the PDI can still be very effective. The type of intervention the PDI chooses, is really important, as it can enable structural change in the lives of their target group. An effective way for a PDI to do this, is by focusing on so-called first- and second-generation activities, that include teaching the target group skills, helping them find income generating activities and earn an income on their own. It is also crucial that during all parts of an interventions phase (design, implementation, and monitoring phase) the local partner feels involved in decision-making. The sustainability of a PDI intervention increases when the PDI gives their local partner the power of being in charge of decision-making. However, the PDI should be involved as well if the local partner indicates they need guidance. Furthermore, I found that it is important for a PDI to consider the group dynamics of their target group and the distance between the PDI and its local partner when aiming for sustainable aid. When a local partner is disorganised, experiences mismanagement, or lacks internal motivation, it is more difficult for an intervention to be sustainable. A PDI should therefore be aware of the dynamics of group when choosing a local partner. Besides, a PDI should also be aware that the distance between them and their local partner, increases the chance their local partner does not feel responsible and capable to continue the projects without nearby presence of PDI members. I found that the durability of an intervention is not what is most important when aiming for resilience. What matters is that the intervention is focused on tackling the root causes of poverty. A PDI should pay attention to making their target group become independent. This way the local partner can better sustain their families and themselves, even when the interventions do not continue on a long-term. PDIs are therefore able to tackle the root causes of poverty instead of only the symptoms of poverty and they contribute to systemic change.

Acknowledgments

The first person I would like to thank is my supervisor Lotje de Vries for guiding me during this thesis process.

Secondly, I would like to thank everyone who contributed to this research, especially the two women groups Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe, who I interviewed during the data collection phase and who actively contributed to this thesis by giving their time and sharing their perspectives. I am also thankful for the people who stepped in as translator during the interviews.

Third, I would like to thank Ton Korsten-Korenromp, who initiated the idea to do research about her organisation 'Geef de Kinderen van Mpongwe een Toekomst'.

A special thanks goes out to my friends, Sanne and Manon, who have been on fieldwork with me to Zambia, and with whom I spent many hours in the library, writing our theses. Thank you for your support!

Table of contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgments	3
1 Introduction.....	7
GCMF	8
Nchembwe Twesheko	9
Tubombeshe.....	10
1.1 Research objectives.....	10
1.2 Main research question and sub-questions.....	11
2 Conceptual framework.....	13
2.1 Private Development Initiatives	13
2.2 Sustainability	13
2.3 Resilience.....	15
3 Methodology	19
3.1 Research Design.....	19
3.2 Data Collection Methods	20
Informal Conversations	20
Semi-Structured Interviews.....	20
Narrative Interviews	21
Key Person Interviews	21
Focus group discussion.....	21
Participant observations.....	21
3.3 Data analysis during and after fieldwork	22
3.4 Limitations	22
Chapter 4: Sustainability	25
4.1 Type of activity	25
4.1.1 Nchembwe Twesheko interventions.....	25
4.1.2 Tubombeshe interventions	28
4.1.3 GCMFs perspective on sustainability	30
4.2 Intervention manner	30
4.2.1 Stakeholders.....	31
4.3 Relationship women and GCMF in intervention phases.....	34
4.3.1 Design phase.....	35
4.3.2 Implementation phase	35

4.3.3 Monitoring phase	36
4.3.4 Power disbalance in monitoring phase	37
4.3.5 Exclusion and miscommunication in monitoring phase.....	39
4.4 Local ownership and local capacities	41
4.4.1 Initiator of the project	41
4.4.2 Establishment organisation	41
4.4.3 Financial dependency.....	42
4.4.4 Financial and human capital.....	43
4.5 Other relevant factors	44
4.5.1 Group dynamics.....	44
4.5.2 Culture of visiting	46
Chapter 5: Resilience	48
5.1 Context and initial state	48
Poverty	48
Food insecurity	50
Agricultural issues.....	50
Climate change issues	51
Health issues.....	52
5.2 Initial wellbeing outcomes and expectations.....	52
5.3 Challenges	53
Lack of capital.....	54
Not skilled enough.....	55
Problems with the community	55
Not enough demand	55
5.4 End-state	56
5.4.1 Goals achieved?.....	56
5.4.2 Social network	57
5.4.3 New skills and income generating activities	57
5.4.4 Sustaining families and themselves.....	61
5.5. Conclusion resilience	63
Chapter 6: Discussion and conclusion	65
Sustainability PDI interventions	65
Resilience PDI outcome	66
Answer to main research question	67
6.1 Suggestions for further research.....	68

Bibliography:.....	69
Annexes	72
A: List of interviews	72
Semi-structured interviews:.....	72
Narrative interview:	72
Key-person interviews:	72
Focus group discussion:	72
Participant observations:	72
Informal talks:	73
B: Interview guides	74
Semi-structured interviews	74
Narrative interview.....	74
Key-person interviews.....	74
Focus group discussion.....	75
C: Interview Questions	76
Semi-structured interviews	76
Narrative interview.....	77
Key-person interviews.....	77
Focus group discussion.....	78

1 Introduction

The international development cooperation has become more complex over the last decade with the development of new tools, goals and actors. New donors emerged from China, India, and Brazil, which led to heated discussions about their different approach in policy and implementation compared to traditional DAC donors (donors who work together with the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development), as non-DAC donors are not obligated to follow principles of democracy and transparency. At the same time celebrities and billionaires have also become powerful actors in the development cooperation sector. Furthermore, over the last thirty years the development sector has dealt with increasing professionalisation and institutionalisation, which has led to the privatisation of aid (Schulpen, 2007; Schulpen, 2016). However little attention, let alone recognition, is paid to the roles of 'ordinary' citizens from developed countries involved in international development. Many citizens have set up their own development initiative, as a response to development challenges they faced during their journeys in developing countries. These type of development organisations are called citizen-driven 'Private Development Initiatives' (PDIs) (Schulpen, 2016). PDIs are different from other development actors because they are small scale, have a voluntary character and don't receive direct funds from the government but from their own back donors (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011; Schulpen, 2007). They often prefer direct poverty reduction as an intervention strategy (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011), which means providing assistance via services and construction activities (Schulpen 2007; Schulpen, 2016). The number of Dutch PDIs started to increase from the 1970s onwards and reached its peak in 2000 and 2006. Since 2005, studies about PDIs, their projects, and Southern partners appeared in the Netherlands. Since then, PDIs have slowly become recognized as relevant actors in the Dutch development cooperation (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011).

Research into PDIs is still limited (Schulpen, 2007). Therefore, this thesis is an attempt to contribute to the limited existing literature about PDIs by focusing on a PDI that originally started providing aid to orphaned children living in Mpongwe, Zambia, since the year 2002 (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, personal communication, September 19, 2022). The PDI is called 'Geef de Kinderen van Mpongwe een Toekomst' (GKMT), and was established by an ordinary Dutch citizen after a visit to Mpongwe Mission Hospital (*Stichting "Geef de Kinderen van Mpongwe Een Toekomst" Jaarverslag 2005, 2005*).

In the 1980s and 1990s, NGOs were considered popular because it was assumed that they were very cost-effective, because they had a close connection with marginalized people, and because overall, the public legitimised them. Just like NGOs, it can be assumed that PDIs are seen as an ideal aid channel at present because of their same qualities; they are closely connected to their target group, provide services which aren't provided by the government or by other actors and they contribute to creating new legitimacy in the development sector (Schulpen, 2007). Still, there is also criticism on PDIs, as there are doubts if PDIs have an actual contribution to poverty reduction. Critics claim the focus of PDIs on service delivery limits their attention for transformative programs which focus on empowerment and social justice. And their focus on short-term results is at the expense of reaching their long-term goals which generate structural change (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). In other words, critics argue PDIs try to tackle the symptoms of poverty instead of tackling the root causes. Furthermore, although the enthusiasm of PDI members is very valuable, their big drive can lead to PDIs becoming involved in development projects in the South without having done a thorough context analysis or a needs assessment. This can result in PDI projects not fitting the local context or simply not being relevant (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). A third point of critique is based on the way PDIs choose local partners. Most

of the time PDIs find local partners based on very close friendship or family bonds. However, a collaboration based on friendship or family bonds can create complications. Moreover, there is no existing institutionalised learning process PDIs use to do proper monitoring and evaluation on their projects. Evaluation reports are mostly limited to the output of projects without discussing the outcome or impact, meaning that PDIs share information about the implementation of activities but do not go further explaining what the meaning of these activities are for the target group (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011; Schulpen, 2007). Besides that, PDIs do not properly hold themselves accountable to their back donors. Back donors often are badly informed about the possible difficulties or mistakes made by the PDI (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). Furthermore, PDIs prefer to work fast in order to show fast results to their back donors, in order to keep receiving funding. However, the speed of their projects may come at the cost of proper planning. In some cases, a new project seems to be result of received fundings instead of a forethought policy and planning. Besides, PDIs often depend on individuals without much organisational background knowledge, which creates a high dependency on one person and makes organisational strengthening more difficult which is important for the effectiveness of PDI projects. And one last point of critique, PDIs tend to execute projects in countries that are also popular holiday destinations, meaning less favoured countries by tourists which are much poorer are therefore neglected (Schulpen, 2007). Considering these points of critique on PDIs, the focus of this thesis will be on the extent to which sustainability —by which I understand the durability of the organisation’s action and their contribution to structural change — is incorporated in the interventions of GCMF, and the contribution to a resilient outcome for women.

GCMF

GKMT started as a private foundation in 2002 (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, personal communication, September 19, 2022). Give the Children of Mpongwe a Future (GCMF) is the Zambian counterpart of the Dutch organisation, which was officially registered as a foundation in 2005 and later on recognised as an NGO in Zambia since 2014 (Korsten-Korenromp, 2010). GCMF executes all the interventions while GKMT facilitates these activities. The aim of the organisation is to contribute to poverty reduction, sustainable development and the creation of development opportunities. In the year 2020, the collaboration between GKMT and GCMF ended. A year later, the management of all projects were handed over to Zambia’s Ministry of Agriculture (Korsten-Korenromp & Didden, 2022). Since then GKMT managed the organisation alone (Korsten-Korenromp & Didden, 2020). From a scientific point of view GKMT characterises itself as a private development initiative and therefore is treated as such during this thesis.

To understand why GKMT was established, it is important to know the context of Zambia. First of all, Zambia is a country which struggles with poverty. Poverty is estimated at 67 percent in Zambia, the population that lives under the poverty line; with in rural areas more residents living in poverty compared to urban areas (Hamazakaza, 2009). Zambians also struggles with food insecurity, with approximately 44% of the Zambian population experiencing food deprivation. Besides that, Zambian farmers face agricultural and climate change related problems, such as low agricultural productivity, vulnerability to climate shocks and limited governmental support (Bulawayo et al., 2019). Especially vulnerable farmers are negatively affected by the government’s decrease in involvement in agriculture (Arend, 2011). The Zambian population also experiences health issues such as HIV/AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis (Chaponda et al., 2015; Hamazakaza, 2009; Kapata et al., 2011). Women living in Mpongwe, Zambia, are a vulnerable, marginalised group in society. Mpongwe is a small town in the

Copperbelt province, the centre of Zambia. It is an area in which most people earn an income via farming. Women have little capacities to respond structural issues in their lives. They are often formally unemployed, earning little money with farming, and feel like they are failing to sustain their families and themselves (9 NT, 2, 5, 6, 7 TB, interview). Most of Zambia's subsistence farmers are women (65%). Research found that female-headed households experience higher levels of food insecurity compared to male-headed households (Bulawayo et al., 2019). Women are also more vulnerable to getting infected with diseases; statistics show that more women than men are affected with HIV in Zambia, while pregnant women are particularly vulnerable to getting infected with malaria (Butts et al., 2017). Furthermore, women are often the care takers of sick family members. This often means compromises in their health, well-being and their ability to generate an income for their families (Ndjakani et al., 2016). The initial focus of GKMT was on supporting orphaned children, but over time the organisation expanded its target group. The organisation started to support women as well, by establishing income generating projects (Korsten-Korenromp & Didden, 2022). This research pays attention to the interventions of GCMF in two women groups: Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe, located in Mpongwe, Zambia. Noteworthy is that that these women groups were already established before GCMF got involved.

Nchembwe Twesheko

Nchembwe Twesheko is a women's club located in Mpongwe and was established in 2002 (4 NT, interview). The association was formed by women with a professional carrier, such as nurses and teachers, to assist with the development, education and skills of vulnerable women (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). Today the women's club counts 28 members of which 16 members are actively participating (1, 2 NT, interview). The average age lies between 40 and 70 years. The majority of the group is farmer, while some members work as marketeers or own a shop (1 NT, interview). The women aim to improve the lives of their members and the lives of vulnerable people in the community, especially that of orphans (7 NT, interview). Therefore every club activity also benefits the community (1 NT, interview). Other goals of the association are to increase women's knowledge on gender and sexuality relating to HIV/AIDS, to provide women education about income generating activities which makes the women self-sustaining, and to promote cultural social activities (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). The women's club originally started with cooking, baking, and farming together (3, 6 NT, interview). The women had a field and a small garden together on which they cultivated crops which they sold on the market (1, 3 NT, interview). Besides that they taught each other about traditions, home management, self-hygiene, and HIV/AIDS (3, 7 NT, interview). Moreover, the women gave other women training in tailoring, sewing and knitting (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006).

GCMF became involved in the women's club since 2006 after Nchembwe Twesheko asked them for a community hall and skills training centre based in one building (4 NT, Ms. Musukuma, interview). Besides the community hall, GCMF provided the women's club training in organic farming, a donation of 10 sewing machines, a bore hole and training in entrepreneurship. The goal of these interventions was to train as many women as possible in livelihood skills such as tailoring, home management and self-catering to make them self-reliant (Ms. Musukuma, interview). The building also gave the group a proper place to meet (Mr. Kalima, interview). GCMF stopped being involved in the women's club around 2015 (Ms. Musukuma, interview). The group has been disorganized since 2020 and has not participated in any income generating activity anymore, except for renting out their community hall (1 NT, interview). However, since last year the group is experiencing a rebirth of their club. Their leadership is

renewed and they meet once, sometimes twice a month at their community hall (5 NT, interview; NT, participant observation 1, 2). A small group of members varying from 6 to 15 members is motivated to unite themselves, discuss how to build themselves and discuss how to start new communal businesses (2, 9 NT, interview).

Tubombeshe

Tubombeshe Ibenga Gender Association is a gender association, located in Ibenga, a village next to Mpongwe, and established in 2004. The association was established after thirteen gender clubs from Ibenga together decided they wanted to help improve the lives of their community members in need. Together these thirteen clubs formed this organisation (1 TB, interview). Tubombeshe is a community-based and a self-supporting institution (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1). At the start of Tubombeshe, the association counted 6000 members, and 13 clubs. The group currently counts 200 active members, and a large majority of them is women. The clubs that formed Tubombeshe already existed before Tubombeshe Ibenga Gender Association was established (Mr. Lason, personal communication 2). Clubs are created within communities and consist of approximately 10 members. Together they participate in activities in which they learn skills from each other and earn an income, for example by keeping chickens or pigs or by cultivating crops on a communal field together (3 TB, interview). After Tubombeshe was established, clubs continued meeting and working together (1, 8, 9 T.B, interview). The main goal of Tubombeshe is to empower youth, women, and OVCs living in Ibenga area and get them out of the poverty cycle by teaching them livelihood skills (1 TB, interview; Mr. Lason, personal communication 1). The association also takes care of the aged, the disabled, and other vulnerable people in the community (2 TB, interview). Initially the members of Tubombeshe started with farming together, keeping a small number of chickens (interview 5), brick moulding, and clashing stones (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1; 4, 5 TB, interview), which is a method of crushing stones in order to make foundations for houses (3 TB, interview). Besides that, the association provides information about HIV/AIDS, unexpected pregnancy, abortions and gender based violence (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1).

In 2007 GCMF became involved with Tubombeshe (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). GCMF gave Tubombeshe funding for building a vocational training skills centre, a community hall, a bore hole, a piggery house, a shelter, and they donated sewing machines (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1; Mr. Kalima, interview). The skills trainings include carpentry, brick laying, sewing, knitting, and organic farming trainings. Later on GCMF provided a hammer mill, electricity, and a poultry house. The goals of these projects were improving the livelihood skills and living standards of OVCs and women, so that they are able to sustain themselves (Ms. Musukuma, interview). GCMF handed over all the projects to Tubombeshe around the year 2016 (1 TB, interview). After that, Tubombeshe continued most GCMF interventions, only on a small-scale. The association receives an income via income generation activities such as keeping poultry and pigs, however they wish to receive donations to further build their organisation (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1).

1.1 Research objectives

This thesis contributes to the limited existing literature about private development initiatives. Evaluations of PDIs often only focus on the output of their interventions, instead of on the outcome or impact (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). Therefore, this thesis specifically looks into the effects of PDI

interventions on the lives of their target group. Additionally, this thesis will consider to what extent some of the common claims made about PDIs are true. It can be assumed that PDIs are seen as an ideal channel because of their close connection with their target groups and because they provide services which aren't provided by the government neither by traditional actors. PDIs and their supporters believe that PDIs can efficiently and effectively reduce poverty, increase the public support for development cooperation and give International Development Cooperation (IDC) a human face again (Schulpen, 2007). This research looked into these claims.

1.2 Main research question and sub-questions

My thesis is an attempt to contribute to the limited existing literature about PDIs and their often-assumed positive contribution to their target group. I am particularly interested in getting insights on how women involved in PDI interventions experience these events and if they think the interventions have a long-lasting and positive effect on them. I conducted research trying to find out to which extent GCMF interventions are sustainable and have a resilient outcome for their female target group. I gathered data doing semi-structured, narrative and key person interviews and I did a focus group discussion, in Mpongwe district, Zambia. To research the effects of GKMT on female target groups I formulated the following main research question:

To what extent have the GCMF interventions to support women groups in Mpongwe had a lasting and positive impact on the lives of women in the Mpongwe district?

My two sub-questions are:

1. To what extent does GCMF integrate sustainability in their interventions?
2. To what extent do the interventions of GCMF contribute to an increase in resilience for women?

The first sub-question relates to the concept 'sustainability' which in this research means the durability of the interventions and its contribution to structural change. I am curious to examine if the organisation of GCMF involves their target group in decision-making and if the target group feels responsible for the continuation of these interventions in order to sustain the interventions long-term. It is also important to find out if the interventions of GCMF are designed to create structural change in poverty and inequality in order to say something about the sustainability of the interventions.

The second sub-question related to the concept 'resilience' which means the ability to successfully deal with change (Brown, 2016). I want to find out if the GCMF interventions positively contributed to women being able to better deal with structural issues in their lives compared to twenty years ago.

The thesis is structured as follows. In chapter 2 I discuss the conceptual framework I used to analyse the impact of the private development initiative GKMT on the lives of women. The two main concepts are 'sustainability' and 'resilience'. In chapter 3 I will explain the methodology used to conduct this research. The main story of this thesis is divided into two chapters, which all end with a few summarizing key takeaways that explain the main insights and conclusions from that particular chapter. Chapter 4 discusses if GCMF integrates sustainability in their interventions by looking at the type of interventions and the intervention manner of the PDI. The chapter also includes looking at the concepts 'local ownership' and 'local capacities' in relation to the sustainability of the interventions. Chapter 5

elaborates on the women group's resilience level in relation to the interventions. I will discuss if the interventions contributed to a change in the women's resilience capacities, responses, and vulnerability level. The last chapter includes a discussion and conclusion. This chapter is not only focused on answering the research questions, but also links the results of this thesis to the conceptual framework, discusses suggestions for future research and the limitations of this thesis. Moreover, the chapter explores and reflects upon what the insights as presented in this thesis can potentially mean for current and future private development initiatives.

2 Conceptual framework

In this thesis, I used the concepts 'sustainability' and 'resilience' to explain to what extent the GCMF interventions contribute to a positive and long-lasting impact for the women groups involved Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe. First I will explain how PDIs relate to other aid actors in the field. Then I will elaborate on the concept 'sustainability' with regards to the interventions of GCMF. I will explain two more concepts 'local ownership' and 'local capacities' which together form the preconditions of a sustainable intervention. Finally, I will explain the role of 'resilience' in measuring the effects of the GCMF interventions on women groups. While the concept 'sustainability' is focused on the design of the GCMF interventions and the relationship between GCMF and their partners during the involvement of GCMF, the concept 'resilience' makes a comparison of the women's lives before GCMF got involved versus after GCMF was involved in the women groups. Both concepts measure if the GCMF interventions enabled long-term, structural change, only from a different perspective.

2.1 Private Development Initiatives

For this research it is important to understand the background of private development initiatives as they are part of my research objective. PDIs differ from the usual players in the field of development cooperation in many ways (Schulpen, 2016). In general, three aid channels can be distinguished: multilateral (= intergovernmental), bilateral (= governmental), and civilateral (= non-governmental) (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). However, new actors like PDIs, have appeared which do not fit in one of the three traditional channels. Therefore scholars propose to consider a fourth channel called the 'philantral' channel. The philantral channel has a voluntary character and includes actors that become involved in development cooperation based on their own expertise and experience. Within the philantral channel, a further distinction is made between organisations whose main activity is development cooperation and organisations whose main activity is not development cooperation but who are also active in that field. A private development initiative belongs to the sub-group in which development cooperation is the main objective, just like it is for GKMT (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011).

2.2 Sustainability

In this research, I used the concept 'sustainability' to study to what extent GCMF implemented sustainability in the design, implementation, and monitoring part of their interventions and if they contributed to sustainable change. The likelihood that a development organisation contributes to sustainable change depends on their intervention strategy. An intervention strategy is generally believed to consist of two aspects: (1) the type of intervention PDIs execute, meaning what type of activities are performed, and (2) the intervention manner of PDIs, meaning the way the PDI is organised. The type of activities explain whether an intervention enables structural change, while the organisation of a PDI explains the durability of an intervention (Kinsbergen et al., 2017).

The type of interventions of PDIs concerning their level of sustainability can be divided into four generations of strategies. These four generations are based on Korten's classification of NGOs (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). The first generation 'relief and welfare' are aimed at providing service delivery for immediate, basic needs, which are lacking according to their or others' perspective. Most interventions are 'hardware' investments like construction activities or the supply of goods. Even though these interventions are often focused on tackling the symptoms of poverty and not or less on the structural causes of poverty, it does not mean that these interventions cannot address the root

causes at the same time. The second generation 'community development' aims at strengthening the local capacities of the target group to make them more independent. Their interventions focus on community or regional development in which group formation is often part of the intervention. The third generation 'sustainable system development' is focused at removing institutional and policy constraints on a local, national and global level. Organisations executing third generation interventions want to restructure policies and institutions in order to empower local people. With these actions they move beyond the symptoms of poverty and try to enable structural change. The fourth generation 'people's movement' puts people in the centre of development with development organisations serving to create global people's movement. Moving from the first to the fourth generation, development organisations shift away from direct poverty reduction strategies towards making larger institutional and policy changes. Korten's underlying message is that development interventions should be aimed at tackling the structural causes of poverty and inequality in order to be sustainable (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). According to the research done by Kinsbergen et al. (2017), PDIs mainly or only focus on first generation activities. A smaller, second group of PDIs combines first generation interventions with second generation interventions. A small minority of PDIs execute third generation activities and within their samples they did not identify PDIs conducting fourth-generation interventions. Part of this thesis will be to find out in which categorie(s) the GCMF women projects belong to and if they enable structural change. I am particularly interested if these projects made women more resilient. Later in this chapter I will explain the concept 'resilience'.

The second aspect of an intervention strategy is the intervention manner, meaning the organisational structure of an organisation. According to Korten (1990), the intervention manner of PDIs are linked to each generational strategy. The first-generation are often seen as 'doers', the second generation as 'mobilisers', third as 'catalysts' and fourth as 'activists/educators'. The different types of intervention manners indirectly define the position and the role of the PDI and the target group. In the first-generation strategy, Korten describes the role of an NGO as 'the doer', while the target group takes on a passive role. The extent to which the intervention of a development organisation is sustainable depends on the level of participation of local stakeholders. The participation can be measured via three different perspectives: (1) dept, (2) breadth, and (3) timing. Dept is the degree to which stakeholders have an influence on decision-making. Therefore it is important to pin down the exact role of the stakeholders in the project cycle. Breadth means measuring the range of stakeholders involved in the organisation. One has to look at the degree of the involvement of the target group, the local partners and other local stakeholders such as the local government. Measuring their involvement is often done by looking at the design and implementation stage of the interventions. This is the third perspective 'timing', to make clear in what phases of the intervention the stakeholders are involved. In this thesis, next to the design and implementation phase, I also focused on the monitoring phase as this phase explains more about the role of the PDI and the target group. The concept 'sustainability' provides me with insights on the role of the women in the GCMF projects and their degree of involvement. Furthermore, sustainability in development organisations can be measured on four different levels; the individual or family level, the community level, the regional level and the national level. However for this research I will only focus on the community level, because my research participants consist of women community groups and I am limited to certain time constraints, which makes it unrealistic to address all four levels in my research (Kinsbergen et al., 2017).

In order for GCMF interventions to sustain long-term, two important interlinked preconditions are needed; local ownership and local capacities. In order for projects to be able to continue after donors left the field, the target group should feel responsible and capable to continue the interventions on their own (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). The level of local ownership depends on multiple factors. First of all, the partner who initiates a project and invites the other partner to collaborate on the project has a higher degree of ownership than those who do not. In this case GKMT would have the dominant ownership. Although, the power of the initiator should not be overrated. In practice, when local partners are the initiators of a project and collaboration with a PDI, they have a strong influence on the initial phase, however often it turns out the PDI has the decision-making power during the next phases. Especially the partner with the largest financial capabilities seems to have predominant power in the end (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). Another factor that influences local ownership is whether the local partner has their own organisation when getting involved with an PDI. When PDIs decide to support already existing local organisations that have initiated projects before, local organisations experience higher levels of ownership. It turns out local organisations are better at maintaining their influence on projects when they have worked with other (Western) donors before. This is not the case of the Zambian counterpart of GKMT, which is created by GKMT itself. However, GCMF decided to work with already existing organisations Tubombeshe and Nchembwe Twesheko, who submitted GCMF requests for support (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, personal communication, September 19, 2022). A third factor which influences local ownership is the extent of financial dependency of local partners on PDIs. The more financial resources the local partner owns, and the lesser the PDI financially supports the local partner, the higher the local ownership will be. When a local partner experiences a high levels of financial independence, the partner will feel freer to be critical on the input given by PDIs (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011).

Furthermore, PDIs should increase local capacities in order for their intervention to be sustainable. Local capacities means that local partners have the resources to (independently) manage interventions which results in the target group being able to better meet their own needs (Anneli, 2001). Scholars doubt that PDIs increase the local capacities of their local partner as they often do not build connections with other stakeholders in the environment such as the local government or other civil societies, making it harder for the target group to continue the intervention independently. Especially the increase in financial and human capital must be given attention to (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). Financial capital means increasing capacity via income, savings, and investment. Human capital means increasing knowledge and skills in order to understand community risks and be able to design and implement risk management strategies (Mayunga, 2007). Capacity building is an internal process, meaning that the role of the local partner is to take the lead, and the role of the external partner is to assist in strengthening the local capacities. Furthermore, capacity building needs to build on and strengthen the already existing capacities. In general, capacity building should increase the level to cope with change (Anneli, 2001). This brings me to explaining the last concept 'resilience'.

2.3 Resilience

While increasing capacities is a precondition to the sustainability of an intervention, it is also an indicator to measure resilience. In this research I also measured the impact of the GCMF interventions on the lives of women using the concept 'resilience'. To answer the question 'Did the GCMF interventions contribute to making the lives of women more resilient?', it is important to have a clear definition on what resilience is and how to measure it. The concept resilience is used in various

disciplines and contains a variety of definitions (Cretney, 2014). The United Nations (UN) gives the following definition of resilience:

'Resilience is the ability of individuals, households, communities, cities, institutions, systems and societies to prevent, resist, absorb, adapt, respond and recover positively, efficiently and effectively when faced with a wide range of risks, while maintaining an acceptable level of functioning without compromising long-term prospects for sustainable development, peace and security, human rights and well-being for all' (United Nations, 2020).

This definition of the UN is very broad can be made more concrete for my research, quoting the resilience definition of Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD):

Resilience is 'the ability of individuals, communities and states and their institutions to absorb and recover from shocks, whilst positively adapting and transforming their structures and means for living in the face of long-term changes and uncertainty' (OECD, 2013).

This definition adds to the UN definition that besides absorbing and adapting, the subject is able to 'transform'. In this research I recognise three key dimensions of resilience. The first is to 'bounce back' which means to regain stability after a shock. The second is to 'adapt' to uncertainty and the third is to 'transform' in a positive way, which requires structural change. Resilience is thus broadly defined as the ability to successfully deal with change. Resilience is not only used as a response to (structural) issues, it is also a proactive strategy for building the capacity to deal with possible challenges in the future (Brown, 2016). In addition, Brown (2016) explains that resilience is 'the process of, capacity for, or outcome of successful adaptation despite challenging or threatening circumstances'. The aim of including resilience in interventions should not be only on resilience as an outcome, rather the focus should be on the process; improving the wellbeing of individuals, households or communities in relation to (structural) issues they experience. Resilience is therefore not a static concept, but has an identity and functioning which keeps evolving over time.

For this thesis I looked specifically at community resilience because my target groups consists of women groups living in Mpongwe district. Communities are groups of people who live in the same social and geographical context and share the same characteristics. Community resilience means that a community goes through a process of change, adapting to disruption (Cretney, 2014). The concept community resilience emphasizes that local people are capable of finding shared solutions to their problems within a group which results in them being empowered (Bowen, 2013). I focused on the way women groups enhance resilience together. The concept 'resilience' suits my research, because resilience emphasizes the capabilities and independence of local people in developing countries. The focus is on what communities can do for themselves rather than seeing them from a vulnerable, 'victim' perspective (Schipper & Langston, 2015). This is in line with my research; trying to find out if GCMF interventions make their target group more independent.

A resilience analysis consists of measuring the relationship between issues, responses, and future states of wellbeing (Béné et al., 2015). In order to do that I used four indicators, based on a combination of the articles of Béné et al. (2015) and Agrawal (2018). Only the change in each indicator over time can measure the actual effectiveness of a resilient intervention. The development or resilience can be

divided into three phases: (1) the initial state which includes the initial resilience capacities, desired outcomes, and vulnerability level of the target group. (2) The challenges the target group aims to become resilient to. And (3) the end-state, which is the contemporary state including the current resilience capacities, desired outcomes, and vulnerability level of the target group. In order to measure the change in the indicators high frequency monitoring of the indicators is necessary (Béné et al., 2015). However, my fieldwork was limited to a period of two months and the interventions were already finished, therefore I couldn't monitor the change in indicators myself. Instead I discussed the four resilience indicators within these three phases with my participants, trying to capture the change in the indicators over time. I combined the four indicators to analyse resilience with the three development phases to make a comprehensive resilience analysis:

1 Context and initial state: I identified whose resilience was being built, that of the two women groups, and indicated the women's initial vulnerability level and resilience capacities before GCMF got involved.

2 Initial wellbeing outcomes and expectations: I indicated what wellbeing outcomes the women groups desired and what expectations they had from the GCMF projects at the beginning of the interventions.

3 Challenges: I identified the challenges the women groups and wider environment were exposed and aim to be resilient to, in the period after the projects were realised until the year 2022.

4 End-state: I identified the women groups' capacities to respond to challenges, in other words their resilience capacities. I also identified the actual responses of women to these challenges and their vulnerability level in the year 2022, comparing it to twenty years ago. And I explained if the women's initial wellbeing outcomes are achieved.

The capacity to respond to a shock or stress depends on the size of it, the degree to which a system will respond or be affected by the certain shock or stress, and how well the system can adapt to the disturbance leaving damage or creating opportunities. Resilience capacities means there are different ways in which a target group can respond to a challenge. The capacity to respond depends on the size of the challenge, the degree to which a system responds or is affected by a challenge, and how well the system can adapt to the challenge. The different responses can be classified under three types of responses: (1) absorptive capacity which means that the risk management strategies is focused on only coping with the impacts of the challenge and regaining stability after a shock, (2) adaptive capacity which is defined as giving a pro-active, adapted response to uncertainty based on what is learned from experience and knowledge, in order to change and continue the process and (3) the transformative capacity enables positive, systemic change through structural change, by focusing on good governance, policies, infrastructure and service delivery. Responses can vary from improving the system being more able to deal better with challenges in the future, recovering and returning to the original state, to collapsing the system. Capacities can be expanded, stay neutral or decrease (Béné et al., 2015).

It is important to realise that the final wellbeing outcome is not only a result of the shock or stressor. Instead, it depends on the effect of a shock or stressor, the capacities and the responses to a shock or stressor given by individuals, households or communities. Other actors in the field, who do not belong to stakeholders of my research, may also play a role in what the effect of a shock or stressor is. Think

about local or national authorities that may implement certain policies which reduce the severity of a shock or stressor. Therefore resilience should be measured on multiple scales: individual, household, community, district, national and larger systems (Béné et al., 2015). However, my research is limited to researching communities. Therefore it is important to be aware of external actors which might have an influence on the resilience outcome of my participants. Also important to note is that a response to (structural) issues does not always lead to a positive wellbeing outcome. In addition, adaptive or transformative strategies do not necessarily result in better outcomes compared to using coping strategies. There are cases in which adaptive or transformative strategies lead to a negative wellbeing outcome in the long-term.

The concept 'resilience' has received a lot of critique over the years. Research has shown that the popular use of the concept does not consider the distribution and justice issues such as power, politics, agency, inequality, poverty, income and benefits and risks (Cretney, 2014; Bimeny, 2022). Scholars also criticise resilience for being used as a tool in projects to support neoliberal ideologies that aim for decreasing state involvement and increasing community self-reliance (Cretney, 2014). In addition, resilience-focused interventions might increase the vulnerability of their local target group when opposing external coping mechanisms on them while rejecting the historically successful local coping mechanisms (Bimeny, 2022). Resilience in the development field is also used to de-politicise developmental issues, ignoring local politics, and placing the responsibility on the local victims of inequality rather than on the actors who have the actual political power to change structures of inequality (Bimeny et al., 2021). Lastly, some scholars argue that the attention given to resilience could stigmatise individuals and communities who experience low levels of resilience (Agrawal, 2018). I have to take this critique into consideration throughout my research.

Both concepts 'sustainability' and 'resilience' will complement each other in my research and enable me to fully capture the impact of GCMF interventions on the lives of women, as far as that is possible within the limitations of my research. While the concept 'sustainability' explains if GKMTs goal to 'enable structural change' is implemented in the design, implementation and monitoring phase of the intervention, the concept 'resilience' will be used as a lens to see if outcome of the interventions actually did result in structural change for the target group. Simply said, both concepts explain the impact of GCMF interventions on their target group, but sustainability is focused on the input of interventions, and resilience is focused on the outcome the intervention.

3 Methodology

In this chapter I will explain my research design, the six different data collection methods I used, the limitations of this data collection, and my data analysis during and after fieldwork.

3.1 Research Design

This study is a qualitative research. This type of research is most suitable, because qualitative methods enables researchers to “explore, uncover, describe, and understand what lies behind any phenomenon about which maybe little is known” (Cypress, 2015). It allowed me to understand my research participants and their perceptions, and the way they give meaning to their daily lives regarding GCMF (Lune & Berg, 2017). This kind of knowledge can only be attained through qualitative methods and not through quantitative methods focused on numbers and statistical models (Cypress, 2015).

The research was conducted through a case study. The main goal of a case study is to gain in-dept details about an event, person or process, giving answers to “how” and “why” questions (Njie & Asimiran, 2014). This kind of study made it possible to receive in-dept answers to my research- and sub-questions concerning GCMF and the meaning people attach to it, therefore it suits my research. However, there are also limitations to a case study. The most common critique on conducting a case study is that it lacks reliability, meaning that it is difficult to repeat the study and get the same results, and it is hard to generalize the study to a higher level. Still, a case study is the most appropriate research design to provide an holistic view of the way women groups experienced the GCMF interventions over time (Noor, 2008).

The research took place in Mpongwe district, Zambia, because that’s where GCMF is established and operates. I conducted interviews with women involved in GCMF interventions over the past twenty years. The focus is on women groups because women in Zambia are marginalized in society and experience gender inequality in their daily lives. I was interested to find out if GKMT positively contributed these women’s lives in a sustainable way. Therefore I conducted interviews with each women individually. I divided the interviews equally over the two women groups; nine interviews with Nchembwe Twesheko members and nine interviews with Tubombeshe members. I gained access to both women groups via the staff of the GCMF guest house I stayed and via my contact person Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, who provided me telephone numbers of Tubombeshe’s community leader and Nchembwe Twesheko members. With Nchembwe Twesheko, I selected my participants based on a snowball-effect. I started calling women whose telephone number I got from Ms. Korsten-Korenromp. Then I was invited to join a Nchembwe Twesheko meeting where I met more members whom I later interviewed. After interviews I kept asking more telephone numbers from Nchembwe Twesheko women, who I called and arranged interviews with. With Tubombeshe, the community leader of the association selected the partners for me. I intended to select my research participants as random as possible, but it was difficult for me to approach Tubombeshe members myself. Therefore I discussed with the community leader that I needed to interview women from different backgrounds to make the selection process as random as possible. I had to trust the community leader in making the best decisions. I also interviewed the board members of both women groups, two board members of GCMF and one board member of GKMT.

My interview questions were focused on gaining information on the women groups, the GCMF interventions, the relationship the women had with GCMF and the outcome of the interventions. Therefore I asked the women about the relationship they had with each other, about their involvement with their women group and the GCMF interventions, and the relationship with GCMF. I also asked them if they felt responsible for the GCMF projects and if they felt able to continue the projects without external support. Besides that, I asked my interviewees to describe their living situation from twenty years ago and compare it to their current living situation. I also asked if GCMF contributed to these changes in their lives. In the annexes A and B you can find interview guides and questions for more detailed information about the interviews. Besides interviews, I conducted literature research as a source of information to improve my understanding of the social context, explain my findings and justify the research. This includes document about GKMT and GCMF, the particular women groups, and about the social context of Mpongwe and Zambia.

3.2 Data Collection Methods

To be able to answer the research questions, six different data collection methods were used during fieldwork: Informal conversations, semi-structured interviews, narrative interviews, key person interviews, focus group discussions and participant observations.

Informal Conversations

I had informal conversations throughout the whole period of fieldwork, as it allowed me to find valuable or new information about my research. These informal talks enabled me to gain general knowledge about the social life in Mpongwe, exploring that topics are important for my research and what slang is used in my research field. Also during later stages of my fieldwork, informal talks helped me to better understand certain topics and see the relevance of it. I spoke to staff of GCMF guest house where I stayed, other guests that stayed at the guest house, and members of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. Besides that I had multiple informal talks with the community leader of Tubombeshe, which helped me get more clarity on certain topics. I intended to have informal conversations about my research with people on the streets, but I did not feel comfortable enough to do that.

Semi-Structured Interviews

After having done my first informal conversations, I conducted semi-structured interviews with both women groups. Semi-structured interviews offer a certain degree of direction and at the same time a degree of flexibility and openness, which enable important themes and topics to emerge during interviews (Moen & Middelthon, 2015). I interviewed nine Nchembwe Twesheko women, of which eight interviews were semi-structured, and I interviewed nine Tubombeshe women, of which all interviews were semi-structured. The number of active Nchembwe Twesheko members was really small, so I tried to interview as many members as possible, which was nine out of sixteen active members. I also selected women of both women groups based on their years of involvement with their women groups and GCMF. They had to be involved in one of the GCMF interventions at some point in the past twenty years. Although I preferred talking to women who have been involved in the projects for a longer time, throughout the past 20 years, because they have the longest time frame in which GCMF could have made a contribution to their lives. I also tried to speak to women who ended their membership with the women groups in the past. I thought it might be interesting to speak to women

who stepped out of their women group to get more insights on the sustainability of the interventions. However, arranging interviews with them was difficult to realise, as women who stopped being members of their women group often had moved to other villages or had no time for an interview.

Narrative Interviews

I also conducted one narrative interview for this research. I choose to do a narrative interview with a Nchembwe Twesheko member in order to find out if I missed certain relevant topics in my semi-structured interviews. I asked the member if she could tell me anything about the involvement of GCMF in her life. I gave her the space to recall anything that popped up in her head and was aware of moments of silence, which I deliberately did not fill in. After the participant finished her story I asked some questions to further clarify or explain something to ensure that I had understood everything correctly. I chose to do this narrative interview after I did multiple semi-structured interviews, as these interviews provided similar answers. The woman I chose for this interview was selected randomly. I intended to do a narrative interview with a Tubombeshe member as well, but I started my fieldwork with interviewing Tubombeshe women and at that time, I did not feel confident enough to perform a narrative interview yet.

Key Person Interviews

I conducted key person interviews as well. Key persons have expert knowledge on a particular theme relevant for certain research (Moen & Middelthon, 2015). In each women group I conducted one key person interview with a board member, and in the board of GKMT and GCMF I conducted three key person interviews as well. The key person interviews in the women groups helped me to get a better overview on the history the women groups had with GCMF, the details of GCMF interventions and the outcome of it. I struggled to conduct the key person interview with the Tubombeshe board member as she tended to give personal answers, about her own experiences with GCMF, instead of giving a helicopter view on the topic. However, the information she provided was still valuable for my research. The key person interviews with GKMT and GCMF enabled me to get insights on my research topic from a different perspective. I also used these interviews to further clarify some issues, as the members from the women groups sometimes gave different or contradictory answers or could not remember everything clearly.

Focus group discussion

I performed one focus group discussion with five Tubombeshe board members. My initial idea of the focus group discussion was to create a space for the board members to discuss their experiences about GCMF with each other, while I would observe the conversation from the background and take notes. In reality however, it became more of a group interview as all eyes were pointed on me during the conversation. This was however, still valuable to my research as I gained new insights on the relationship between Tubombeshe and GCMF throughout the GCMF interventions.

Participant observations

I did three participants observations as I joined three meetings of the women group Nchembwe Twesheko. I did these observations to find out more about the group dynamics of Nchembwe Twesheko and relevant research topics for my thesis. During the meetings I mostly listened to the conversations and I tried to observe everything. The women spoke in Bemba, a regional Zambian

language, with each other because not every woman was able to speak English. One woman always sat next to me and translated the conversation for me. The meetings lasted a few hours and helped me to create a better bond with my research participants.

3.3 Data analysis during and after fieldwork

During fieldwork, I was able to record most interviews on my telephone. In case I got no permission from my research participant to record the interview, I took notes with pen and paper. In the Netherlands, I analysed the data by transcribing all interviews on my laptop. I used the website 'otter.ai' to transcribe the recorded texts automatically. I typed out the non-recorded conversations on my laptop as well, afterwards.

The second step I did was analysing all the interviews for which I used the program 'atlas.ti'. I used both methods of deductive and inductive coding. I used deductive coding to sort the data into different categories in order to organise the data and create an overview. I based these categories on the conceptual framework and the pre-determined interview themes and questions (Bingham & Witkowsky, 2022). The categories within the conceptual framework were: concepts 'sustainability', 'resilience', 'local ownership' and 'local capacities'. The concepts were meant as a direction for further data analysis rather than being static or definitive (Bowen, 2006).

After that, I conducted inductive coding, which means I went through the transcriptions again and developed new codes as they emerged (Bowen, 2006). This inductive analysis approach enabled me to find relevant perspectives and concepts which I had not captured in my predetermined design. Lastly, I used the deductive approach again to test the findings with my concepts. I safely stored the data on my laptop, and the data was only shared between me and my supervisor Lotje.

3.4 Limitations

There are several limitations present in my research. The first one is validity. Validity refers to whether the research data is honest and veritable. The validity of this study is at risk due to researcher bias which makes it impossible to aim for full objectivity in qualitative research. The personal background, values, knowledge and opinions of a researcher will always partly affect the research outcome. The presence of the researcher on the setting or among the participants will also have an effect on the research. As a researcher in the field, I tried to be aware of my personal background which influenced the research. During interviews, I tried staying as neutral as possible, not asking questions that steer into certain directions. Also during field work, and especially during data analysis and interpretation, I tried to be aware of these biases.

The second limitation in my research is that I may have been biased during conducting interviews with my research participants, as I got into contact with my interviewees via Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, the founder of GKMT and GCMF, and via the GCMF guesthouse. My research participants also might have had prejudice about me and my fellow researchers prior to our visit, as more than a hundred youngsters from Belgium and the Netherlands have been to Mpongwe over the last twenty years. Regardless of the nature of this prejudice, it influenced our fieldwork with regards to building relationships, trust, and way of communication.

The third limitation is related to my positionality in this research. I came to Mpongwe with two other students. We all did research on our own, however, the population of Mpongwe might have considered us to be one group, not separating us from each other. The way my fellow researchers behaved during their fieldwork and in informal settings might have influenced the image my research participants have of me, and vice versa. Moreover, some of my research participants thought I was related to GKMT or GCMF, which might have influenced the interviews as well. Some women thought I was part of GKMT:

“Especially with your [GKMT] coming. Your coming has helped us.” (1 NT, interview)

The interviewees who thought I was related to GCMF often started talking about their wish to receive funding from GCMF again, instead of answering my interview questions. I felt like the women hoped that via these interviews they will get assistance from GCMF again. Other women thought I was related to Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, the founder of GKMT and GCMF:

“She says thank you for you coming, for what Ton has done. You've been here checking on us, discussing with us. It's lifting because we feel like Ton has not left us. When they see you they feel like Ton is still there.” (6 NT, interview)

My research participants might not give their honest opinion because of whom they relate me to. That's why I tried to explain to my interviewees that I am an independent researcher who does not work for GKMT or GCMF and will try to keep their identities confidential. I also tried telling this to the community leader of Tubombeshe. However, he also had the wrong expectations about my coming as well. The first time I visited Tubombeshe, the community leader invited as many members as possible to come meet me, while I was unaware of this. The women thought I was going to give them something, in the form of funds or anything related to that. However, I expected to just meet the community leader in his office and have a tour around the building. This made me feel very uncomfortable and left the women disappointed. This might have also influenced my interviews with these women.

The fourth limitation is related to my independency in this research. My contact person during this research has been Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, the founder of GKMT and GCMF. She helped me and the two other students to get into contact with our research participants. Prior to our visit to Mpongwe, she also let some of our interviewees know that we were going to approach them for interviews. This influenced my independency in this research.

The fifth limitation is the use of translators and the difficulties finding suitable ones. In Zambia not everyone's mother language is English. A variety of regional languages are spoken which I do not speak. To do some interviews, I needed to find a translator. My initial idea was trying to find a translator who was not involved with GKMT, GCMF or the women groups. However, there were difficulties finding a translator. Unfortunately, my network in Mpongwe remained small, therefore I did not get to know suited translators who were not involved in the women groups. Most of the time, I had to arrange translators who were also members of the women groups. This could have influenced the answers I received from my research participants. It also resulted in the translator answering the interview questions by themselves instead of translating the participant's answers. I tried tackling this problem by telling my translator that I would like to hear the answer given by the participant. Besides that,

sometimes I found a translator spontaneously, last minute, not knowing if they were well-skilled in translating. This also might have resulted in less complete answers from my research participants.

The sixth limitation of this research is that for my research topic I mostly focused on events from the past. During interviews I experienced that my research participants sometimes found it difficult to talk about the past, because they did not remember everything well. This resulted in mixed up answers or interviewees contradicting each other. Some participants also did not understand I wanted to talk about the past. They preferred talking about the future as I suggest that feels more relevant to them. This made it more difficult for me to receive desired answers from my participants.

During my research, I also struggled with finding the right interview location, which is the seventh limitation of this research. With Tubombeshe, I did many interviews in their office. I also conducted interviews at the GCMF guesthouse. Both places can be considered not to be a neutral place. One interview was at the market, which was very busy and distracting. The environment of my interview locations might have resulted in interviewees not giving honest or elaborate answers during interviews. The last limitation of this research was the time available to conduct the field work. I went to Zambia for two months which meant I could only interview a limited number of participants and had restricted time to build meaningful relationships with my participants.

Chapter 4: Sustainability

4.1 Type of activity

In this thesis, the sustainability of a PDI activity is measured via two aspects; (1) the type of activity which shows whether an intervention can create structural change and (2) the organisation of a PDI which shows the durability of an intervention (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). In this chapter I will discuss both aspects regarding to GCMFs interventions with Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe, starting with the first aspect. In order to indicate the sustainability of GCMFs type of interventions, I classified the interventions into four generations of strategies, based on Korten’s classification of NGOs (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). I will present six GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko and four GCMF interventions in Tubombeshe, see table 1, in which I will analyse the sustainability of each intervention following Korten’s arguments (Kinsbergen et al., 2017).

Table 1. A table showing the previous GCMF Interventions in both the groups.

GCMF interventions Nchembwe Twesheko	GCMF interventions Tubombeshe
Construction community hall	Construction training skills centre
Donation sewing machines	Donation sewing machines
Training in organic farming	Organic farming training
Construction bore hole	Construction poultry house
Donation catering equipment	
Training in entrepreneurship	

4.1.1 Nchembwe Twesheko interventions

Community hall

The GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko are all first- or second-generation activities, or a combination of the two. Take as example the construction of the community hall. In 2006, Nchembwe Twesheko asked GCMF to build a community hall for their group. Before the community hall was built, the women had no proper meeting place of their own. They often had to switch meeting places which made it difficult for the group to plan activities and resulted in a lack of structure (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). The women’s aim of the community hall was to have a meeting place and a skills training centre in which women are taught livelihood- and agricultural skills, and to generate an income with these skills or by renting the building to others (Ms. Musukuma, Mr. Kalima, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, 2 NT, interview; Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). The skills include keeping poultry, sewing, knitting, cooking, reading and writing English, and basic book-keeping. The women’s aim of learning these skills is to reduce the dependency on farming, as that is oftentimes their only income source which makes them vulnerable (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). The community hall also enables women to share health and culture related information on HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, Malaria and women’s rights. Besides that, the hall provides women a space for social events and for raising funds for their projects (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). Constructing a community hall is a ‘hardware’ investment. Therefore the intervention is a typical first-generation strategy. However, the community hall was not built to fulfil immediate, basic needs such as receiving food, clothes or housing. Building a community hall does not have the same level of urgency like building hospitals or houses does. The community hall is indeed considered a need for the women, as they had no structure in their group without a proper meeting place. However, the community hall is focused on tackling structural causes of poverty instead of

tackling the symptoms of poverty, as the building can provide a meeting place which tackles one cause of poverty; lack of personal safety nets. Furthermore, the building enables income generating activities for the women and thereby tackles one major cause of poverty: lack of access to jobs and livelihood (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*). GCMF combined the first-generation strategy with the second, as GCMF focused with their intervention on strengthening the local capacities of the women group Nchembwe Twesheko. The construction of the building enabled the women to increase or learn new skills and to participate in income generating activities, with the goal of making the women more independent. Therefore this intervention suits a second-generation strategy (Ms. Musukuma, interview).

Donation sewing machines

Another first- and second-generation strategy intervention of GCMF is the donation of sewing machines. GCMF donated ten sewing machines to Nchembwe Twesheko after the women's club requested this from GCMF. Before the women received the sewing machines, the women were sewing with small needles, using no machines (9 NT, interview). GCMF's aim of donating sewing machines was for the women group to give sewing lessons, make clothes for themselves, sell products and to make school uniforms for OVCs (3, 4 NT, Mr. Kalima, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). What makes this intervention a first-generation strategy is that the donation of sewing machines is a typical supply of goods from donor to receiver. However just like the community hall, this intervention is not aimed at providing immediate basic needs. The women's goal of the sewing machines is to generate an income and to be able to support their community. GCMF creating an income generating activity for the women tackles one cause of poverty: lack of access to jobs and livelihood. GCMF creating an opportunity for the women group to help their community, tackles another major cause of poverty: lack of personal safety nets (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*). This intervention is therefore focused on tackling the root causes of poverty, not the symptoms. Besides that, this intervention is also a second-generation strategy as the sewing machines are donated to benefit a group, and the use of the sewing machines can strengthen the skills of the women. Instead of sewing with needles, which is a slower method of sewing, the women can now make use of sewing machines, which increases their efficiency. GCMF enabled an income generating activity which increased the group's independency. Therefore this intervention can also be classified as a second-generation strategy.

Construction bore hole

Just like the community hall and the sewing machines, the construction of the bore hole is also a combination of a first- and second-generation strategy. However, GCMF initially built the bore hole as a first-generation activity. Only later the intervention developed into a second-generation activity as well. Nchembwe Twesheko asked GCMF for a bore hole because there was no opportunity to draw water somewhere close to their community hall. Before the bore hole was built, the women had to draw water from the surrounding villages which they experienced to be very hard (3 NT, interview). Together with Mpongwe council, GCMF built Nchembwe Twesheko a bore hole (3 NT, interview). GCMF's goal of the bore hole was to provide Nchembwe Twesheko and their community with access to clean drinking water (Mr. Kalima, interview). Constructing a bore hole for basic needs, in this case access to clean water, is a typical 'hardware' investment which makes this a first-generation intervention. The goal of the bore hole to provide clean water, is tackling the structural causes of poverty, namely 'the lack of access to clean water' (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*). Besides using the bore hole for drinking water, the women group started to use the bore hole for

other purposes. The access to water gave the women the opportunity to do income generating activities such as cooking and baking, gardening and catering at their community hall. The bore hole therefore strengthened the local capacities of the women group and made them more independent, which makes this intervention also a second-generation strategy.

Donation catering equipment

Another first- and second-generation intervention of GCMF is the donation of cooking equipment. GCMF donated Nchembwe Twesheko cooking utensils like pots and a stove after the women requested this. The equipment enabled women to do cooking and baking activities. GCMF's goal of this donation is for the women to generate an income with participating in catering or selling their own food products on the market. The cooking equipment also enabled women to teach each other how to cook and bake certain food products. Besides that, with the cooking utensils the women can cook for OVCs. GCMF donating a supply of goods, in this case, cooking equipment, suits the first-generation strategy. While the focus of a first-generation intervention lies on tackling the symptoms of poverty, this intervention also tries tackling one of the structural causes of poverty, namely the lack of access to jobs and livelihood. The cooking supplies enabled the women's club to participate in income generating activities such as catering and selling self-made food products. Besides that, as the women take care of OVCs by providing meals for them, another cause of poverty is tackled, namely lack of personal safety nets (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*). What makes this intervention also a second-generation strategy is that the intervention is focused on improving the local capacities of a group. The cooking utensils enabled women to learn from each other and enhance their cooking skills which makes them more independent.

Training in entrepreneurship

There are two remaining GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko that need to be discussed; training in entrepreneurship and training in organic farming. Both projects can only be applied to second-generation strategies. First of all, GCMF provided Nchembwe Twesheko with training in entrepreneurship after the women asked for this. The women were taught about the meaning and the importance of business (7 NT, interview). The goal of this training was to help women open up their own stores. This is a second-generation strategy as the training is focused on increasing the local capacities and independency of the women group. The project also tackles one cause of poverty: the lack of access to jobs and livelihood, since the aim of the training is to enable income generating activities for women.

Training in organic farming

Second, GCMF provided the women group with training in organic farming. Before GCMF became involved in this women's group, the women had a communal field together and they were taught agriculture from FTC (Farmers Training Centre) (4 NT, interview). The women's goal of the communal field was for members to share skills and to increase food security, especially for households taking care of orphans. Later on the women lost the plot as it was difficult for them to organise themselves without having their own meeting place (4 NT, interview). After the women received a community hall from GCMF, two Nchembwe Twesheko women got organic farming training from GCMF. The women did not request this intervention from GCMF. Instead GCMF stimulated the women to take part in this training as it was a pilot project from GCMF (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). GCMF's goal of this communal field was to use it as a demonstration tool for new farming methods and crops and as an

income generating activity to make the women self-sustaining (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). After the training, the women started farming at a small field where they crops and sold them on the market (1, 4 NT, interview). Having a communal field together allowed the women group to register as a cooperation and get access to the Governments Fertiliser Support Programme. This governmental support provided the women low-cost seed and fertiliser (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). This intervention is a second-generation strategy because the aim of providing training in organic farming is to enhance the agricultural capacities of a women group. The majority of Nchembwe Twesheko members already had the skill of farming before this intervention started, however this training extended their knowledge on farming in an organic way. Learning organic farming can be very useful in a place like Mpongwe, where it is difficult for vulnerable farmers to get access to seeds and fertilizer. Often vulnerable farmers in Mpongwe cannot afford to buy fertilizer and therefore use non on their fields. This results in a lower food production and farmers living in poverty. Many farmers in Mpongwe depend on receiving seeds and fertilizer from their government, however the Zambian government reduced their role and budget for agriculture. This hurts smallholder farmers as they depend on this public service delivery the most (Arend, 2011). Organic farming makes it possible to produce and apply self-made compost. Therefore organic farming can make Nchembwe Twesheko members more independent from the government. This way of farming therefore tackles one structural cause of poverty, namely 'lack of government support' (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada*, n.d.). Organic farming also increases food production and therefore food security and profit as well, which results in vulnerable farmers getting out of the poverty cycle (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). Therefore this way of farming tackles another structural cause of poverty, namely 'the lack of access to jobs and livelihood'.

In short, all GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko are first- or second-generation strategies or a combination of both. GCMF mostly focused on hardware investments to provide the women's club basic service deliveries, but also to enhance the women's capacities and to make them more independent. This makes most interventions a combination of the first- and second-generation strategies. Besides that, GCMF provided the women skills trainings which can be classified as a second-generation strategy. Even though Korten claims that first-strategy interventions are mostly focused on tackling the symptoms of poverty and not on the structural causes of poverty, this is not the case with GCMFs interventions. They do often tackle root causes of poverty such as the lack of access to jobs and livelihood, the lack of personal safety nets, the lack of access to clean water, and the lack of government support. According to Korten, if interventions tackle the root causes of poverty, the interventions can be classified as sustainable (Kinsbergen et al., 2017).

4.1.2 Tubombeshe interventions

Construction trainings skills centre

Just like in Nchembwe Twesheko, GCMFs interventions in Tubombeshe can be applied to first- and second-generation strategies. The interventions GCMF did in Nchembwe Twesheko are comparable to the interventions in Tubombeshe. An example of a GCMF intervention in Tubombeshe which is both a first- and second-generation strategy is the construction of the trainings skills centre. GCMF constructed a trainings skills centre for the members of the women's group Tubombeshe, after Tubombeshe applied for it (2 TB, interview). In the trainings skills centre women were taught carpentry, brick moulding, bricklaying, sewing, organic agriculture, English and financial administration (9 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). This project is a first- and second-generation strategy as the

construction of the building is a hardware investment, built to increase the local capacities of a group. The training skills centre enables women to learn skills and start an income generating activity. Therefore this project does not tackle the symptoms of poverty, but over of the root causes; the lack of access to jobs and livelihood (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*).

Construction poultry house

Another GCMF project which is both a first- and second-generation strategy, is the construction of the poultry house. GCMF built a poultry house after Tubombeshe requested this (1, focus group discussion). Tubombeshe's aim of the poultry house was to keep chickens to make a profit and to use the chicken's manure as compost for farming (3, focus group discussion; 7 TB, interview). GCMF's initial goal of the poultry house was for the building to function as an income generation activity for GCMF, instead of for Tubombeshe. With the profit of the poultry house GCMF was able to support other projects in the community (Ms. Musukuma, interview) and depend less on the financial support of GKMT (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). GCMF monitored the chickens every day and provided the chicken's food and medicine when needed (1 TB, interview). After three years GCMF handed over the building to Tubombeshe and Tubombeshe started keeping chickens on their own (2 TB; Ms. Musukuma, interview). The poultry house was initially not designed to support Tubombeshe but to support GCMF itself. Therefore, in first instance, this project does not strictly tick the boxes of any generation strategy as it was not meant to directly support Tubombeshe. However, from the moment the poultry house was handed over to Tubombeshe, GCMF's goal of the poultry house was to support Tubombeshe. From then on, the poultry house can be treated as a first- and second-generation strategy. First of all, what makes this project a first-generation strategy is that the construction of the poultry house is a hardware investment. The building enables an income generating activity, namely the keeping of poultry, and therefore this project tackles one of the root causes of poverty: lack of access to jobs and livelihood (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*). Second, the poultry house was donated to a group, Tubombeshe, to strengthen their local capacities and make them more independent. This makes the intervention also a second-generation strategy.

Donation sewing machines

GCMF's donation of sewing machines is also a combination of a first- and second-generation strategy. Tubombeshe received sewing machines from GCMF after they requested this. GCMF's initial goal was to teach women how to sew with a sewing machine, to enable them to start their own tailoring shop and to be able to sustain themselves (Ms. Musukuma, interview). This is a first- and second-generation strategy, as the donation of sewing machines is a hardware investment and also increases the sewing capacities of a group. The sewing machines enabled women to start their own income generating activity. Therefore this strategy tackles one of the roots causes of poverty, namely 'lack of access to jobs and livelihood' (*10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.*).

Training in organic farming

The last GCMF intervention I will discuss is the organic farming training. Tubombeshe applied to GCMF for an organic farming training so they could learn how to make their own compost manure (1, focus group discussion). GCMF's goal of this project was to contribute to sustainable developments in agriculture (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp). Just like Nchembwe Twesheko women, the organic farming training taught Tubombeshe women how to make their own compost manure (9 TB, interview). This GCMF project is a second-generation strategy as the training increases the farming skills of women

helps to them become more independent from the government. This way of farming tackles two structural causes of poverty, namely the 'lack of access to jobs and livelihood' and the 'lack of government support' (10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada, n.d.).

Just like GCMFs interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko, the interventions in Tubombeshe are all first- and second-generation strategies as well, also with the goal to tackle the root causes of poverty, which can be considered sustainable.

4.1.3 GCMFs perspective on sustainability

According to Ms. Korsten-Korenromp and Ms. Musukuma, former GCMF and GKMT board members, GCMF did consider the sustainability of the GCMF projects when designing the projects. With strengthening or teaching various skills, women were expected to be able to sustain themselves. The women were trained to do 'cheap skills' such as sewing and self-catering, meaning that the women were taught skills that can be performed without having a big start-up capital. This enabled women generate an income and sustain themselves without help of external support. Teaching these kind of 'cheap' skills was a deliberate choice of GCMF. Besides that, GCMF discussed together with the women groups strategies how the women could continue their activities without the assistance of GCMF (1 TB, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). One strategy Nchembwe Twesheko women did to sustain their projects was organising a fundraising. The profit of these fundraisings went to their activities, such as buying materials for sewing (2 NT, interview). A strategy of Tubombeshe was that each woman who was taught sewing, had to pay for her sewing classes. The saved up money was invested in buying new materials and maintaining the sewing machines (Ms. Musukuma, interview). Lastly, GCMF supported the women in connecting with people who can help build their activities. For example, GCMF supported Nchembwe Twesheko women in approaching a sewing tutor to give sewing lessons (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

To conclude, all GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe are a first- or second-generation strategy, most of the times a combination of it. The third- and fourth-generation strategies which typically focus on making larger institutional and policy changes, cannot be applied to these GCMF interventions. Even though according to Korten (1990), the first-generation strategy is known for tackling the symptoms of poverty, and not the root causes of poverty, this thesis shows that first-generation strategies can tackle the root causes of poverty on a regular basis as well. In order for PDIs to achieve structural change it is important that interventions focus on strengthening the target group's local capacities, learn them new skills, but most important enable them to participate in income generating activities. According to Korten's classification of NGO's, the GCMF interventions can be considered sustainable as they are designed to enable structural change in the lives of their target group.

4.2 Intervention manner

In this sub-chapter I will elaborate on the second aspect of an intervention strategy, which also measures the sustainability of a PDI, namely the intervention manner: the organisational structure of an organisation. According to Korten, the extent to which the intervention of a development organisation is sustainable depends on the level of participation of local stakeholders (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). Following Korten's arguments, the participation can be measured via three different perspectives: (1) depth, (2) breadth, and (3) timing. In this chapter we will look at timing based on three

phases: design, implementation and monitoring phase. With the design phase I mean the phase in which the design for the intervention is made. With the implementation phase I mean the phase in which the intervention is being constructed or realised. The monitoring phase is the phase in which the PDI and/or the local partner start monitoring the project. This paragraph will start discussing the range of stakeholders involved in the GCMF projects, including their role in the interventions and the complexity of their involvement. After that I will discuss for each phase the relationship between GCMF and the women groups, what role each partner has and how that affects the sustainability of the interventions.

4.2.1 Stakeholders

In the following paragraphs the range of stakeholders involved in the GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe and their role will be discussed. This covers number (1) depth and (2) breadth, of the three perspectives that measure the level of participation of the women groups. The stakeholders include; Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe, GKMT, GCMF, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, Ms. Musukuma, Mr. Kalima, donors and the government.

Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe

It may be obvious that the two most important stakeholders are the two community women's groups Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe, which I've introduced earlier. Both women groups received assistance from, and worked together with, GCMF to realise their associations' goals and visions. Together with GCMF, the women groups wanted to improve the lives of their members, and that of vulnerable people in their community.

GKMT

Geef de Kinderen van Mpongwe een Toekomst (GKMT) is a Dutch Private Development Initiative and founder of GCMF, the Zambian counterpart of the Dutch organisation. Together they formed an organisation which realised a variety of interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. The Dutch board has been responsible for facilitating the GCMF interventions by giving their financial support. GKMT has served as an extension of GCMF, operating from the Netherlands and giving advice to GCMF from the background. While GCMF functions as the local board and is responsible for making all the decisions in Mpongwe.

GCMF and GKMT experienced some challenges concerning the role of each board has. It was sometimes unclear which board was responsible for certain tasks and decisions (Ton). On the one hand GKMT tried to give GCMF full responsibility in Mpongwe, on the other hand GKMT tried to remain control over some issues. For example, when selecting a new local partner GCMF made a selection which had to be approved by GKMT in the end. Besides that, during the interventions, a lot of Dutch GKMT board member, volunteers, and students visited Mpongwe. They served as extensions of GKMT (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). They took on an assisting role and tried to encourage both women groups (3 NT, interview). The GKMT members were given a lot of power as they were also part of decision-making in GCMF interventions. They had the power to retrieve materials that were donated to women groups if they thought the women weren't using them (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, Mr. Kalima, interview).

GCMF

Give the Children of Mpongwe a Future (GCMF) is the Zambian counterpart of the Dutch board GKMT. They were responsible for the design, implementation, and monitoring phase of all GCMF interventions. GCMF did not want to take on a supervisory role for the women groups, as the women clubs were already established before GCMF got involved (Mr. Kalima, interview). Instead GCMF wanted to take on more of an advisory role, providing the women with guidance, and trying to maintain the women clubs' independency (Ms. Musukuma, interview). GCMF encouraged the women clubs to do activities, empower themselves and to help each other (3, 4 NT, interview). However sometimes it was difficult for GCMF not to take on a supervisory role, as Tubombeshe came to GCMF every time when they could not solve a problem on their own (Mr. Kalima, interview).

Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe members have different feelings about GCMF and GKMT. Some members treat GCMF and GKMT as one organisation, while others make a clear distinction between the two boards. Overall, Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe look back positively at the collaboration with both GKMT and GCMF (3, 5, 6, 8 NT, 7 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). Although there is a group of Tubombeshe members that trusts GKMT and distrusts GCMF because of the following reasons. Some women argue that GCMF does not have the best intentions for their local partners. Instead they claim that GCMF just wants to benefit themselves. One woman blames GCMF for the projects that failed by saying the following:

"That's why we are suffering, because of the Mpongwe people." (7 TB, interview)

Besides that, Tubombeshe women distrust GCMF because the women felt excluded from certain decision-making in certain projects, GCMF took away the associations' equipment without communicating, and because the board of GCMF was mismanaged (1, 4, focus group discussion). One woman describes her feelings about GCMF as follows:

"I think the GCMF were selfish and greedy." (4, focus group discussion)

Therefore, some members would not want to work with GCMF in the future anymore, only with GKMT (7, 8, 9 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). The Tubombeshe board also prefers not to work with GCMF anymore, unless there can be made a new contract with terms and conditions about collaborating together (5, focus group discussion). Even though members dislike the GCMF board, they think of GKMT as a well-functioning board that has members with a compassionate heart for assisting their target groups (1, focus group discussion). One woman strongly expresses her preference towards GKMT:

"Let only Ton (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp) be communicating with us." (7 TB, interview)

The women's difference in attitude towards GCMF and GKMT can be explained by the amount of contact the women had with both boards. The women groups had direct contact with GCMF board members and all communication had to go through GCMF, except for when Dutch volunteers were present in Zambia. Adding to that, GCMF was responsible for the design, implementation and monitoring of all GCMF projects. As a result, when a GCMF intervention fails, the women groups therefore tend to blame GCMF for it. Besides that, it is possible that GCMF was not transparent in

communication and actions, which led to women losing trust in this board. However, more research has to be done about that. I expect these women to speak highly of GKMT because GKMT was in charge of giving the women groups financial contributions. Moreover, many women link GKMT to the founder of GKMT and GCMF, a woman they think is trustworthy and inspirational.

Ms. Korsten-Korenromp

Ms. Korsten-Korenromp is the founder of GKMT and GCMF and has played an important role in the GCMF interventions of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. During the GCMF involvement in the women groups, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp came by every year to check up on both women groups (2 NT, interview). According to Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, she built a relationship with the women based on the contact she had when she was visiting Zambia (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). Indeed, both women groups speak highly of her. The Nchembwe Twesheko women describe their connection with Ms. Korsten-Korenromp as a personal relationship. They say that Ms. Korsten-Korenromp is a good woman who has helped the group a lot (2, 6, 8 NT, interview). The women also think of Ms. Korsten-Korenromp as a contact person, who was most interested in their group. Ms. Korsten-Korenromp joined meetings in an informal way, in which she and the women sang and danced together, she participated in traditional events like weddings, and was interested in updates on the GCMF interventions (6 NT, interview). Besides yearly visits, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp made annual reports on the process of both women groups (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

Ms. Musukuma

Ms. Musukuma had a special position in the context of GCMF and Nchembwe Twesheko, being a former vice-chair and secretary member of GCMF and a former member of Nchembwe Twesheko at the same time. She used her power as GCMF board member to support her women's club. When GCMF was selecting local partners, she arranged that her women's club was put on the map for selection (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). As a Nchembwe Twesheko member, Ms. Musukuma was very influential. She motivated other members to come to meetings and to show interest in their women group. However, when she moved for her job transfer her membership with Nchembwe Twesheko ended, and therefore the women group lost an invested member (Mr. Kalima, interview). Besides Nchembwe Twesheko, she was also very involved in Tubombeshe projects as GCMF board member (Ms. Musukuma, interview).

Mr. Kalima

Mr. Kalima has also played an important role in the GCMF interventions of Nchembwe Twesheko. He's been a former chair member of the GCMF board which overlapped with his membership in Nchembwe Twesheko. Nchembwe Twesheko consists only of female members except for Mr. Kalima. The women group has a complicated relationship with him. At first, he encouraged the women's club to apply for funding from GCMF. After that, the women invited Mr. Kalima to become a member of their club (Mr. Kalima, interview). He is also a school principal. The community hall of Nchembwe Twesheko and Mr. Kalima's school stand right next to each other, each based on their own plot. Mr. Kalima has rented the community hall for years to use as an extra classroom. After having multiple issues with Mr. Kalima, which I will discuss in the next sub-chapter, the women stopped having trust in him and involve him less in their group nowadays (6 NT, interview). However, after all these years Mr. Kalima is still a member of the women's club and after the group was disorganised around 2020, Mr. Kalima tried to help rebuild

the group (3 NT, interview). He was very involved in both Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe interventions (Ms. Musukuma, interview).

Donors

The GCMF projects have been sponsored by different donors such as Wilde Ganzen, Cordaid, the World Bank and Stoppelhaene. Whether a GCMF intervention could be realised depended very much on the gifts of donors, as GKMT did not possess enough financial capital to operate independently. While some donations were receiver-oriented, others were donor-oriented, meaning that the local partner or the donor decides how to spend the money. For example, the World Bank provided Nchembwe Twesheko with kitchen equipment because the women applied for it (9 NT, interview). Stoppelhaene on the other hand, funded the organic farming training for Nchembwe Twesheko because it suited their interest, not that of the women per se. Furthermore, these donors expect to see results from the money they invested. It can be difficult for PDIs to show fast results to donors when the projects are focus on long-term change. In order to keep donors satisfied GKMT wrote annual reports on the projects every year (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

Government

And finally, the council of Mpongwe also played a role in the GCMF interventions of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. The council of Mpongwe supported the women groups by helping them to realise certain projects. For example, the council and GCMF worked together to realise the community hall and bore hole for Nchembwe Twesheko (3 NT, interview). The council gave Nchembwe Twesheko a plot to build the community building on (4 NT, interview). The council also supported Tubombeshe by giving technical support, entrepreneurial workshops and in helping to maintain the poultry by giving food and medicines (Mr. Lason, personal communication 2). This research contains limited information on the role of the government in the GCMF interventions.

According to Korten (1990), the degree to which the intervention of a development organisation is sustainable depends on the level of participation of local stakeholders. This sub-chapter discussed two out of three perspectives that can be used to measure the participation of local stakeholders: (1) depth and (2) breadth, in other words the range of stakeholders involved in the interventions and their role. The most important stakeholders involved in the GCMF interventions are the women groups themselves and GKMT and GCMF, with GKMT taking on a facilitating role while GCMF was in charge of the interventions and decisions made in Mpongwe. GCMF tried to support the women clubs' independency by not taking on a supervisory role, which according to Korten (1990) increases the sustainability of the interventions. However, the women also experienced difficulties in their relationship with GCMF, which decreased the sustainability of the interventions. I will present more examples of this in the next sub-chapter.

4.3 Relationship women and GCMF in intervention phases

In the following paragraphs I will discuss the third perspective that Korten (1990) uses to measure the participation of local stakeholders: (3) timing. I will explain the relationship between both women groups and GCMF in each intervention phase of the GCMF projects; design, implementation, and monitoring phase. I will elaborate on the extent to which the women groups are involved decision-making in these phases and how that influences the sustainability of the projects.

4.3.1 Design phase

Almost every GCMF intervention in Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe is designed by the women groups themselves. This is valued positively by Kinsbergen et.al (2017) who found that the sustainability of a project increases when the local partner of a PDI takes on an active role during the design of projects. Overall, the women groups were in charge of the designs (4 NT, interview). In the examples above, the women groups sent proposals to GCMF about project designs which they based on their own needs-identification (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1). After that, GCMF and the regarding women group came together to discuss the interventions. In some cases, GCMF made few adaptations to the designs, but only to make them more viable. For the construction of the community hall for Nchembwe Twesheko, GCMF asked the women for an upfront, meaning the women had to show GCMF that they already had a starting point for the project. The women provided all the locally available materials for the construction such as building sand, crushed stones and burnt building bricks (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). They also paid for the plot where the community hall was built (2, 6 NT, interview). This way the women could show GCMF that the intervention is viable and that they are committed and motivated to make the community hall a success. Besides that, GCMF made collaboration contracts to ensure good partnership between them and their partner. For example, when GCMF started collaborating with Tubombeshe, both groups signed a document called 'Memorandum of Understanding' (MOU) which explains the relationship and role of the PDI and their local partner (1 TB, interview). However, GCMF did not make a contract with their partner for each project specifically. When GCMF donated sewing machines to Nchembwe Twesheko, there were no conditions made for the women on how to use the sewing machines. GCMF just hoped that the women group was going to use the machines and that the machines would bring the women together (Mr. Kalima, interview). The GCMF organic farming training in Nchembwe Twesheko is an exception to the local partner being in charge of the GCMF projects design. The training in organic farming was not initiated by Nchembwe Twesheko but by a Dutch GKMT member. A GKMT member that worked for GCMF at that time, had tied connections to Stoppelhaene, a donor interested in agriculture that wanted its money invested in organic farming. This GCMF project therefore was a donor-oriented project (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). Except for the organic farming project, both women groups felt in charge of designing the GCMF projects which according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017) considerably increases the sustainability of the projects.

4.3.2 Implementation phase

GCMF and the women groups collaborated during the implementation phase of the GCMF projects (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp). GCMF deliberately made their local partners contribute to the construction or realisation of GCMF projects, by letting the women contributed money or labour, to make them feel more responsible for the projects (2 TB, interview). The extent to which the women groups are involved in the implementation phase of the GCMF projects, depends on each project. When the intervention involved the construction of a building, both the PDI and the women contributed to the project. They both contributed their time, labour and skills to constructing buildings. For example, when the community hall of Nchembwe Twesheko was built, the Nchembwe Twesheko members crushed stones needed for the foundation of the building, and brought these stones to the construction site (4 NT, Ms. Musukuma, interview). During the construction of the bore hole at Nchembwe Twesheko, the women helped with building the foundation and drawing water (4 NT, interview). Tubombeshe members also provided their labour when the poultry house was constructed, even though the initial plan of the poultry house was to only bring profit for GCMF. Tubombeshe provided an upfront, they cleared the

land, and moulded the bricks for the poultry house (3, 7 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). When a GCMF project involved giving trainings, the women groups were in charge of finding instructors for the trainings. For example, Tubombeshe members chose their own instructors for the sewing, carpentry and bricklaying trainings. Besides that they paid for the instructors themselves (Mr. Lason, personal communication 2). During the implementation phase of the projects, GCMF and women groups worked together and, in some cases, GCMF even gave the local partner full responsibility for the projects. The high level of involvement of the women groups considerably increased the interventions' level of sustainability. However, I find it remarkable that GCMF involved Tubombeshe in building a poultry house that was initially not built for Tubombeshe. This cannot have led to an increase in sustainability of the poultry house project, except for GCMF itself.

4.3.3 Monitoring phase

GCMF monitored the interventions together with the women groups (Ms. Musukuma, 1 TB, interview). A former GCMF board member explains it was important for GCMF to monitor the projects together with the women groups as monitoring is a two way mechanism, in which the donor and the local partner should work together. During the monitoring phase, GCMF visited Nchembwe Tweshoko approximately once a month to check on the progress. They only visited when the women asked them to be present (Ms. Musukuma, Mr. Kalima, interview). During those visits GCMF and Nchembwe Tweshoko discussed the progress of the women group and GCMF gave advice when needed (Ms. Mukusuma, 7 NT, interview). The majority of Nchembwe Tweshoko women felt content with their collaboration with GCMF (3, 5, 6, 8 NT, interview). At one point, the women's club even requested GCMF to monitor them more often. They wanted GCMF to be available to them, so that in the event of the women making a mistake, GCMF can correct them in time. GCMF tried to come by more often after that. At some point, the women group had meetings with GCMF every week (9 NT, interview) but GCMF didn't succeed in continuing to visit that regularly (4 NT, interview). One Nchembwe Tweshoko member explains that the women group couldn't rely on GCMF. Sometimes they were coming by to check up on them, other times they didn't (9 NT, interview).

To a certain extent, Tubombeshe members look back positively on their collaboration with GCMF (2 TB, interview). During the monitoring phase, GCMF gave Tubombeshe what they needed and they consulted Tubombeshe in what they did. Besides that, Tubombeshe felt comfortable to be critical on the projects (1, 2 TB, interview). GCMF came by one or two times per week and together the two boards supervised the projects. They monitored if members reached the objectives of trainings, and if the budget was spent on the projects and not used for other purposes (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1, 2). However, according to a Tubombeshe member, GCMF was mostly focused on monitoring the organic farming project and did not get much involved with monitoring other GCMF projects. This led to Tubombeshe members feeling frustrated. Only the founder of GKMT and GCMF, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, showed interest in the progress and challenges of other projects, however she was not in charge of solving these issues (Mr. Lason, personal communication 2). This shows the struggle of GKMT wanting to be involved in the process of the interventions on the one hand, while giving GCMF authority over the projects on the other hand.

Both women groups felt very much involved in monitoring the GCMF interventions as the women worked together with GCMF. Even though Kinsbergen et al. (2017) claims that the higher the involvement of the local partner in the intervention, the better the sustainability of the interventions,

the local partner might not agree on that. Both groups indicate that they wanted GCMF to be more involved in the monitoring phase. Nchembwe Twesheko wanted GCMF to monitor their women group more often, in order to make the GCMF interventions more effective. Tubombeshe wanted GCMF to be more involved in monitoring projects not related to organic farming. Also noteworthy is that, again, Tubombeshe members make a distinction between GCMF and GKMT in which GCMF is pictured as ‘the bad guy’ while GKMT is mentioned in a positive way.

4.3.4 Power disbalance in monitoring phase

During the monitoring phase, women dealt with structural issues that influenced the relationship between GCMF and the women groups. I would like to elaborate on these structural issues now and explain how they affected the sustainability outcomes of the GCMF interventions. The first relevant structural issue is related to ‘power disbalance’. While GCMF and the women groups aimed for an equal partnership, this was not always the case. Sometimes there was a power disbalance between GCMF being the powerful one and the women remaining with little power. Take the GCMF project of the community hall at Nchembwe Twesheko for example. Around the year 2018 Nchembwe Twesheko started renting their community hall to Mr. Kalima, the former GCMF chair member and Nchembwe Twesheko member. For four years Mr. Kalima rented the community hall without paying rent for it. The women tried collecting the money from him multiple times, but he denied their requests. According to one of the Nchembwe Twesheko women, Mr. Kalima used his power as GCMF chairman to rent the building for free and thereby overlooked the need of the women (6 NT, interview). In Mr. Kalima’s defence, he claims that he wanted to pay rent, only he did not know whom to give the money to, as the group was disorganised at the time. He also did not feel the need to pay as long as the group was not having meetings. Moreover, Mr. Kalima paid certain bills for the women’s club, and never asked any of it back. He once paid for a new roof for the community hall, as the old one blew off. He also paid the owners of the plot on which the community hall is built, who came to collect money. Mr. Kalima argues that renting the building for free is a compensation for him paying these bills (Mr. Kalima, 3 NT, interview).

This power difference between Nchembwe Twesheko and Mr. Kalima resulted from the different positions both parties have within the organisation of GCMF; Mr. Kalima as chairperson of the GCMF board and the women as the local partner. However, the power difference can also result from gender inequalities. For example, besides renting the building to Mr. Kalima, Nchembwe Twesheko also rents their building to a church. The church pays Mr. Kalima the rent and Mr. Kalima passes the money on to the women (NT, participant observation 1). This could result from a culture in which men have higher power than women over financial issues. The case of the community hall shows that Nchembwe Twesheko was not always powerful enough to make decisions about the GCMF interventions. This limited their ability to actively participate in the projects, which according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017) decrease the sustainability of the project.

The Nchembwe Twesheko women also experienced issues with power disbalance in other interventions. At the start of the sewing project, Nchembwe Twesheko was in charge of making decisions about the use of the sewing machines and finding the right tutor. After the women received sewing machines from GCMF they needed a sewing tutor to teach them (3 NT, interview). They hired a tutor for some time, but the sewing activity ended as it became too expensive to afford the sewing lessons. Besides that the women lacked money to buy fabrics or to repair broken sewing machines (Ms.

Musukuma, interview). GCMF did not get involved after the sewing activity stopped, because the organisation wanted to support the independency of their local partner (Mr. Kalima, interview). After a while, GCMF decided to take away the sewing machines as they were not used anymore (Ms. Musukuma, interview). GCMF made this decision without involving Nchembwe Twesheko (3 NT, interview). The machines were donated to another GCMF project, a college in Mpongwe. The Nchembwe Twesheko women disagreed with GCMFs decision. They felt deprived and discouraged (4 NT, interview). GCMF took away the sewing machines while the women were saving up money to buy equipment and fix the broken sewing machines (2 NT, interview). The women thought the machines were going to be of value for them in the future (4 NT, interview). At that time the group was being disorganised and not meeting. This resulted in some members not being aware that the machines had been taken away (3 NT, interview). After the sewing machines were retrieved, the women group asked Mr. Kalima, the former GCMF chair person, for clarity about the machines. According to the women group, Mr. Kalima denied that he was responsible for retrieving the machines and blamed the college for it (6, 7 NT, interview). After their conversation with Mr. Kalima the women lost trust in him. Besides that, they became so frustrated they didn't discuss this issue with any other GCMF board member (6 NT, interview). Mr. Kalima himself remembers that the GCMF board took the machines to the college because the women were disorganised and didn't use them (Mr. Kalima, interview).

The sewing machines project shows that although GCMF aimed to give Nchembwe Twesheko decision-making power over the project, in the end it is GCMF who has the final say. I find it contradictory that GCMF did not want to intervene in Nchembwe Twesheko's sewing activity at first, to support the women's group independency, while in the end they made a decision which harmed the women's independency. According to Kinsbergen et al. (2017), the women's limited power in decision-making results in the intervention's decrease in sustainability. Furthermore, retrieving the sewing machines resulted in the women's loss of a possible income generating activity and it also harmed the women's trust in GCMF.

Another example of power disbalance, or possibly better described as corruption, is related to GCMFs financial expenditures. GCMF once aimed to help Tubombeshe to register as an official cooperation, in order for the women group to get access to agricultural benefits from the government. However, Tubombeshe did not succeed in becoming an official cooperation because, according to the Tubombeshe community leader, GCMF used donations meant to support Tubombeshe, for their own purposes (Mr. Lason, personal communication, 14 June, 2023). The women's group could not afford to pay for this registration on their own (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). As a result of power disbalance between GCMF and Tubombeshe, Tubombeshe had no influence over GCMFs financial donations meant for Tubombeshe and therefore did not become an official cooperation at the time. Following Kinsbergen et al. (2017) her arguments, the limited power of Tubombeshe in their partnership with GCMF, lowered the intervention's level of sustainability.

The above mentioned examples of power disbalance and disagreements between GCMF and their local partners show that in some GCMF interventions, GCMF took on an active, decision-making role, resulting in a less active, powerful role for the women groups. According to Kinsbergen et al. (2017), this power disbalance decreased the sustainability of the GCMF projects.

4.3.5 Exclusion and miscommunication in monitoring phase

The women groups did not only struggle with power disbalance during the monitoring of projects, they also struggled with the feeling of exclusion. The poultry house of Tubombeshe explains this the best. At first, Tubombeshe felt included in making decisions about the GCMF interventions. However, after the poultry house was constructed, Tubombeshe experienced a change in their partnership. Tubombeshe felt excluded from the poultry house project (2, 7 TB, interview). One member explains that GCMF was not listening to their views anymore, instead they made decisions on their own (2, focus group discussion). Besides that, Tubombeshe was not aware of the profit that was being made from the poultry house (1, 7 TB, interview). The association felt it was not possible to have a conversation with GCMF about their change in partnership (1, focus group discussion). A Tubombeshe member argues:

“But when they built that poultry house, it's when they started as if we are not part of that.” (7 TB, interview)

Another member agrees with that, by saying:

“We were totally isolated from the project.” (1, focus group discussion)

This feeling of exclusion resulted from miscommunication between GCMF and Tubombeshe. While Tubombeshe thought the poultry house was built for them as an income generating activity, GCMF initially constructed the poultry house to support GCMF itself. There are certain factors that contributed to this miscommunication. First of all, Tubombeshe provided an upfront of the poultry house project, they helped constructing the building and took care of the chickens (1, 3, 7 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). This resulted in Tubombeshe members feeling part of the project. Second of all, the poultry house was built right next to Tubombeshe. The plot on which the poultry house was built was not land of Tubombeshe, but that of Ibenga's chiefteness, located right next to Tubombeshe. This led to a disagreement between Tubombeshe and GCMF with Tubombeshe members believing the poultry house was built on their ground and therefore their property. GCMF had many difficult conversations with Tubombeshe explaining to the association that the poultry house did not belong to them (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). GCMF claims that Tubombeshe was never in charge of the poultry house in the first place as it was GCMF who paid for the construction and for the manager of the building (7 TB, interview). Eventually GCMF struggled with managing the poultry house, because it was difficult for them to monitor the project from a distant place. The poultry house is located in Ibenga, while GCMF is located in another town, Mpongwe. Besides that, GCMF struggled to overcome chickens diseases in the poultry house (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). As a result GCMF wanted to sell the building to another party (1 TB, interview). Meanwhile, Tubombeshe really wanted to become the owners of the poultry house. After long negotiations, GCMF decided to hand over the poultry house to Tubombeshe for free instead of selling it to another party (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

The poultry house project shows that there was miscommunication and disagreement between GCMF and Tubombeshe about the ownership and the monitoring of the poultry project. This led to Tubombeshe members feeling excluded from decision-making in projects and created a feeling of unequal partnership between them and GCMF. Besides the decline in the women's relationship with

GCMF, according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017), the women's limited power in decision-making also declined the sustainability of the poultry house intervention.

One last example of power disbalance and miscommunication between GCMF and the women groups is about the property of equipment. During GCMFs involvement in Tubombeshe, the groups made an arrangement about the equipment that GCMF donated to Tubombeshe. According to the Tubombeshe board, the arrangement included that two of each item will remain at the institution to sustain the GCMF projects. However when GCMF ended their collaboration with Tubombeshe, they took back a lot more donated equipment than initially agreed; the feeders and the drinkers inside the poultry house, the carpentry tools, a few sewing machines, wheelbarrows used for organic farming, the pumping machine of the bore hole and the motorbikes used for monitoring the fields (1,2, focus group discussion; Mr. Kalima, 1, 6 TB, interview). GCMF thought the tools could better be used for other projects (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). According to Tubombeshe, GCMF took the equipment without communicating this (1, 7 TB, interview). However, a former GCMF board member claims that Tubombeshe's chairman was aware of the equipment being taken away (Mr. Kalima, interview). Besides that, GCMF argues that when donating the poultry house to Tubombeshe, they wrote in a letter of ownership that the poultry house belongs to Tubombeshe minus the initial capital (1, focus group discussion). Furthermore, GCMF only took the carpentry tools from Tubombeshe after a GKMT member visited Tubombeshe and saw that the tools weren't used. The member suggested that the tools could be better used elsewhere. And lastly, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, founder of GKMT and GCMF, states that GCMF took equipment from Tubombeshe because it belonged to them in the first place, not to Tubombeshe. She is however not aware of all equipment that is being taken away from Tubombeshe or the reasons why GCMF took them away, as GCMF was in charge of these decisions (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

It is difficult to say if the struggle with ownership of equipment derives from a miscommunication between the PDI and the women or from a power disbalance between both parties. Possibly it's both. It does however show that Tubombeshe did not have full decision-making power when it comes to monitoring donated property which, according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017), decreases the sustainability of GCMF interventions. In short, Tubombeshe experienced exclusion and miscommunication with GCMF, which considerably lowered GCMFs interventions' level of sustainability (Kinsbergen et al, 2017).

In short, during the design and implementation phase, the women groups felt in charge of making decisions, which according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017) increases the level of sustainability in the interventions. However, during the monitoring phase, the women groups faced difficulties in their relationship with GCMF which negatively impacted the sustainability of the GCMF interventions. First of all, unlike Kinsbergen et al. (2017) who claims that limited involvement of PDIs in interventions is beneficial for the project's sustainability, both women groups wanted GCMF to be more involved in monitoring the projects. Besides that, the women groups experienced power disbalance, exclusion and miscommunication in their collaboration with GCMF which resulted in women's limited decision-making power over the GCMF interventions. The active role that GCMF took in some interventions in the monitoring phase, and the passive role that was left for their local partners, considerably decreased the level of sustainability for the GCMF projects.

4.4 Local ownership and local capacities

According to Kinsbergen et al. (2017), in order for interventions to sustain long-term, two important interlinked preconditions are needed; local ownership and local capacities. After donors leaving the field, the local partner should feel responsible and capable to continue the interventions on their own. In the following paragraphs I will firstly explain the level of local ownership and capacity of both women groups in the GCMF interventions, following the arguments of Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011). Then I will present other relevant factors that influence local ownership and capacity, not mentioned by Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), based on the results of this research.

Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) argue that the level of local ownership of a local partner can be measured via three factors; initiator of the project, establishment of the organisation, and financial dependency. In what follows I will consider to what extent this case study indeed demonstrates this link between the sustainability of interventions and the local ownership and capacities of a target group.

4.4.1 Initiator of the project

The level of local ownership depends on multiple factors. First of all, the partner who initiates a project and invites the other partner to collaborate on the project, has a higher degree of ownership. In this case study, both women groups initiated all the projects, except for the organic farming training in Nchembwe Twesheko. The women groups invited GCMF to support them financially by sending them project proposals. The women groups felt in charge of designing and initiating the projects and therefore, according to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), the local partners have a high degree of ownership. However, in reality the power of the initiator should not be overrated. When local partners are the initiators of a project and collaborate with a PDI, they have a strong influence on the initial phase, although it turns out that often PDIs have the decision-making power during the next phases. The partner who provides financially seems to have the predominant power in the end (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). Like I explained in the previous paragraphs, this is also the case with GCMF. Even though GCMF tried to remain the independency of the women groups by taking on an advisory role, they sometimes didn't give their partners full decision-making power during the monitoring phase. An example I have given before I that GCMF solely decided to take away Nchembwe Twesheko's sewing machines. Still, overall both women groups are content with their collaboration with GCMF (3, 5, 6, 8 NT, 2 TB, interview). Even though GCMF sometimes used their decision-making power during interventions, in most projects the women groups felt like they were in charge of the interventions which, according to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), should result in a high degree of ownership.

4.4.2 Establishment organisation

Another factor that influences local ownership is whether the local partner has their own organisation when getting involved with an PDI. When PDIs decide to support already existing local organisations that have initiated projects before, local organisations experience higher levels of ownership. Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe were already established organisations before they got involved with their donor GCMF. Therefore the local partners should experience higher levels of ownership.

It turns out local organisations are better at maintaining their influence on projects when they have worked with other (Western) donors before. As far as my research concerns, both women groups did not however work with other donors before. GCMF was the first donor that both women groups got involved with. According to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), this could have made it more difficult for the women groups to stay in charge of the projects throughout the interventions. However, the women did have some experience with receiving assistance from other organisations, like the council and FTC. This gave the women some knowledge on how to collaborate with other organisations, which they possibly used in their advantage when working together with GCMF. Based on the establishment of the women groups, according to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), the local ownership of the women should be high. However, it could have been difficult for the local partners to maintain their influence on the projects. This was also the case of GCMF and their local partners, as I explained in the ‘monitoring phase’ paragraph how both women group struggled to have decision-making power over the GCMF interventions.

4.4.3 Financial dependency

A third factor —one that deserves a separate heading since it is fundamental— which influences local ownership is the level of financial dependency of local partners on PDIs. The more financial resources the local partner owns, and the lesser the PDI financially supports the local partner, the higher the local ownership will be. Moreover, when a local partner experiences high levels of financial independence, the partner will feel freer to be critical on the input given by PDIs (Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011). At the start of the projects, the women groups experienced a low level of financial independency based on their financial resources. The main reason why the women groups wrote project proposals to GCMF was because they lived in poverty and lacked the money to realise these projects themselves. GCMF financially supported the women clubs in order for the women to realise their goals.

After GCMF stopped assisting, both women groups did not feel financially able to run the GCMF interventions independently. They learned skills they cannot use due to a lack of financial means. Most women declared they need GCMFs assistance again in order to be able to continue their activities (4, 7, 8 NT, 4, 8 TB interview). One Nchembwe Twesheko woman explains the need of her women group as follows:

“Yes and they [GCMF] were helping us very much, they were helping us too much. We still need them to be back with us to cooperate with us.” (7 NT, interview)

A member of Tubombeshe explains that her women group is financially depending on GCMF by arguing the following:

“If the GCMF left us with a capital we would have continued this time. The poultry could be full of chickens.” (6 TB, interview)

With this quote the Tubombeshe member states that the GCMF poultry project could have continued with a start-up capital from GCMF, only that didn’t happen. With the help of sponsors, the women groups feel like they could build themselves (3, 7, 8 NT, 4, 8 TB interview). Nchembwe Twesheko needs capital to improve their community building. They want to make the place attractive for hosting events

and do catering (4, 5, 7, 9 NT, interview). Tubombeshe argues they need capital to buy equipment for organic farming and to expand their skills on poultry keeping (4, 7, 8 TB, interview).

Reflecting on the past, the founder of GKMT and GCMF, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, agrees that the women clubs depended too much on her organisation (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). Based on the article of Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), the financial dependency of both women groups resulted in the local partners experiencing low levels of local ownership in the GCMF projects. However, based on my results the level of local ownership of Tubombeshe remained high, even though they faced financial difficulties (8 NT, 2, 5, 6, 9 TB, interview; Mr. Lason, personal communication 1). Nchembwe Twesheko's level of local ownership has decreased, but not only as a result of financial issues. I will explain more about the difference in local ownership between both women groups in sub-chapter 4.5.

4.4.4 Financial and human capital

Besides local ownership, PDIs are believed to be able to increase local capacities to enhance the sustainability of interventions. Local capacities means that the local partner has the resources to independently manage interventions that results in the local partner being able to better meet their own needs (Anneli, 2001).

Especially the increase in financial and human capital must be given attention to (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). Financial capital means increasing capacity via income, savings, and investment. GCMF aimed to increase the financial capital of both women groups as many of their interventions enabled income generating activities. GCMF was indirectly also involved in increasing capacity via savings and investment by giving the women groups financial advice, explaining the women about saving and investing money, instead of directly spending it (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). GCMF also donated the poultry house for free to Tubombeshe, an investment which Tubombeshe could not have been able to afford on their own. According to a former GCMF board member, with this investment Tubombeshe should have been able to keep chickens on their own and increase their financial capital (Ms. Musukuma, interview). In short, GCMF increased the financial capital of both women groups, which according to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) increases the sustainability of interventions.

Increasing human capital means a growth in knowledge and skills in order to understand community risks and be able to design and implement risk management strategies (Mayunga, 2007). As far as my research concerns, GCMF did not increase the women's knowledge on understanding community risks except for the GCMF community hall project. GCMF constructed a community hall for Nchembwe Twesheko which provided a place for the women to receive information on health risks such HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria. By constructing the community hall, GCMF indirectly increased the women's knowledge on understanding community risks. GCMF also enabled women to design and implement risk management strategies as the goal of each GCMF projects was to lower certain community risks such as poverty, food insecurity and depending on one source of income (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). Besides that, GCMF provided the women groups capacity building training in poultry and in tailoring, with the goal to enable women to manage the poultry and sewing projects independently (Ms. Musukuma, interview). Therefore GCMF also contributed to increasing the human capital of both women groups.

Scholars doubt that PDIs increase the local capacities of their local partner as PDIs often do not build connections with other stakeholders in the environment, such as the local government or other civil societies. This makes it harder for the local partner to continue the intervention independently (Kinsbergen et al., 2017). For some projects, GCMF did collaborate with the council of Mpongwe in order to realise the community hall and the bore hole of Nchembwe Twesheko (3, 4 NT, interview). GCMF also arranged meetings between both women groups to exchange knowledge and learn from each other. GCMF did not build connections with many other local stakeholders, which might have caused difficulties for the women groups to continue the intervention independently. Besides increasing the sustainability of interventions, capacity building should also increase the level to cope with change, in other words resilience (Anneli, 2001). Whether the capacity building of GCMF really increased resilience for both women groups is a question I will answer in the next chapter.

To conclude, according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017) a PDIs intervention can be considered sustainable if the local partner feels responsible and capable to continue the interventions on its own. Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) argue that the level of local ownership and local capacities of a local partner can be measured via three factors; the initiator of the intervention, the establishment of the local partner, and the financial dependency of the local partner. According to this theory, the sustainability of GCMFs interventions is high, as the women groups initiated most interventions and felt like they were in charge of most interventions. The interventions' level of sustainability is also considered high because the women groups were already established before GCMF got involved. However, during the monitoring phase, GCMF sometimes used their decision-making power during the monitoring of the projects, which decreased the interventions level of sustainability. Besides, both women groups have been financially very dependent on GCMF during the interventions and they still rely on other donors today, which according to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) also decreases the interventions' level of sustainability.

4.5 Other relevant factors

Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) have explained in their article the relevance of local ownership and local capacity when aiming for sustainable PDI interventions. They used certain factors to measure the level of local ownership and capacity of local partners. I used their theory as a lens for my research but that doesn't mean that this theory perfectly fits the case study of this research. Based on the results of my research there are other relevant factors that influence the local ownership and capacity of the women groups, not mentioned by Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011). I will now introduce these new factors.

4.5.1 Group dynamics

I found that the dynamics of a target group strongly influence the local ownership and capacity of their group. While Tubombeshe continued all GCMF projects on its own on a smaller scale, Nchembwe Twesheko does not run any GCMF project anymore. How did one women group manage to continue all GCMF projects while the other group failed to do so? Both groups struggled with power disbalance and financial dependency but that didn't hold Tubombeshe back to continue the interventions. To explain the difference, it is important to look at the group dynamics of both women groups. Even though some Nchembwe Twesheko women feel responsible for the continuation of the GCMF projects

(8 NT, interview), the women faced certain difficulties in their group which decreased their level of local ownership and local capacity.

First of all, the women group was disorganised as many members were transferred to other towns for their jobs or marriage (3 NT, interview). Second, at one point in the past there has been mismanagement in their women's club. The leaders of the group were malfunctioning and a former treasurer misused club money (6, 9 NT, interview). And most important, third, not all members are motivated to invest in the GCMF projects. Women felt like they contributed time and money to the club for a long time without gaining anything from it (4 NT, interview). Some members do not show up at meetings because they are lazy (7, 8 NT, interview). Others feel less motivated to continue meetings as they are growing older. They feel like it might be time to stop, as they have no younger members in their group who can replace them (NT, participant observation 1).

The most dominant reason why women lack motivation is that they prioritise their own activities above club activities like farming, working as a marketeer or in a shop (1, 3, 8, 9 NT, interview). Take for example the GCMF organic farming project in which the Nchembwe Twesheko women did organic farming on a field together. Cultivating crops in an organic way comes with a strict time management. The women failed to keep up with this, because they prioritised their own fields over the communal field (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, 1 NT, interview). One Nchembwe Twesheko member explains the difficulties of having to work on two fields at the same time:

“Community activities never used to work properly. Because most of the time when in agriculture, there is timeframe for everything. By the time they [Nchembwe Twesheko members] want to plant their farms, that's the time they [Nchembwe Twesheko club] want to plant in the communal field. So in the end, you find that they concentrate more on their fields than in the club fields. Because agriculture is timeframe.” (1 NT, interview)

The women claimed they didn't have enough time to farm on the communal land. That's why they hired a man to take over their work on the communal field. However, he was not skilled in organic farming and the strict time management that comes along with it. As a result the organic farming project failed. Important to mention is that the organic farming training was also a donor-oriented project, which further explains why the women were not very motivated to do organic farming together (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). Since GCMF left, Nchembwe Twesheko does not undertake any activities during meetings anymore. The members who do come to meetings only to chit chat and then head off home (9 NT, interview). That's why when going to club meetings some women feel like:

“We are wasting our time here instead of making money.” (3 NT, interview)

In general, the group gave up which made it difficult for the small number of motivated members to continue their activities (2 NT, interview). The explanations of Nchembwe Twesheko women why their local ownership and capacity is low can be divided into two categories. On the one hand, most members argue that the reason why the projects did not continue was out of their hands. Situations occurred which they could not influence that negatively affected the outcome of their projects. For example, members had to go on transfers to other villages which disorganised the group, the sewing machines were retrieved by GCMF which ended the sewing activity and GCMF did not donate enough

money to Nchembwe Twesheko to become financially independent. One member explains how GCMF stopped giving assistance to her women group when the women still depended on them:

“The start was good, but you know, there was no continuing. That’s the sad part of it. It’s like you get somebody from the shore and when you reach the middle of the lake, you abandon them. That’s this is the way I look at it.” (4 NT, interview)

On the other hand, there is a small group of members that blame the termination of the GCMF projects on the women themselves (1, 3 NT, interview):

“We now realise GCMF helped us, it is us who failed.” (3 NT, interview)

They blame the women for not appreciating enough the support they got from GCMF. These given explanations show the importance of a background of a group when it comes to the level of local ownership and local capacity.

Nchembwe Twesheko has a different group dynamic than Tubombeshe. While Nchembwe Twesheko has had 28 active members at its peak, Tubombeshe counts 200 active members today. The difference in numbers explains why transfers or non-motivated members probably affects Tubombeshe less than it affected Nchembwe Twesheko. Besides that, the average age of Tubombeshe members is lower than that of Nchembwe Twesheko members. Therefore, it is probably easier for Tubombeshe members to continue with the GCMF projects. Furthermore, according to a former GCMF board member, Tubombeshe members seem to be better organised compared to Nchembwe Twesheko:

“Nchembwe women would be difficult to organize because each one had its own things to think about and how to run it than Tubombeshe in Ibenga. Because they [Tubombeshe] were for a common purpose, which was different from the Nchembwe here. They [Nchembwe Twesheko], you would think they are for one thing, but when you take a little time you think and each one has something different to think about.” (Mr. Kalima, interview)

The different group dynamics show that the background information of a target group is an important factor to include when measuring the local ownership and local capacity of a target group.

4.5.2 Culture of visiting

Besides the dynamics of a target group, the local capacity and ownership of a target group also depends on another factor which I call ‘culture of visiting’. Dutch people visiting Mpongwe, like GKMT board members, the founder of GKMT and GCMF, Dutch volunteers and interns, influenced the local ownership of Nchembwe Twesheko members during the GCMF interventions. The women group always tried to organise themselves when they heard that GKMT came to visit Mpongwe because they knew that GKMT financially provides the GCMF projects. They started cleaning up their houses and began having club meetings in the hope that ‘the Dutch people’ would give them something valuable (Mr. Kalima, interview). A Nchembwe Twesheko members confirms that when GKMT volunteers would come to Mpongwe, the women’s club was booming. The volunteers would check on how the women’s club is doing and after that report an update to the founder of GKMT and GCMF, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp. The women were afraid that if the club had no meetings or did not participate in activities,

the volunteers would report this to Ms. Korsten-Korenromp and she would be disappointed. The women also claim that the presence of Dutch people in Mpongwe added value to their group and encouraged them (3, 6 NT, interview). The moment the Dutch people left Mpongwe, the women group went back to their former situation, that of being disorganised (Mr. Kalima, interview).

The dynamics between the Dutch people and the women group became a cultural thing. The distance between the GKMT board, located in the Netherlands, and their local partners, located in Zambia, being very big, and GKMT people not always being present in Mpongwe, created this 'culture of visiting'. When the Dutch people were present in Mpongwe, the women group felt capable and responsible to run the GCMF interventions, however as soon as the Dutch people left, the level of local capacity and ownership decreased to the initial level. As far as my research concerns, I am not aware if the 'culture of visiting' can also be applied to Tubombeshe. However, Tubombeshe still shows high levels of local ownership and capacity in the year 2022, years after GCMF stopped giving them assistance. Therefore it is questionable if you can blame the long distance between the PDI and its local partner for causing a decrease in a target group's local ownership and capacity. A possible explanation for Nchembwe Twesheko's discontinuance of any GCMF intervention is that they easily blame external factors for the failure of projects, while they could have achieved more if they would have had more internal motivation to invest in the GCMF interventions.

To conclude, the sustainability of PDI interventions is partly measured by looking at the intervention manner of a PDI and its local partner, which includes measuring the local ownership and local capacities of the local partner. Even though GCMF tried to make both women groups independent in managing the interventions by increasing their local ownership and capacities, the women struggled to continue the GCMF projects on their own. While Tubombeshe continued the GCMF projects on a smaller scale, Nchembwe Twesheko did not succeed in continuing any GCMF intervention. The difference between both groups can be explained by adding two important factors to the theory of Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) that influence local ownership and capacity; group dynamics and 'culture of visiting'. These factors turn out to be crucial when measuring the sustainability of PDI interventions. PDIs should therefore carefully consider these factors when choosing a local partner.

Chapter 5: Resilience

In the previous chapter I discussed the sustainability of the GCMF projects. I looked at the input of the interventions and the relationship between GCMF and the women groups during the interventions to see if the projects enabled long-term and structural change for women. Now I will use a different lens 'resilience', which I also use to indicate if GCMF made a positive impact on the lives of women. With the concept 'resilience' I measure the output of the interventions by comparing the lives of women before GCMF got involved versus after GCMF got involved. In this thesis 'resilience' is defined as follows:

Resilience is 'the ability of individuals, communities and states and their institutions to absorb and recover from shocks, whilst positively adapting and transforming their structures and means for living in the face of long-term changes and uncertainty' (OECD, 2013).

Shortly said, resilience is the ability to successfully deal with change. For this thesis I looked specifically at community resilience because my target groups consists of women groups living in Mpongwe district. In order to make a resilience analysis for Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe I used the following four indicators, combining the article of Béné et al. (2015) and Agrawal (2018): (1) context and initial state, (2) initial wellbeing outcomes, (3) challenges, and (4) end-state.

First I will discuss the context and initial state, including the initial vulnerability level and resilience capacities of the women before they joined their women group. The impact GCMF made on the lives of women blends with the impact that the women groups made on their members, as GCMF supported many activities of the women groups shortly after the groups were established. Therefore, I will discuss the context and initial state of the women before they joined their women group instead of before GCMF got involved in the women groups. In sub-chapter 3.2, I explain what both women groups expected from the GCMF projects to happen, in other words their initial wellbeing outcomes. In sub-chapter 3.3, I discuss what challenges women experienced in these projects in the period after the projects were realised until the year 2022. And lastly, in sub-chapter 3.4, I will explain the so-called 'end state' of the women including their resilience capacities, actual responses to challenges and vulnerability level in 2022 compared to twenty years ago. I will also discuss if the women's initial wellbeing outcomes are achieved. In short, I will give an answer to the question: have women regained stability after challenges, adapted to uncertainty or transformed their lives in a positive way?

5.1 Context and initial state

In this sub-chapter, I will discuss the context and initial state of the two women groups Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe before the women joined their women group, including their initial resilience capacities and vulnerability level, as part of making a resilience analysis. This sub-chapter is structured by discussing in each paragraph one structural issue that the women experienced in the last twenty years in their lives, and aim to become resilient to; including poverty, food insecurity, agricultural issues, climate change and health issues.

Poverty

Women who joined Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe live in small, rural towns in the Copperbelt province, the centre of Zambia. Both women groups have experienced poverty in their daily lives

throughout the last twenty years. This is the biggest challenge the Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women faced in the past twenty years. Poverty is estimated at 67 percent in Zambia, meaning the proportion of the Zambian population living below the poverty line, with in rural areas more residents living in poverty compared to urban areas (Hamazakaza, 2009). Zambia's economy relies heavily on copper mining; accounting for over 70% of its exports. However within the mining sector there are limited employment opportunities. Only less than 2% of Zambia's labour force works in the mining industry. Unemployment, no industrial growth, and low agricultural productivity in Zambia results in high levels of poverty. Besides that, Zambia experiences an increasing gap in income, making the difference between the rich and the poor only bigger (Bulawayo et al., 2019). The growing gap between the rich and poor is also visible in poor infrastructure, limited livelihood opportunities, food insecurity, limited access to health facilities, and the lack of government welfare support (Bond et al., 2008).

Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women experienced poverty through unemployment or earning little capital (2, 5, 6, 7 TB, 9 NT interview). Before the women joined their women groups, most of them were unemployed (Ms. Musukuma, interview). The women who did earn an income, participated in small-scale farming, moulding bricks or clashing stones (7 NT, interview). Nchembwe Twesheko members came from different backgrounds. A small number of members had a professional career as teacher or as business lady (2, 4 NT, interview) while other women were earning small-incomes or were unemployed. The unemployed women were more vulnerable than the employed women, however the difference in vulnerability is relatively small, as the employed women are still exposed to a variety of challenges in their daily lives. Most Tubombeshe members were unemployed as well before they joined Tubombeshe. Although some women were already part of clubs before Tubombeshe was established in which they generated a small income together. Both women groups dealt with a variety of issues resulting from poverty. They struggled to sustain their families and themselves as they could not afford nutritious food, a proper place to sleep, or pay for their children's school fees. Women also struggled with aging related issues. Besides that, they had no financial security as they spent money without making a budget or saving any. They could therefore not afford to pay for unexpected expenditures such as hospital bills. (7 NT, 2 TB, interview). Moreover, they worried about their (grand)children having no chance of education or employment. Most children with no future opportunities got involved in drinking, smoking and prostitution (9 NT, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8 TB, interview).

Before the women joined their women group, they didn't have many skills or opportunities to learn skills in order to start their own income generating activity. They also felt like their chances to share information and skills with others was limited (1, 3, 4, 6 NT, interview). This resulted in a low level of resilience capacities. Most women didn't know how to do business, how to sew using a sewing machine, how to cook, bake, farm, keep chickens, or how to speak and write English (7, 9 NT, 1, 5 TB interview). Before joining the women group, Nchembwe Twesheko women did things individually which made it difficult for them to learn new skills (1, 7, 9 NT, interview). As one Nchembwe Twesheko members explains:

Translator: "She's saying before I joined Nchembwe yes, I was just doing things on my own. [...]."

I couldn't know how to sew everything at the sewing machine. I didn't know how to bake. I didn't know how to cook, how to prepare dish. [...] Yes she is saying she learned skills through Nchembwe women's group." (9 NT, interview)

For Tubombeshe, the situation was a bit different. Some Tubombeshe women were already part of clubs before Tubombeshe was established, which enabled them to share skills with each other such as keeping poultry. However their knowledge on certain skills was limited. For example, they struggled with keeping their chickens healthy as they had little knowledge about poultry keeping (5 TB, interview). This also resulted into a low level of resilience capacities for Tubombeshe members. Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe women who did earn an income, tried to cope with poverty by using their absorptive capacities, meaning they continued their work and way of living. They didn't feel there were many alternative opportunities to overcome poverty. This resulted in the women's high level of vulnerability.

Food insecurity

Besides poverty, both women groups faced the difficulty of food insecurity in their lives. Sub-Saharan Africa has one of the highest levels of undernourishment (35% and above) compared to most regions in the world. Zambia is compared to other Sub-Saharan African countries dealing with one of the highest percentage of undernourishment; approximately 44% of the Zambian population experiences food deprivation. The number of undernourished citizens has only increased from 3 million in the mid-1990s to 6 million around 2011 (H. Nyanga, 2012). Food insecurity is defined as a state in which people do not have proper physical, social or economic access to adequate nutritious food for all household members at all times (Bulawayo et al., 2019). An important indicator of food insecurity is a household's daily meal frequency. In 2015, 45% of all Zambian households was unable to obtain three meals a day. Zambian households struggle to meet the required food quantity and quality standards as their diet often lacks diversity and is nutritionally unbalanced. Food insecurity mostly results from poverty. Poor households struggle to obtain sufficient, safe and nutritious food. Moreover, research found that rural households experience higher levels of food insecurity compared to urban households (Bulawayo et al., 2019). In rural Zambia, most households struggle to supply their families with food during the rainy season, as crops are being cultivated at the time, while during the dry season the majority of households are likely to be food secure (Cole & Tembo, 2011). Research found that female-headed households experience higher levels of food insecurity compared to male-headed households (Bulawayo et al., 2019).

Food insecurity has led to Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe women struggling to feed their families and to provide them with nutritious meals. Especially households who also take care of orphans experienced food insecurity (4 NT, 2 TB, interview). Women found themselves in a vulnerable position, trying to respond to food insecurity by using their absorptive capacities, meaning they tried to cope with the impact of food insecurity by using the little resources they had.

Agricultural issues

The majority of Zambians (80%) live in rural areas and depend on agriculture for their livelihood. Even though Zambia has one of the most fertile soils in the world, many times scholars argue that Zambia experiences low agricultural productivity (Bulawayo et al., 2019). Farmers cultivate crops that are very vulnerable to floods and droughts and they depend on rainfall and hoe cultivation for their harvest to

succeed. Farmers also strongly depend on cultivating maize, which makes them very vulnerable to climate shocks. Besides that, most of Zambia's subsistence farmers are women (65%) (Bulawayo et al., 2019). They experience higher levels of discontent, stress and pressure as increasing household food insecurity and rising food prices make it more difficult to provide their families with quantitative and qualitative good meals. Furthermore, the Zambian government significantly decreased their involvement in, and budget for, agriculture which negatively affected vulnerable, smallholder farmers as they depend on public services from the government (Arend, 2011).

Both women groups struggled with being dependent on farming as their main source of income and food, as it made them vulnerable to shocks (9 NT, 6, 8 TB, interview). Before Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe members became members of their women group, they farmed without making a program and the variety of crops they grew was limited (9 NT, 6 TB, interview). The majority of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women were subsistence farmers (6, 8 TB, interview), struggling to earn an income with farming. Besides that, the women depended on receiving farm inputs from the government, as they could not afford to pay for fertilizer themselves. However, the government did often not provide farmers with enough farm inputs. Besides that, before GCMF involvement, most women didn't know about organic farming, especially not about how to make fertilizer yourself (NT 2, interview). As a result of farmers having little resilience capacities to respond to farm input shortages, most of them used no fertilizer in their fields. This led to a lower food production, farmers struggling to provide their families with food throughout the whole year and farmers living in poverty (2, focus group discussion; Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, 1, 3, 4, 6 NT, 1, 7, 8 TB interview).

Climate change issues

Both women groups also dealt with climate change which has a negative effect on their lives. Southern Africa, including Zambia, is compared to other regions in the world one of the most affected regions by global climate change. The increase in temperature is twice as high compared to the average global rate of temperature increase and the region experiences a growth in extreme weather events such as floods and droughts, heavy rainfalls and heat waves. The intensity of these events are reinforced by the low levels of adaptive capacity, the lack of income diversity and poverty in general. Zambia is particularly vulnerable to floods and droughts, decreased rainfall and a shorter and a more difficult to predict rainfall season. This threatens the local livelihood of Zambians, which is mainly farming. Zambia also faces indirect climate change risks such as inaccessible roads due to heavy floodings, which makes it more difficult for Zambians to access markets or health and educational facilities. Besides that, flooding destroys houses, crops, livestock and other household properties which impacts the health of the Zambian population and their access to social services. Moreover, droughts destroys crops as well and temperature increase will reduce the grain yield of maize. Lastly, flooding results in less feed for livestock and less grazing land available (Verschuuren, 2012).

Before GCMF got involved in the women groups, the women had little options to respond to climate change. Instead they just tried to cope with the impacts of climate change. This resulted into a high vulnerability level for women.

Health issues

Lastly, both women groups experienced challenges related to their health. HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria are the most common diseases in Zambia and therefore the more threatening ones (Verschuuren, 2012). Zambia experienced a HIV/AIDS epidemic around the year 2000 (Nakazwe et al., 2019; Hamazakaza, 2009). Besides orphaned children, women in Zambia are particularly vulnerable to the effects of the HIV/AIDS pandemic. Research shows there are more women than men are affected with HIV in Zambia (Glynn et al., 2001; Butts et al., 2017). Tuberculosis was declared a global emergency in 1993. The increase in tuberculosis in Zambia between 1990 and 2000 occurred at the same time there was an increase in HIV/AIDS. Malaria has been present in Zambia for over many decades. Pregnant women and children are particularly vulnerable to getting infected with malaria. The infection of HIV increases the chance of getting infected with tuberculosis or malaria (Kapata et al., 2011; Chaponda et al., 2015). When a household member suffers from a disease, oftentimes the women take care of these ill family members (E. Robson et al., 2006). For women, taking care of sick family members often means compromises in their health, well-being and their ability to generate an income for their families. Besides, they risk losing their property if their husband dies (Ndjakani et al., 2016). Even though the Zambian government provides its population with free treatment for both HIV and tuberculosis, households experience disease in relation to social and economic inequalities. Poor households are mostly affected by a disease when a family member get ill and is unable to earn an income for some months (Bond et al., 2008).

Both women groups worried about health challenges in their lives such as being infected with HIV/AIDS (3 NT, 2, 7 TB, interview). The women have been extra vulnerable related to health issues because of their gender and poor living conditions.

In short, before Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women joined their women group most women were very vulnerable. They were busy coping with the impact of structural issues that occurred in their lives such as poverty, food insecurity, agricultural issues, climate change and health related challenges. Following Béné et al. (2015) and Agrawal's (2018) their arguments, the women only used absorptive capacities to respond to these challenges, not being able to give pro-active, adjusted responses that create structural change. Both women groups had limited options to learn or improve skills, which left their resilience capacities to increase very little or remain in their original state.

5.2 Initial wellbeing outcomes and expectations

In this sub-chapter, I will explain the women groups' initial wellbeing outcomes and expectations of the GCMF interventions at the beginning of GCMFs involvement in the women groups, as part of making a resilience analysis. Elaborating on the wellbeing outcomes of the Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women desired at the beginning of the GCMF projects, it is important to note that the desired outcomes of the GCMF projects and that of joining a women group are often blended in as one. Therefore I will treat the desired outcomes of the GCMF projects and that of joining a women group as one, unless explicitly stated otherwise.

The women groups wanted the GCMF projects to support their association's goals and visions. Therefore, it is important to know what these goals and visions of both women groups are. When GCMF became involved, Nchembwe Twesheko had the following goals for their association; they wanted to increase women's knowledge on gender, sexuality and HIV/AIDS, increase their skills through

participation in national development programmes, and they wanted to provide women with education in self-sustaining and income generating activities such as farming, poultry keeping, sewing and cooking. They also aimed to promote cultural social activities (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). Besides, the association aimed to improve the lives of vulnerable people in their community, especially that of orphans (7 NT, interview). When GCMF became involved in Tubombeshe, one of Tubombeshe's goals was to teach their members livelihood skills in order to overcome poverty and to make women self-reliant. Tubombeshe aimed to contribute to self-employment and they wanted to improve the living standards of OVCs, aged, widows, disabled, people with HIV/AIDS, women and men in the local community.

Nchembwe Twesheko expected from their women group and GCMF projects to build a social network; they wanted to make friends, to take care of each other and to be in each other's company instead of doing things alone (1, 4 NT, interview). Tubombeshe members expected from their women group and GCMF projects to provide income generating activities for each member and to be able to sustain themselves (3 TB, interview; 2, focus group discussion). Tubombeshe also expected to achieve more together in a group, for example when helping the community (3, 4 TB, interview). But most important, both women groups expected to learn new skills (1, 4 NT, interview), such as (organic) farming, brick moulding, keeping poultry, reading and speaking English, tailoring, and carpentry (4, 5, 8, TB, interview; Lason, 2009).

From this research it appears that Nchembwe Twesheko had no further expectations of their women group and the GCMF projects. However, Tubombeshe members did have specific expectations of certain GCMF projects. First of all, Tubombeshe expected from the GCMF poultry keeping project that GCMF was going to teach Tubombeshe how to keep chickens (1 TB, interview; 2, focus group discussion). They also expected that GCMF would help them raise their numbers of chickens and provide chickens to their clubs and they hoped to receive profits from the chickens poultry and to receive a start-up capital or chickens from GCMF when GCMF left (1, 2, 3, 7 TB, interview). With the farming project, the women expected to have a large number of chickens, and with the chicken manure, they wanted to make their own fertilizer and cultivate big fields. With the sewing projects, Tubombeshe members expected that each sewing student would receive her own sewing machine and materials so that each student could start their own business (5 TB, interview).

To summarize, the desired wellbeing outcomes of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women of the GCMF projects were that the GCMF projects support the associations' goals, to build a social network, enable income generation activities, make women able to sustain themselves, achieve goals in group settings, learn skills, and to help the associations grow in their activities. In chapter 5.4 I will discuss if the desired wellbeing outcomes have been achieved.

5.3 Challenges

In this sub-chapter I will explain the challenges that both women groups are exposed and hoped to become resilient to in the period after the GCMF interventions were realised until the year 2022, when this research took place. The challenges that the women have been exposed to can be divided into two categories: issues related to their relationship with GCMF and other (structural) issues. In sub-chapter 5.1 I already discussed structural issues that women experienced in their lives over the last twenty years; poverty, food insecurity, agricultural issues, climate change and health issues. In the

'Sustainability' chapter, I discussed challenges that the women groups experienced related to their relationship with GCMF: power disbalance, exclusion, miscommunication, complex group dynamics and the 'culture of visiting', which had a negative impact on the sustainability of the GCMF interventions. In this chapter, these issues are identified as challenges related to their relationship with GCMF that the women aim to become resilient to. I will now discuss the remaining challenges not yet discussed, including: lack of capital, not skilled enough, problems with community and no demand for activity.

Lack of capital

Besides the already mentioned challenges, one of the biggest challenge both women groups faced during the GCMF projects is having the lack of capital. Both women groups struggled to continue their activities properly, or even at all, due to scarce financial resources (9 NT, 2, 8 TB, interview). Nchembwe Twesheko did not continue any GCMF project or any other club activity, except for using the bore hole, receiving rent for the community hall and having club meetings (NT 5, interview). The group struggled to pay for their sewing lessons as the sewing tutor increased the fees after some time (Ms. Musukuma, interview). The women also didn't have enough money to buy fabrics, tables and chairs for sewing or to pay for the repair of broken sewing machines. Besides that, they were not able to buy electricity for the community hall due to a lack of capital (2, 5, 9 NT, Ms. Musukuma, Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

Tubombeshe did continue most of their activities, but on a small-scale due to limited financial capital (2, 4 TB, interview). After GCMF handed over the poultry house to Tubombeshe, the association struggled to keep poultry due to a lack of capital. They could not afford to buy medicines for sick chickens and they also could not afford to buy new chickens (3, focus group discussion). As a result of that, the poultry house at Tubombeshe is not being used today. One Tubombeshe members confirms that the poultry house is empty due to scarcity of money by saying;

"We learned how to keep the chickens but we have not continued due to lack of capital." (8 TB, interview)

The organic farming project continued on a small-scale. Most Tubombeshe women still farm organically today because it is possible to perform this skill without having much capital. However, some women struggle to expand the size of their fields as they are not able to make enough fertilizer on their own. In order for women to make their own fertilizer, they need to keep a large number of chickens which produce chicken manure. The women use the chicken manure to make their own compost manure. However, most women cannot afford to keep large number of chickens. Therefore they can only use a small quantity of chicken manure to make their own fertilizer. As a result, the women continue farming on a small-scale.

Tubombeshe women also struggle to pay for new farming materials when old ones become damaged. GCMF once donated wheelbarrows and knapsacks to Tubombeshe for organic farming, but after they got damaged Tubombeshe was not able to replace these items themselves. Now Tubombeshe members perform organic farming with fewer equipment which is a struggle for them (1, focus group discussion).

The sewing activity of Tubombeshe also continued on a small-scale because the association cannot afford to buy enough sewing machines for each sewing student. Therefore the association lacks the capital to grow (8 TB, interview). Both women groups still depend on donors today to be able to fully continue or expand their projects. They are actively looking for donors, however their proposals get rejected every time so far (3 NT, interview). To conclude, the lack of capital made it difficult for both women groups to continue their GCMF projects and other club activities properly or even at all.

Not skilled enough

Another challenge the women of Nchembwe Twesheko endured was that they were not skilled enough to continue the GCMF sewing project. As I explained in the previous paragraph, the women group lacked the capital to continue their sewing activities. However, 'not being skilled enough' has been another relevant challenge related to the sewing activity. The women wanted to teach each other sewing. However, after the women received the sewing machines from GCMF, they found out that no one was skilled enough to do so. The women then decided to hire a sewing tutor (3 NT, interview) who as I explained before, became too expensive to pay for after two months (Ms Musukuma, interview). Based on these two months of knowledge the women used the sewing machines for some time to make uniforms for private schools. After the women sent the private schools three uniforms, the schools ended their collaboration with Nchembwe Twesheko as they were not satisfied with the quality of the uniforms. Nchembwe Twesheko women not being able to sew properly, contributed to the end of their sewing activity (1, 4 NT, interview).

Problems with the community

Nchembwe Twesheko has also experienced difficulties with their surrounding community related to the GCMF projects. The gardening activity of the women has been disturbed as the community stole the women's food crops from the garden. The garden therefore did not bring any profit which resulted in the end of the gardening activity (3 NT, interview). Besides that, the women disagree with the way their community uses the bore hole that was donated by GCMF. They claim that the community misuses the bore hole by washing their clothing close to bore hole, which they consider to be unhygienic (NT, participant observation 3). Next to that, the women lost their communal farming field after their landlord decided to sell the land to someone else (2 NT, interview).

Not enough demand

Another difficulty the Nchembwe Twesheko women experienced was the challenge of not having enough demand for their income generating activity. Nchembwe Twesheko did catering for some time; they were booked as caterers at events and they rented their community hall for events while providing catering at the same time (1 NT, interview). They also baked and sold food products together which generated an income (4 NT, interview). Nchembwe Twesheko has not continued their catering activities as there is not a high demand for hiring caterers in Mpongwe. In Mpongwe these kind of catering events are not regularly organised, explaining why the women were not able to sustain themselves with catering (2, 4 NT, interview).

Next to the above mentioned challenges, the women groups experienced more difficulties related to the GCMF projects which do not fit the categories of the above paragraphs. For example, the kitchen equipment of Nchembwe Twesheko went missing. The women stored the kitchen equipment at the

GCMF guest house, but after the GCMF guest house was handed over to the government the women lost their kitchen equipment which also made it difficult to continue the catering activities (4, 8 NT, interview). Another challenge, related to organic farming, is that the communal field of Nchembwe Twesheko turned out to be over-used and not suited to grow certain crops on (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview).

In general, both women groups have been exposed to structural issues related to the GCMF projects which they aim to be resilient to. This includes the issues I discussed in the previous chapter: power disbalance, exclusion, miscommunication, complex group dynamics and 'culture of visiting'. And the challenges I explained in this chapter: lack of capital, not skilled enough, problems with community and no demand for activity. In this sub-chapter the majority of challenges was related to Nchembwe Twesheko. This is logical considering that Tubombeshe succeeded in continuing most GCMF projects, while Nchembwe Twesheko did not.

5.4 End-state

In the first sub-chapter I discussed the initial state of the women groups. Now I will elaborate on the 'end-state' of the women groups, meaning their level of resilience in the year 2022 compared to their level of resilience twenty years ago. I will discuss the change in resilience capacities, responses to challenges and the vulnerability level over the last twenty years. Next to that, I will discuss if the initial wellbeing outcomes are achieved, to indicate if the GCMF interventions have been successful. This sub-chapter is structured by discussing in each paragraph the achievement of a different initial wellbeing outcome.

5.4.1 Goals achieved?

In order to measure if GCMF increased the resilience of women, it is important to know if the women's initial wellbeing outcomes of the GCMF projects are achieved. Both women groups wanted the GCMF projects to support their association's goals and visions. One of Nchembwe Twesheko's goals was to increase women's knowledge on gender, sexuality and HIV/AIDS. GCMF supported the women in that by providing the women a community hall, in which the women could discuss sensitive issues with each other in a safe place. GCMF therefore indirectly increased the women's resilience capacities towards health issues. Nchembwe Twesheko also wanted to increase the women's skills by educating them in self-sustaining, income generating activities. GCMF made a big contribution to this goal, by providing the women with skills training and equipment which increased the women's resilience capacities towards poverty, food insecurity, and agricultural issues. The women also aimed to promote cultural social activities (Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). However, this research did not gather any information about GCMFs contribution to this goal. Besides that Nchembwe Twesheko aimed to improve the lives of vulnerable people in their community, especially that of orphans (7 NT, interview). GCMF supported the women indirectly in this goal, by giving the women skills that help increase food security and employment etc. This resulted in less food insecurity, poverty and a better social network for the community.

GCMF also supported Tubombeshe's goals which was to teach members livelihood skills and improve the living standards of vulnerable people in the community. GCMF provided Tubombeshe with many skills trainings and equipment which increased the women's resilience capacities towards poverty, food

insecurity and agricultural issues. GCMF also indirectly supported Tubombeshe in helping vulnerable people by teaching vulnerable members skills which increased employment opportunities. It made people less vulnerable to structural issues such as poverty.

In short, GCMF made a valuable contribution in supporting Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe's goals and visions. They contributed to increasing the resilience capacities of women towards poverty, food insecurity, agricultural issues, and health issues. Besides the above mentioned goals and visions, both women groups had more initial wellbeing outcomes they wanted their women groups and GCMF to achieve. I will discuss these in the next paragraphs.

5.4.2 Social network

GCMF contributed to achieving one of Nchembwe Twesheko's initial wellbeing outcomes, namely to build a social network. The establishment of Nchembwe Twesheko created a social network for its members. The women indicate that they changed their behaviour after joining this association. They first did things individually, now they do things communally and spend more time together (1 NT, interview). The women's club also provided a space for the women in which they could discuss personal challenges in their daily lives such as marriage-, family-, financial- and health issues (3 NT, interview). The women group helps each other when needed and visit each other when one is not feeling well (4 NT, interview). Besides that, after joining Nchembwe Twesheko, members felt more united with their families and neighbours (9 NT, interview). Nchembwe Twesheko women reached their expectations of becoming a group that takes care of each other and spends more time together instead of alone. GCMF taught Nchembwe Twesheko women how they could unite themselves and do more for their community (4, 8 NT, interview). One member describes how she was inspired by the founder of GKMT and GCMF to help her community:

“These people like Ton, Ton was embracing all this program, the commitment, the feel for other people. It overwhelmed me. You see, if this one can have time for other people, why can't I have time for other people. If this one can devote so much energy to ensuring that other people get a smile on their face, why can't I as well. ... So such commitment overwhelmed me.” (4 NT, interview)

For Tubombeshe member the situation was different. Most women were already part of a social network, their club, before Tubombeshe was established. The establishment of Tubombeshe enabled clubs in the community to unite and work together on a bigger scale. GCMF played an important role in supporting the continuation of these social networks, as they constructed community halls which function as meeting places for both women groups. Compared to 20 years ago when Nchembwe Twesheko members had no social network and Tubombeshe had a smaller social network, women can now face challenges within a community of women. This means that Nchembwe Twesheko's initial wellbeing outcome, which is to build a social network, is achieved. The ability of women to make use of a social network enhances the women's adaptive response to challenges and increases their level of resilience.

5.4.3 New skills and income generating activities

One of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe's initial wellbeing outcomes of the GCMF projects was that the women expected to learn new skills. This outcome was certainly achieved and has had one of the biggest positive impacts on the lives of women. Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe members learned new skills as a result of participating in their association's activities. Nchembwe Twesheko

women were taught a variety of skills; cooking, baking, (organic) farming, gardening, self-hygiene, home management, sewing, knitting, business, working, teaching, communicating, becoming independent, HIV/AIDS information, entrepreneurship, and counselling people (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 NT, interview). GCMF contributed to realising many of these activities (1, 3 NT, interview). For example, the women were able to cook with donated cooking utensils from GCMF. GCMF also provided entrepreneurial trainings which helped women to start their own business. One member explains the contribution of GCMF to her women group as follows:

“So now they [Nchembwe Twesheko members] are enlightened. They didn’t know anything. So Ton [GCMF founder] came and opened their eyes.” (6 NT, interview)

Tubombeshe members also learned a lot of skills by joining their association; keeping chickens and pigs, (organic) farming, brick moulding, clashing stones, family planning including information about HIV/AIDS, sewing with a machine, knitting, carpentry, and brick laying (Mr. Lason, Mr. Kalima, interview). GCMF also played a big role in realising the opportunities for women to learn these skills. For example, GCMF provided Tubombeshe with a vocational training centre, a poultry house and sewing machines. They also taught Tubombeshe members how to keep poultry (9 TB, interview). Tubombeshe members are grateful for the skills they learned from GCMF, as one member states:

“The good thing of GCMF is we are left with skills.” (5 TB, interview)

Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women used their new skills in order to start or expand their own income generating activity. Even though the GCMF interventions in Nchembwe Twesheko have not continued, the women feel like the knowledge they gained from their women’s association and GCMF empowered them and changed their lives (1, 3 NT, interview), as one member states:

“The time I joined Nchembwe, really everything has changed. It changed my life.” (9 NT, interview)

As a club, the women might not have achieved much, but the women still use the skills they learned from GCMF in their personal lives. Before GCMFs involvement, Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women mostly earned an income with farming, moulding bricks and clashing stones. Now the women have a bigger variety of skills which has resulted in an increase in employment opportunities, an increase in income diversification and a higher income level. The increase in employment decreased poverty and food insecurity (3 TB, interview). One Nchembwe Twesheko member sets an example of how GCMF enabled women to learn new skills which increased women’s possibilities in job opportunities, by saying:

“For the past few years if I have gotten an idea to sew or to plough something or to bake or to do business, it’s through GCMF. Very helpful. And it has helped me so much. At this time I have a farm through GCMF. Yes, I have a farm and I’m a business lady through GCMF.” (2 NT, interview)

The new skills that the women learned helped them to find a job or create employment for themselves without having an official diploma (1, 9 TB interview; Mr. Lason, personal communication 2). The training in entrepreneurship enabled Nchembwe Twesheko women to open up their own stores, the poultry house at Tubombeshe enabled clubs to generate an income from poultry keeping, and the

organic farming training enabled both women groups to farm on a bigger scale and in a more profitable way. (3, 9 NT, 2 TB interview). Women's harvest increased, which makes women less vulnerable to food insecurity (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). The increase in crop production also enabled women to shift from being a subsistence farmer to being a commercial farmer, resulting in a higher income (2, 5, 6 NT, interview). This makes women less vulnerable to poverty. The organic farming training also taught women who only farmed on a communal farm how to farm on their own, instead of in a group, which made women more self-reliant (3 TB, interview). They also learned how to grow a bigger variety of crops which decreased their risk of harvest failure and food insecurity. Besides that, before women farmed organically they depended on receiving fertilizer from the government, as fertilizer was too expensive to buy on their own (1, 4 TB, interview; 3, focus group discussion). Organic farming made women more resilient, because it enabled them to make their own fertilizer and to not rely on farm resources from the government (6 TB, interview). Compared to twenty years ago, women now approach agricultural challenges with adaptive capacities instead of absorptive capacities. They innovated their agricultural practices, and as a result of that they are now more resilient to challenges such as poverty, food insecurity and agricultural difficulties.

Before women joined their women groups, most of them had little options to respond to poverty. The majority of women was formally unemployed and some earned a small income via the few skills they had. When women became members of their women groups, they found new ways of generating an income based on knowledge they gained from their women groups and GCMF. This is a pro-active, adapted response to poverty which enhances their adaptive capacities and increases their level of resilience. However, women are not always able use their resilience capacities to their best potential. One of Tubombeshe's initial wellbeing outcomes is that Tubombeshe and GCMF enable income generating activities for each member. This outcome has not been fully achieved as women are not always able to use their resilience capacities and perform their income generating activity (3 TB, interview). One of the factors that makes it difficult for women to use their new learned skills, is that not every GCMF intervention continued after GCMF due to a lack of capital. A Tubombeshe member confirms this struggle by saying:

"They [Tubombeshe members] have the knowledge, but they don't have the resources." (3 TB, interview)

Take as example the poultry house of Tubombeshe. Tubombeshe expected that GCMF would help raise Tubombeshe's number of chickens and the association would receive profits from poultry keeping. However, Tubombeshe members cannot use their poultry keeping skills or make any profit at their association, as Tubombeshe does not keep chickens on location anymore. One Tubombeshe member explains the struggle as follows:

"We learned how to keep the chickens but we have not continued due to lack of capital." (8 TB, interview)

Tubombeshe members feel like the poultry house is still on the same level as 22 years ago (3 TB, interview). However, the women do benefit from the knowledge they gained from GCMF about poultry keeping. While there are no chickens at Tubombeshe, members keep chickens on a small-scale in their community as an individual or with their club (4 TB, interview). Tubombeshe's wellbeing outcome of

learning from GCMF how to keep chickens has been achieved. They learned what food to give the chickens and what medicines to use when the chicken have diseases (3 TB, interview). When GCMF introduced poultry keeping to the women, not many people in their community had this skill. Therefore there was not a lot of competition in the area which made poultry keeping a very profitable activity and a valuable skill for the women. However, the women only perform poultry keeping on a small-scale, due to a lack of capital, and therefore cannot use their skill as adaptive response to poverty to their best potential.

Another GCMF project that Tubombeshe members cannot perform or only perform on a small-scale, is sewing with a sewing machine. In order for women to perform their sewing skill at home, they need a start-up capital to buy a sewing machine for themselves. This is financially not possible for most women (9 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). Tubombeshe members expected from their association and GCMF that each sewing student would receive her own sewing machine and materials so that she could start her own business (5 TB, interview). However, that didn't happen. Women can only sew at Tubombeshe using the machines available on location. Although there are not enough machines for everyone, as explained by a Tubombeshe member:

"We have three machines in here. So most of the time when there are a lot of people coming, we sometimes we have 10, 20 using three machines. So if you come maybe you won't even do anything. You just be seated, waiting for the person who's doing the sewing." (8 TB, interview)

Some women who do not have a sewing machine at home do not make use of this skill at all (1, 6, 8 TB, interview). Instead a group of women continued knitting or sewing with needles, because it is a cheap skill to perform (9 TB, interview). Even though not every women who learned sewing with sewing machine can use such a machine, the sewing skill did result in women being able to make their own clothes or sell their products (2, focus group discussion). As far as the sewing skill concerns, not every Tubombeshe sewing student enhanced her resilience capacity. Some still use the same sewing technique as before they became Tubombeshe members. Other members cannot use their sewing skill to their full potential.

GCMFs organic farming project with Tubombeshe is another example of women who can only use their new resilience capacities on a small-scale. Tubombeshe women expected to have large numbers of chickens, which produce enough chicken manure to make fertilizer for large fields. However, most women can only farm organically on a small-scale, as they cannot afford to buy enough chickens that produce an amount of fertilizer big enough to farm large-scale (4, 7 TB, interview). Therefore Tubombeshe women do not cultivate big fields, which was one of their initial wellbeing outcome, but only little fields (5 TB, interview). Still, through organic farming women farm on a bigger scale and generate more profit.

A last example of a skill that Tubombeshe members can only perform on a small-scale is carpentry. There are little carpentry tools available on location for students to use. Besides that, students who completed their carpentry training are failing to start a carpentry business on their own because they cannot afford to buy their own carpentry tools (6 TB, interview). The lack of capital is again the reason for women to not make full use of their skills.

Even though women oftentimes cannot fully exploit their skills due to lack of capital and resources, these skills nonetheless still changed the lives of women as it opened up possibilities to earn an income. Before Tubombeshe women learned how to sew, they had to visit tailors from other towns to make clothes for them. Now, the women can provide clothes for themselves and sew as an income generating activity on a small-scale (2, 6, 8 TB, interview). Before Tubombeshe women learned skills such as carpentry and bricklaying, people from other cities came to Ibenga to build and repair their houses. Now the women do it themselves as an income generating activity (7 TB, interview).

Besides having learned new skills, there is another factor which also helped women to find employment; GCMF certificates. When a student completed a GCMF skills training, GCMF handed out certificates as prove that the student can perform a certain skill. Women are able to show these certificates when applying for a job. The certificates helps women who did not finish any education to get hired more easily (Mr Lason, personal communication 1; NT 7, interview).

One of GCMFs biggest achievements is that that women feel more empowered, even if in practice women still suffer many of the same difficulties. GCMF contributed to the increase in women's level of resilience as they enabled opportunities for new income generating activities and increased income diversification, which made women feel more self-reliant. Women in Mpongwe still face challenges such as poverty and food insecurity, however they do not feel limited to only giving absorptive responses to these difficulties anymore. GCMF supported women in giving pro-active, adjusted responses to structural issues in their lives which improved the lives of women.

To conclude, the initial wellbeing outcome of both women groups, which is to learn skills from their women group and GCMF, has been achieved. The skills trainings increased income diversification and the income level of women. However, women cannot perform every skill to their full potential or at all due to a lack of capital. That's why Tubombeshe's initial wellbeing outcome, each member having its own income generating activity, is not achieved. This shows again why according to Kinsbergen & Schulpen (2011) the 'financial independency' of a local partner is such an important pre-condition in order to achieve sustainable interventions. Still, GCMF and the women groups changed the way women respond to challenges in their lives, from using absorptive capacities to adaptive capacities. As a result, women are now more resilient to structural issues such as poverty, food insecurity and agricultural issues.

5.4.4 Sustaining families and themselves

Both women groups share the same initial wellbeing outcome of their women groups and GCMF projects; they expected to become better able to sustain themselves (3 TB, interview; 2, focus group discussion; Nchembwe Twesheko, 2006). This outcome has been achieved as the women groups and support from GCMF resulted in an increase in employed women and an increase in income. This makes women feel more able to sustain their families and themselves (8, 9 NT, 8 TB, interview). Women argue that their lives have become more stable and easy compared to twenty years ago (9 NT, interview), as one women explains:

Translator: "She's saying yes my life has changed. It was difficult before I joined the group, but has that now my life is easy." (8 NT, interview)

An example of how women feel like their lives have become easier is that they can send their children to school with the extra money (2, focus group discussion; 9 NT, 1, 2 TB, interview). This is a future investment, which increases the chance of the women's children finding employment in the future. Actively trying to get out of the poverty cycle can be seen as an adaptive response to poverty.

Women who became organic farmers also feel better able to sustain their families. Before they farmed organically, they did not vary much in crops and relied on one harvest each year. Now they cultivate new sorts of crops and have multiple harvests each year which results in a higher food production and food security (6 TB, interview). Farmers also changed their behaviour from selling crops immediately after harvest, to storing some of the food. As a result they can sustain their families food throughout the whole year and sell what's left of it on the market (Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview). One woman who became a farmer after joining the women group explains the importance of having learned organic farming skills in her life:

Translator: "Even if she's old, she's able to stand and sell in the market and also help her family." (6 NT, interview)

Before this woman knew how to farm, she was unemployed and couldn't sustain herself and her family. Now, because of the organic farming training provided by GCMF, she earns an income and can take care of her family. As I explained before, the change in agricultural practices made women more resilient to poverty and food insecurity.

Joining a women group also enabled women to respond differently to health issues and to take better care of themselves and their family. Both women groups provide safe spaces for members to receive and discuss information on health risks such HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria (NT proposal) (Lason). GCMF contributed to these spaces, by realising community halls for both women groups. Tubombeshe also provides a free HIV testing on location (Mr. Lason, personal communication 1). Moreover, Nchembwe Twesheko helps their members financially when they cannot pay for hospital bills themselves (2 TB, interview). Twenty years ago, women used only absorptive capacities to respond to health challenges. Women often tried to cope with diseases by being the caretaker of the infected person. Now they are able to use adaptive capacities, which include being aware of the health related risks and actively trying to prevent to get infected. The women groups and GCMF helped women to become more resilient to health issues in the future.

GCMF also supported women in changing their financial behaviour which also made women better able to sustain themselves and their families. GCMF taught women how to save up capital, instead of always spending it immediately. Women learned how to save money on a personal savings account. Before GCMF, women did not have a savings account and didn't make a financial budget or for themselves. Now they make programs on how they are going to spend their money (2, 9 NT, interview). Twenty years ago women only responded to poverty with absorptive capacities; they spent all their money at once. Now women have actively changed their financial behaviour. Saving money makes them less vulnerable to challenges related to poverty in the future. One woman explains the impact GCMF made in her life as follows:

*“Now Ton [GCMF] has gone, but still I know I can work, I can stay well, my life has already changed.”
(8 NT, interview)*

And lastly, joining a women group also enabled women to better take care of their community. One of Tubombeshe’s initial wellbeing outcome is that they expected to achieve more together in a group, for example when helping the community. This outcome is achieved in both women groups as women indicate that after they joined their women group, they felt better able to take care of vulnerable people in their community (9 NT, 1, 2 TB, interview). Moreover, women spread the knowledge they learned from their women groups and GCMF to their community. They teach family and community members their knowledge on skills such as organic farming, knitting and sewing, passing on these skills from generation to generation (1, 2, 9 TB, interview; 1, focus group discussion). And besides that, communities of the women groups benefit from GCMF projects as women who keep poultry provide the community with eggs, and women who farm organically provide the community with more food (5 TB, interview). GCMF contributed to strengthening the women’s communities in resilience capacities.

It is important to keep in mind that resilience is a process, not only an outcome, meaning that the resilience of both women groups and their individual members is never a literal ‘end-state’. Resilience keeps evolving and can reach different levels over time. For example, around twenty years ago, most Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe women struggled to pay for their children’s primary and secondary school fees. Nowadays most women earn more money and are able to pay for their children’s school fees, so you can argue that this challenge has been solved and women can respond better to poverty. However, twenty years later, the women embarked on a new challenge, as they want their children to go to college and struggle to pay for college fees (6, 8 TB, interview). Now the women need new resilience capacities to overcome this challenge.

Also important to mention, is that besides the influence of the women groups and GCMF on the resilience of women, there might have been others external factors influencing the level of resilience of women, such as the government, NGOs, other women groups and personal relations.

In short, the initial wellbeing outcome of both women groups, which is being able to sustain themselves and their families, has been achieved. Tubombeshe’s initial wellbeing outcome is also achieved, that of expecting to achieve more in a group, especially when helping the community. As a result of becoming a member of the women groups and the support of GCMF, women changed from using absorptive capacities to respond to structural issues, to using adaptive capacities. Women feel better able to deal with structural issues in their lives, which according to Kinsbergen & Schulpen, 2011 increases the women’s level of resilience.

5.5. Conclusion resilience

To conclude, did GCMF increase Nchembwe Tweshoko and Tubombeshe women’s level of resilience? I aimed to capture the change in the women’s level of resilience, comparing their lives before they joined Nchembwe Tweshoko or Tubombeshe with their lives in the year 2022, approximately twenty years later. In order to indicate if the lives of women have been improved in relation to their challenges, I made a resilience analysis, using the following indicators: context and initial state, initial wellbeing outcomes, challenges, and end-state. I specifically looked at the change in resilience capacities, responses to challenges and vulnerability level over time. I also discussed if the women groups’ initial

wellbeing outcomes have been achieved in order to measure resilience. The initial state of women, around twenty years ago, consisted of a high level of vulnerability. They used absorptive capacities in order to respond to (structural) issues and experienced a low level of resilience capacities. Both women groups experienced a variety of challenges during the past twenty years, some related to the GCMF projects and/or related to structural issues. GCMF project related challenges include: power disbalance, exclusion, miscommunication, complex group dynamics, 'culture of visiting', lack of capital, not skilled enough, problems with community and no demand for activity. The structural issues include: poverty, food insecurity, agriculture, climate change and health issues.

After twenty years, most initial wellbeing outcomes of both women groups have been achieved; women built social networks and they learned a variety of skills which enabled them to find income generating activities and become independent. However, due to a lack of capital, women sometimes cannot use their skills to their full potential. As a result of that, many of their income generating activities are performed on a small-scale. Besides that, women now feel better able to sustain their families, their communities and themselves. Moreover, women have more resilience capacities as a result of their women groups and the contribution of GCMF. This enabled them to respond differently to structural issues. They are now better able to deal with structural issues such as poverty, food insecurity, agricultural, climate change and health issues. Women shifted from using absorptive capacities to adaptive capacities which increased their level of resilience. GCMFs biggest achievement is that even though women still experience difficulties in their lives, women feel more self-reliant.

Chapter 6: Discussion and conclusion

The international development cooperation has become more complex over the last decade with the development of new tools, goals and actors. Moreover, over the last thirty years the development sector has dealt with increasing professionalisation and institutionalisation, which has led to the privatisation of aid (Schulpen, 2007). However, little attention is paid to Private Development Initiatives (PDIs). Many citizens of the Global North have set up their own development initiative as a response to development challenges they faced during their journeys in developing countries. It is assumed that PDIs are seen as an ideal aid channel because of their close connection with their target groups and because of their unique services. Research into PDIs is still limited, however critics who did research about PDIs, doubt the idea that PDIs have an actual contribution to poverty reduction. Their biggest point of critique is that PDIs try to tackle the symptoms of poverty instead of the root causes. They claim that the focus of PDIs on service delivery limits their attention for transformative programs which enable structural change. Besides that, evaluations of PDIs are often only focused on the output of their interventions, instead of the outcome or impact.

This thesis looked into a Dutch PDI called 'Geef de Kinderen van Mpongwe een Toekomst' (GKMT), as an attempt to contribute to the limited existing literature about private development initiatives. This thesis also contributed to gaining knowledge on what the impact of PDI interventions is on the lives of their target group, in this case study two women groups Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. And lastly, this thesis considered to what extent the claims made about PDIs are true. In this chapter I will give an answer to my main research question:

To what extent have the GCMF interventions to support women groups in Mpongwe had a lasting and positive impact on the lives of women in the Mpongwe district?

I approached this question by analysing my case study through a 'sustainability' and a 'resilience' lens. This resulted in the following two sub-questions, which I will also give an answer to in this chapter:

1. To what extent does GCMF integrate sustainability in their interventions?
2. To what extent do the interventions of GCMF contribute to an increase in resilience for women?

Sustainability PDI interventions

In chapter 4 I discussed the sustainability of the GCMF's interventions, following Kinsbergen et al.'s (2017) concept of 'sustainability'. I found that, according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017), the PDI's interventions can be considered partly sustainable. GCMF's type of projects were first- and second-generation activities, meaning GCMF mostly focused on hardware investments to provide the women group with basic service deliveries, but also to enhance the women's capacities and to make them more independent. The third- and fourth-generation strategies which typically focus on making larger institutional and policy changes, cannot be applied to these GCMF interventions. Even though, according to Korten (1990), the first-generation strategy is known for tackling the symptoms of poverty, and not the root causes of poverty, this thesis shows that first-generation strategies can tackle the root causes of poverty on a regular basis as well. All discussed first-generation interventions of GCMF are designed to tackle the root causes of poverty as they enabled women to perform income generating activities. This increased the sustainability of the GCMF interventions.

Besides that, Kinsbergen et al. (2017) measures the sustainability of PDIs interventions by looking at the intervention manner of a PDI. During the design and implementation phase, the women groups felt in charge of making decisions, which according to Kinsbergen et al. (2017) contributes to the sustainability in the projects. However, during the monitoring phase, the women groups faced difficulties with GCMF which negatively impacted the sustainability of the GCMF interventions. They experienced power disbalance, exclusion and miscommunication in their collaboration with GCMF which resulted in women's limited decision-making power over the GCMF interventions. The active role that GCMF took in the monitoring phase, and the passive role that was left for their local partners, considerably decreased the level of sustainability for the GCMF projects. Besides that, the women would have liked GCMF to be more involved in the monitoring phase of the interventions. Even though Kinsbergen et al. (2017) claims that the higher the involvement of the local partner in the intervention, the better the sustainability of the interventions, the local partner did not agree on that. Both groups indicated that they would have liked more guidance from GCMF than that was offered, in order to make the interventions more effective.

According to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011), a PDIs intervention can also be considered sustainable if the local partner feels responsible and capable to continue the interventions on its own. According to this theory, the sustainability of GCMFs interventions is high, as the women groups established their own associations, initiated most interventions and felt like they were in charge of most interventions. However, during the monitoring phase, GCMF sometimes used their decision-making power during the monitoring phase of the projects, which decreased the interventions level of sustainability. Besides, both women groups have been financially very dependent on GCMF during the interventions and today they still rely on donors, which according to Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011) decreases the interventions' level of sustainability.

Based on the results of my research there are other relevant factors that influence the local ownership and capacity of the women groups, not mentioned by Kinsbergen and Schulpen (2011). I found that the dynamics of a target group strongly influence the local ownership and capacity of their group. While one women group continued all the GCMF interventions, another women group did not. This difference is based on the different group dynamics of the women groups. I found that a group being disorganised, experiencing mismanagement, and most important, lacks internal motivation contribute to the decrease in sustainability of a PDIs intervention. Besides that, I found that 'the culture of visiting', meaning long distance aid between the PDI and its local partner, also contribute to the decrease in the level of sustainability of an intervention. There is a chance that when PDI members are on location of the intervention, their local partner feels capable and responsible to run the intervention, however as soon as the PDI members leave, the level of local capacity and ownership turns back to its original state. Overall, GCMF aimed to manage sustainable interventions by increasing the local ownership and capacities of both women groups. Still, they were not able to overcome certain challenges within the women groups that decreased the local ownership and capacity of their local partner, and therefore the interventions are considered less sustainable.

Resilience PDI outcome

In chapter 5 I indicated the impact of the PDIs interventions on the resilience of their target group, by conducting a resilience analysis based on the articles of Béné et al. (2015) and Agrawal (2018). I aimed to capture the change in the women's level of resilience, comparing their lives before they joined

Nchembwe Twesheko or Tubombeshe with their lives in the year 2022, approximately twenty years later. In order to indicate if the lives of women had been improved in relation to their challenges, I used the following indicators: context and initial state, initial wellbeing outcomes, challenges, and end-state. I found that before Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe women joined their women group, most women were very vulnerable. They were busy coping with the impact of structural issues that occurred in their lives and used absorptive capacities to respond to these challenges, not being able to give proactive, adjusted responses that create structural change. Both women groups had limited options to learn or improve skills, which left their resilience capacities to increase very little or remain in their original state. During the past twenty years, the women groups have been exposed to GCMF project related challenges including: power disbalance, exclusion, miscommunication, complex group dynamics and 'culture of visiting', lack of capital, not skilled enough, problems with community and no demand for activity. And structural issues: poverty, food insecurity, agriculture, climate change and health issues.

After twenty years, most initial wellbeing outcomes of both women groups have been achieved; women built social networks and they learned a variety of skills which enabled them to find income generating activities and become independent. However, due to a lack of capital, women sometimes cannot use their skills to their full potential. As a result of that, many of their income generating activities are performed on a small-scale. Besides that, women now feel better able to sustain their families, their communities and themselves. Moreover, women have more resilience capacities as a result of their women group and the contribution of GCMF. This enabled them to respond differently to structural issues. They are now better able to deal with poverty, food insecurity, agricultural-, climate change- and health issues. Women shifted from using absorptive capacities to adaptive capacities which increased their level of resilience. GCMFs biggest achievement is that even though women still experience difficulties in their lives, women feel more self-reliant. Important to keep in mind is that one resilience indicator I used, based on the articles of Béné et al. (2015) and Agrawal (2018), is called 'end-state', but the resilience of both women groups and their individual members is never a literal 'end-state'. Resilience is a process, not only an outcome. It is a concept which keeps evolving over time and changes in identity.

[Answer to main research question](#)

To give an answer to the main research question 'To what extent have the GCMF interventions to support women groups in Mpongwe had a lasting and positive impact on the lives of women in the Mpongwe district?'. I found that even though not all GCMF interventions continued long-term, the interventions still made a positive impact on the lives of women in the Mpongwe district. The type of intervention the PDI chooses, is really important, as it can enable structural change in the lives of their target group. An effective way for a PDI to do this, is for a PDI to focus on first- and second-generation activities, that include teaching the target group skills, helping them find income generating activities and earn an income on their own. It is also crucial that during all parts of an interventions phase (design, implementation and monitoring phase) the local partner feels involved in decision-making. The sustainability of a PDI intervention increases when the PDI gives their local partner the power of being in charge of decision-making. However, the PDI should be involved as well if the local partner indicates they need guidance. Furthermore, I found that it is important for a PDI to consider the group dynamics of their target group and the distance between the PDI and its local partner when aiming for sustainable aid. When a group is disorganised, experiences mismanagement, or lacks internal motivation it is more

difficult for an intervention to be sustainable. A PDI should therefore be aware of the dynamics of group when choosing a local partner. Besides, a PDI should also be aware that the distance between them and their local partner, increases the chance their local partner does not feel responsible and capable to continue the projects without nearby presence of PDI members.

This thesis contributes to the limited existing literature on PDIs as I found that even when the sustainability of PDIs interventions could be improved, the resilience outcome of the PDI can still be very effective. The durability of an intervention is not what is most important when aiming for resilience. What matters is that the intervention is focused on tackling the root causes of poverty. A PDI should pay attention to making their target group become independent. This way the local partner can better sustain their families and themselves, even when the interventions do not continue on a long-term. PDIs are therefore able to tackle the root causes of poverty instead of only the symptoms of poverty and contribute to systemic change.

6.1 Suggestions for further research

There are certain parts of this thesis which have limited information on relevant topics. First of all, resilience should be measured on multiple scales: individuals, households, community, district, national and larger systems. However, my research is limited to only researching communities. Therefore it is possible that my research did not include all important stakeholders that may play a role in the resilience analysis of Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. I recommend further research on the resilience of these women groups, by measuring the resilience of the remaining scales.

Besides that, in relation to resilience, this thesis only discussed women's responses to structural issues and left the responses to other challenges out, as this research has no further information about that. Further research could be done about these topics. Moreover, in relation to sustainability, this research has limited information about the role of the Zambian government as stakeholder in the GCMF interventions. More research could be done about that.

Besides that, I recommend to do further research about the involvement of a PDI in relation to the effectiveness of a PDIs interventions. As Kinsbergen et al. (2017) claims that limited involvement of PDIs in interventions is beneficial for the project's sustainability, in this thesis the local partner wanted the PDI to be more involved in the projects, in order for the interventions to be more effective. Therefore it could be useful to research the degree to which a PDI should be involved in an intervention in order to achieve the biggest positive impact for on their target group.

And lastly, I recommend further research on the differences between both women groups. The sustainability of the PDIs interventions in one women group was negatively affected by long distance aid, while in the other group it was not. It could be interesting to research what causes this difference. Adding to that, it could also be interesting to do more research about the effects that the collaboration between the two boards, GCMF and GKMT, had on the effectiveness of the interventions. The double board experienced challenges such as: who is responsible for certain decisions being made within the organisation? Who keeps the overview of the decisions being made? Who can be held accountable in the end? These challenges possibly affected the outcome of the GCMF interventions.

Bibliography:

- 10 Major Causes of Poverty | World Vision Canada. (n.d.). <https://www.worldvision.ca/stories/child-sponsorship/major-causes-of-poverty>
- Agrawal, N. (2018). Disaster resilience. *Advances in Natural and Technological Hazards Research*, 49, 147–191. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-024-1283-3_4
- Anneli, M. (2001). *What do we know about capacity building? An overview of existing knowledge and good practice.*
- Arend, E. (2011). *Gender, IFIs and Food Insecurity Case Study: Zambia. November*, 1–6.
- Béné, C., Frankenberger, T., & Nelson, S. (2015). Design, Monitoring and Evaluation of Resilience Interventions: Conceptual and Empirical Considerations. *Institute of Development Studies*, 2015(459), 26. <http://www.ids.ac.uk/publication/design-monitoring-and-evaluation-of-resilience-interventions-conceptual-and-empirical-considerations>
- Bimeny, P. (2022). Problematic Ideological Humanitarianism : Generating more Resilient Markets but More Fragile Beneficiaries. *Civil Wars*, 00(00), 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698249.2022.2092688>
- Bimeny, P., Angolere, B. P., Nangiro, S., Sagal, I. A., & Emai, J. (2021). From Warriors to Mere Chicken Men, and Other Troubles: An Ordinary Language Survey of Notions of Resilience in Ngakarimojong. *Civil Wars*, 00(00), 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698249.2022.2015215>
- Bond, V., Chileshe, M., Magazi, B., & Sullivan, C. (2008). The converging impact of tuberculosis, AIDS, and food insecurity in Zambia and South Africa. *RENEWAL Policy Brief, February*, 5–6. <http://www.ifpri.org/sites/default/files/publications/rfbrief05.pdf>
- Bowen, B. (2013). *An analysis of agricultural development projects as a tool to increase community resilience: a case of Monze District in Zambia. February.*
- Brown, K. (2016). *Resilience, Development and Global Change (Paperback) - Routledge.* <https://www.routledge.com/products/9780415663472>
- Bulawayo, M., Ndulo, M., & Sichone, J. (2019). Socioeconomic Determinants of Food Insecurity among Zambian Households: Evidence from a National Household Survey. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 54(6), 800–818. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909619841655>
- Butts, S. A., Parmley, L. E., Alcaide, M. L., Rodriguez, V. J., Kayukwa, A., Chitalu, N., Weiss, S. M., & Jones, D. L. (2017). Let us fight and support one another: Adolescent girls and young women on contributors and solutions to HIV risk in Zambia. *International Journal of Women's Health*, 9, 727–737. <https://doi.org/10.2147/IJWH.S142232>
- Chaponda, E. B., Chandramohan, D., Michelo, C., Mharakurwa, S., Chipeta, J., & Chico, R. M. (2015). High burden of malaria infection in pregnant women in a rural district of Zambia: A cross-sectional study. *Malaria Journal*, 14(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12936-015-0866-1>
- Cretney, R. (2014). Resilience for whom? Emerging critical geographies of socio-ecological resilience. *Geography Compass*, 8(9), 627–640. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gec3.12154>
- Cypress, B. S. (2015). Qualitative research: The “what,” “why,” “who,” and “how”! *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*, 34(6), 356–361. <https://doi.org/10.1097/DCC.0000000000000150>
- Hamazakaza, P. (2009). *Building resilience to AIDS impacts. September.*

- Kapata, N., Chanda-Kapata, P., O'Grady, J., Schwank, S., Bates, M., Mukonka, V., Zumla, A., & Mwaba, P. (2011). Trends of Zambia's tuberculosis burden over the past two decades. *Tropical Medicine and International Health*, 16(11), 1404–1409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-3156.2011.02849.x>
- Kinsbergen, S., Koch, D. J., Plaisier, C., & Schulpen, L. (2021). Long-Lasting, But Not Transformative. An Ex-post Sustainability Study of Development Interventions of Private Development Initiatives. *European Journal of Development Research*, 34(1), 51–76. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41287-020-00346-0>
- Kinsbergen, S., & Schulpen, L. (2011). Taking stock of PIs: The What, Why and How Private Initiatives in Development. *Cornell Law Review*, 87(1), 99–157. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780585110011-046>
- Kinsbergen, S., Schulpen, L., & Ruben, R. (2017). Understanding the Sustainability of Private Development Initiatives: What Kind of Difference Do They Make? *Forum for Development Studies*, 44(2), 223–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08039410.2017.1307270>
- Korsten-Korenromp, T. (2010). *Jaarverslag 2015* (Issue 14074683).
- Korsten-Korenromp, T., & Didden, M. (2020). *Jaarverslag 2020*.
- Korsten-Korenromp, T., & Didden, M. (2022). *Jaarverslag 2021* (Issue 14074683).
- Lason, K. (2009). *Ibenga Area Gender Association Annual Report 2009*.
- Mayunga, J. S. (2007). Understanding and Applying the Concept of Community Disaster Resilience: A capital-based approach. *Summer Academy for Social Vulnerability and Resilience Building, July*, 1–16. <http://www.ehs.unu.edu/file/get/3761.pdf>
- Moen, K., & Middelthon, A. L. (2015). Qualitative Research Methods. In *Research in Medical and Biological Sciences: From Planning and Preparation to Grant Application and Publication*. Elsevier Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-799943-2.00010-0>
- Nchembwe Twesheko. (2006). *Nchembwe Twesheko project proposal*.
- Njie, B., & Asimiran, S. (2014). Case Study as a Choice in Qualitative Methodology. *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSRJRME)*, 4(3), 35–40. <https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-04313540>
- Noor, K. B. M. (2008). Case study: A strategic research methodology. *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 5(11), 1602–1604. <https://doi.org/10.3844/ajassp.2008.1602.1604>
- OECD. (2013). What Does “Resilience” Mean for Donors? *OECD Fact Sheet*. [http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-development/May 10 2013 FINAL resilience PDF.pdf](http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-development/May%2010%202013%20FINAL%20resilience%20PDF.pdf)
- Schipper, E. L. F., & Langston, L. (2015). A comparative overview of resilience measurement frameworks analysing indicators and approaches. *Overseas Development Institute - Working, November*, 30. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2430.0882>
- Schulpen, L. (2007). *Development in the 'Africa for beginners' Dutch Private Initiatives in Ghana. November*.
- Schulpen, L. (2016). “50+ and sexy?” *Ten years of research on Dutch Private Development Initiatives. Stichting “Geef de kinderen van Mpongwe een toekomst” Jaarverslag 2005*. (2005).
- United Nations. (2020). *UN Common Guidance On Helping Build Resilient Societies. December*, 48.

Verschuuren, J. M. (2012). Adaptation to Climate Change: Opportunities and Barriers. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1291183>

Annexes

A: List of interviews

Note: This list of interviews refers to most interviewees by number, to keep the interviewees names anonymous. TB stands for Tubombeshe members, NT stands for Nchembwe Twesheko members. The dates refer to the moments the interviews were conducted.

Semi-structured interviews:

2 TB, interview, 11 October, 2022
3 TB, interview, 14 October, 2022
4 TB, interview, 14 October, 2022
5 TB, interview, 19 October, 2022
6 TB, interview, 20 October, 2022
7 TB, interview, 20 October, 2022
8 TB, interview, 4 November, 2022
9 TB, interview, 4 November, 2022

1 NT, interview, 22 October, 2022
2 NT, interview, 7 November, 2022
3 NT, interview, 8 November, 2022
4 NT, interview, 10 November, 2022
5 NT, interview, 14 November, 2022
8 NT, interview, 15 November, 2022
9 NT, interview, 20 November, 2022

Narrative interview:

7 NT, interview, 15 November, 2022

Key-person interviews:

1 TB, interview, 11 October, 2022
6 NT, interview, 14 November, 2022
Mr. Kalima, interview, 16 November, 2022
Ms. Korsten-Korenromp, interview, 26 January, 2023
Ms. Musukuma, interview, 16 March, 2023

Focus group discussion:

1, focus group discussion, 19 October, 2022
2, focus group discussion, 19 October, 2022
3, focus group discussion, 19 October, 2022
4, focus group discussion, 19 October, 2022
5, focus group discussion, 19 October, 2022

Participant observations:

NT, participant observation 1, 12 October, 2022

NT, participant observation 2, 21 October, 2022

NT, participant observation 3, 11 November, 2022

Informal talks:

Mr. Lason, personal communication 1, 6 October, 2022

Mr. Lason, personal communication 2, 4 November, 2022

B: Interview guides

Semi-structured interviews

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. I would like to talk to you about your experiences with GCMF interventions. This research is for my study at the University. Since I am not familiar with the context, in order to fully understand your answers I will ask follow-up questions. My understanding of things may be different than yours, and to ensure that I have understood correctly what you mean, I may ask you to further clarify or explain something. The duration of the interview is approximately 45 minutes. I would like to record the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Although if you feel uncomfortable being recorded I can also take notes during the session. Important to know is that I work independently from Ton. All responses will be kept confidential. Ton will only see the end report. My aim is that any information I include in the report does not identify you as the participant. Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time.

Narrative interview

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. I would like to give you a topic and then you can tell me all your experiences about it while I will just listen. You can share everything you want to share with me, even details that pop up in your head that might seem irrelevant to you. The topic I would like to talk about is your membership with Nchembwe Twesheko and your club's involvement with GCMF from the past 20 years. You can tell me everything about how you experienced this from the beginning of your membership until today. You may take some time to think about this topic if you want. After that you can start telling your story while I will just listen. Important to know is that I work independently from Ton. This research is for my study at the University. All responses will be kept confidential. Ton will only see the end report. My aim is that any information I include in the report does not identify you as the participant. Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time.

Key-person interviews

The key-person interviews all differ from each other as the interview questions are adjusted to each interviewee personally. Here is one example, the interview questions designed for a former GCMF member:

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. I am doing research about the long-term effects of private development initiatives on the lives of women in Mpongwe, Zambia. I used the private development initiative GCMF as my case study to find out what kind of effects they had on the following two women groups: Nchembwe Twesheko and Tubombeshe. I have been to Mpongwe for two months in which I interviewed eighteen women in total. I mostly heard stories about the collaboration with GCMF from the women, but I would also like to hear the other side from the other side: the story from GCMF, from you personally. The women could sometimes not give me the information I needed or their stories did not add up. Therefore I hope that you can give me more clarity on some topics. I am especially interested to hear more about the types of projects that GCMF conducted in the women groups, the way you designed, implemented, and monitored these projects and the relationship GCMF had with these women. First, I have some general questions, then some

questions related to Tubombeshe and then about Nchembwe Twesheko. Important to know is that I work independently from Ton. This research is for my study at the University. All responses will be kept confidential. Ton will only see the end report. Is it okay if automatically transcribe and record the sound of this conversation? Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time.

Focus group discussion

I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me today. I would like to discuss your experiences and relationship with GCMF over the past years. My goal is to hear all your opinions on this topic. In order to do so, I will ask a question to each participant in turn and then we can start a discussion about this. During the discussion, it is important to create an open, polite environment in which each opinion is respected. You don't have to agree with each other. It is okay for everyone to have different opinions. Everyone is encouraged to participate as I would like to hear all of your opinions. Therefore, it is important to let each other finish their sentences. My role is being the facilitator of this discussion. Does everyone understand the topic of discussion and their role? Important for you to know is that I work independently from Ton. This research is for my study at the University. Ton will only see the end report. I respect your confidentiality during this research but as this research is small-scale there is the risk that people find out about your identity eventually and others that are present here today could risk your confidentiality as well. Is it okay if automatically transcribe and record the sound of this conversation? Remember, you don't have to talk about anything you don't want to and you can stop the interview at any time.

C: Interview Questions

Semi-structured interviews

Can you tell me a little bit about yourself?

Can you tell me about your family?

Were you born here?

Do you like living there? Why?

Are there are things which make your life difficult here?

When did you decide to join the women group?

Why did you decide to join the women group?

Can you explain what role do the women of your women group have in your life?

Were you involved in this women group before GCMF got involved?

If yes, what kind of activities did you do before GCMF got involved?

What kind of activities does this women group do currently?

In what kind of activities do your participate?

How often do you have meetings with the women group?

Can you describe how your organisation has been given full ownership of the projects by GCMF?

Did you feel that you were capable enough to continue the projects without GCMF? Why? What kind of capabilities did you have? Or not have?

Did GCMF gave you tools throughout the project to run the projects eventually on your own? What kind of tools?

Did the projects continue after the withdrawal from GCMF? In what way? The same/different?

Do you feel responsible for the success and continuation of the GCMF projects?

Could you describe your living situation before you got involved with the women group? (family, job, health, education, day schedule)

Did you experience certain struggles in your life that you hoped the women group could help you with?

What kind of struggles?

How did you deal with these struggles before you joined the women group? Did you feel that you had other choices to respond to these issues?

Was the women group able to help you with these struggles? In what ways?

Did you came across other struggles during your involvement in the women group?

How would you describe your current living situation? (family, job, health, education, day schedule)

Did the women group change or improve your life in some way?

Do you think these changes will last over a longer time?

Did the GCMF projects made any changes or improvements in the lives of women in your women group? What kind of changes? (change in poverty, inequality, empowerment, food security)

Do you think these changes will last over a longer time?

Did the GCMF projects change or improve your life in some way?

Do you think these changes will last over a longer time?

Do you feel like you can now better deal with [struggles] in your life compared to the beginning of the projects? What factors played a role in this? (Your women group? GCMF? Other factors? Government? Local authorities? Other organisations?)

How do you now respond to [struggles] in your life? Do you feel you have now better options to respond to these [struggles]? What options? Why?

Are you satisfied with outcome of the GCMF projects?

Narrative interview

Can you tell me about your membership with Nchembwe Twesheko and your club's involvement with GCMF from the past 20 years?

Key-person interviews

The key-person interviews all differ from each other as the interview questions are adjusted to each interviewee personally. Here is one example, the interview questions for a former GCMF member:

What was your role within GCMF? In what years were you a member of the GCMF board?

What kind of relationship did you have with GKMT?

How did GCMF come into contact with the women groups Tubombeshe and Nchembwe Twesheko?

Why did you choose to help these women groups?

What was your involvement in these women groups?

GCMF did a lot of projects for Tubombeshe (VTC, poultry house, borehole, sewing machines). In what years was GCMF actively involved with Tubombeshe?

Who designed these projects?

When making these designs, did GCMF think about the sustainability of the projects? Meaning that in the future the women are able to continue the projects without GCMF?

What goals did you want to achieve with the Tubombeshe projects?

Do you think that the goals of these projects are reached?

Who implemented the GCMF projects in Tubombeshe? Was GCMF involved in that?

Did GCMF monitor the projects? How often, who and in what ways? Did you include Tubombeshe members to monitor themselves?

Can you describe to me moment when GCMF handed over the projects to Tubombeshe?

Can you tell me more about the poultry house build close to Tubombeshe? What was the goal of that poultry house? Did GCMF explain to Tubombeshe members that the profit of the poultry house was not for them? Why did you build the poultry house there?

Was there clear communication with Tubombeshe members about your leaving?

I understood from interviews with Tubombeshe members that GCMF took away carpentry tools, stuff from the poultry house, a motor and the pump machine from the bore hole. Is that true? How did you experience that?

How do you look back on the collaboration between GCMF and Tubombeshe? Do you think that some things could be improved?

You did a lot of projects with Nchembwe Twesheko. In what years was GCMF active with this women group?

Who designed the GCMF projects for Nchembwe Twesheko?

When making these designs, did GCMF think about the sustainability of the projects? Meaning that in the future the women are able to continue the projects without GCMF?

What goals did you want to achieve with these projects?

Do you think that the goals of these projects are achieved?

Was GCMF involved by the implementation of these GCMF projects in Nchembwe Twesheko?

Did GCMF monitor these projects? In what ways, who was involved, how often?

Can you describe to me the moment that GCMF handed over the projects to Nchembwe Twesheko?

Currently the women group has no activities together. Why do you think that is?

Can you tell me about the goal of the community hall that you build for Nchembwe Twesheko? Why do you think that they have no activities left in the building nowadays?

I would like to dive in into the topic of the sewing machines that you donated to Nchembwe Twesheko.

What was the goal of GCMF to give the women sewing machines?

Why were the machines later retrieved to the college?

Why do you think that the women stopped using the machines?

Did you have a conversation with these women about them not using the machines?

The women told me that they had a tutor in tailoring who became too expensive to pay. Did you know the women had little experience in sewing? Did GCMF think about solutions to this problem?

How do you look back on the collaboration of GCMF and Nchembwe Twesheko? Do you think that some things could be improved?

Focus group discussion

First tell me your name, your tasks on the board and what you like about being a board member of Tubombeshe?

What were your expectations of the GCMF projects at the start of each project?

How were decisions made during the design, implementation, and monitoring phase of the GCMF projects?

Was there room for expressing your ideas and critique when collaborating with GCMF?

When Tubombeshe was given ownership of the GCMF projects by GCMF, did you feel like you were able to continue these projects on your own?

To your knowledge, did your relationship with GCMF change over the past twenty years?

Do you think that GCMF made a positive contribution to the lives of Tubombeshe members?