



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare

Volume 45
Issue 1 *Dimensions of Charity versus
Development*

Article 4

2018

Maximization vs. Inclusion as a Value Conflict in Development Work

Johnny Ramírez-Johnson
Fuller Theological Seminary, ramirez-johnson@fuller.edu

Héctor Luis Díaz
Western Michigan University, hector.diaz@wmich.edu

Vijayan Kumara Pillai
The University of Texas at Arlington

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Ramírez-Johnson, Johnny; Díaz, Héctor Luis; and Pillai, Vijayan Kumara (2018) "Maximization vs. Inclusion as a Value Conflict in Development Work," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 45: Iss. 1, Article 4.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.4166>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol45/iss1/4>

This Article is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



**WESTERN
MICHIGAN**
UNIVERSITY

Maximization vs. Inclusion as a Value Conflict in Development Work

Johnny Ramírez-Johnson
Fuller Theological Seminary

Héctor Luis Díaz
Western Michigan University

Vijayan Kumara Pillai
The University of Texas at Arlington

This article builds on previous research studies strongly suggesting that high levels of social capital are positively associated with the economic and political progress of community residents. As previously proposed by the authors of this article, such findings may encourage policy makers of government and non-governmental development organizations to concentrate their efforts and resources in communities whose residents have been identified as having high levels of social capital. Policy-makers may view pre-existing high levels of social capital among community residents as a factor likely to increase the level of success of their respective socio-economic development initiatives. Such course of action however, would pose a serious ethical issue, given that it could lead to the exclusion of the poor communities with lower levels of social capital and the greatest socio-economic needs. This article explores ethical questions that emerge as we contrast an inductively created development model focusing on emotions with the positivistic social capital model often used in development work. Furthermore, it proposes that the ethical principles associated with the feelings and values held by development organizations and service recipients ought to guide decision making in development work. Such an approach would foster the relationships between policy makers, development professionals

and program participants and would enhance the possibility of meeting their expectations.

Key words: Development Ethics, Feelings and Values, Maximizing Development, Relationships

A qualitative and quantitative multinational research study was conducted in the countries of Peru, Bolivia, Nicaragua and Honduras exploring the constructs of social capital, economic progress, and democratic behaviors at the local community level. Quantitative findings strongly suggest that high levels of social capital are positively associated with the economic and political progress of community residents (Diaz et al., 2008). Qualitative analyses, on the other hand, enabled researchers to propose a conceptual model of democracy as development, which is described later in this article. The findings of the previously mentioned study may encourage policy makers working for government and non-governmental development organizations to concentrate their efforts and resources in communities whose residents have been identified as having high levels of social capital. They may view high social capital as a factor increasing the likelihood of success of socio-economic development initiatives.

This course of action however, would pose a serious ethical issue, given that it could lead to the exclusion of the poorest communities, which are more likely to have the greatest needs and lower levels of social capital. The current article suggests an alternate approach for determining how to use governmental and NGO development funds and other resources based on the experience of eight communities surveyed in four Latin American countries.

Social Capital and Democracy

This article aims to explore the ethics associated with promoting social capital, economic progress and democracy from the perspective of community residents who received socio-economic development services in targeted communities of the four studied countries (Diaz et al., 2008). A quantitative study conducted by Carbajal, Parsons, Pillai, Sahelin, and

Sharma (2012) suggests that social capital is positively associated with democratic attitudes. The current study, however, relies on qualitative or phenomenological information. Researchers used open-ended questions that asked participants to define democracy and to identify people or entities that contributed to the promotion of democracy in their respective communities. One thousand two hundred heads of households responded to a semi-structured questionnaire, and approximately 80 of them participated in 12 focus group discussions in which they expressed their views of community development and democracy. The model of democracy as development described below was the result of in-depth interviews, focus groups and open-ended questions. A combined analysis facilitated the emergence of the five areas of the model shown below (see Diaz et al., 2008).

Figure 1. MODEL of Democracy as Development: As Defined by Community Members

1. Community water access: local or national government related →	secures survival
2. Peace and security versus fear and mistrust: national government related →	produces trust
3. Infrastructure of community by governmental and/or NGOs →	quality of life
4. Community’s social capital: government facilitated (organization or intervention) →	produces unity of purpose
5. Knowledge imparted and received (role of NGOs) →	results in community consolidation

END RESULT: A united community with a purpose and a method for achieving its goals of progress = Democracy as development

The development process of the previously described model focuses on the feelings expressed on the topic of democracy and how these feelings addressed or were connected with everyday life events that were presented as central to life. To identify such feelings, narratives were analyzed to tell the story of the interviewees as presented in the interviews. Such analysis enabled the interviewees and the interviewer to connect via identified feelings as the *emit* and *etic* approach described by Barrett (2009).

Emic and etic analysis are terms taken from linguistics, and refer respectively to the actor's insider (subjective) perspective and the observer's outsider (objective) perspective. Historical particularists give priority to emic analysis and to subjective data such as values, norms, and emotions. (Barrett, 2009, p. 54)

The idea that emotions and feelings are key to the interpretation of the perspective of the interviewees as understood by the interviewer took central stage in the development of this model. That is why water access and democratic values were associated in the life and experience of these communities. Water access was given the central and primary role in defining democracy. Thus, the abstract concept of democracy becomes the tangible access to water via everyday feelings and emotions.

This article explores ethical questions that emerge as we contrast the previously described development model that focuses on emotions with the positivistic social capital model often used in development work that focuses on abstract ideas to define development.

Social Capital

The social capital construct has been used for almost four decades in sociology, economics, and social work (Durlauf & Fafchamps, 2004). Efforts have been made to quantify concepts associated with social capital such as: good will, fellowship, mutual sympathy, and social intercourse among individuals and families (Hanifan, 1916); the sum of the actual or potential resources associated to possession of a durable network (Bourdieu, 1985); networks and resources connected to them that network members can access or mobilize (Lin, 2001); and as

networks, norms, and trust that facilitate social action for the common good (Putnam, 1993). Some studies have focused on social capital as attitudes and cognitive dynamics, while others have focused on behavioral manifestations (Aldrich & Meyer, 2015). Consistent with this second group, Pringle and Welsh (2001) have conceptualized social capital as consisting of networks of mutual trust and norms of reciprocity.

Given the long and varied list of commonly used definitions of social capital, Durlauf and Fafchamps (2004) conducted a review of the existing literature related to this construct. As a result, they were able to identify the following three ideas underlying all definitions: (1) Social capital generates positive externalities for members of a group; (2) these externalities are achieved through shared trust, norms, and values and their consequent effects on expectations and behavior; (3) shared trust, norms, and values arise from informal forms of organizations based on social networks and associations. The study of social capital is that of network-based processes that generate beneficial outcomes through norms and trust (Durlauf & Fafchamps, 2004, p. 5).

Baum and Ziersch (2003) have classified social capital as *bonding, bridging and linking*. In their view, bonding social capital is horizontal in nature and brings together individuals or groups with similar characteristics. This type of social capital will tend to exclude persons who do not share certain characteristics and may lead to lack of cooperation and trust. On the other hand, bridging and linking social capital tends to cut across communities and individuals with varying levels of power. People with this type of social capital will feel responsible for the well-being of others outside of their group. Because of this, it is likely to help reduce inequities. Furthermore, according to Pringle and Welsh (2001) there are three types of social capital: physical, human, and social.

Easterly (2006) and Pawar (2006) criticize the concept of social capital as stemming from assumptions and theories associated with capital and capitalism. According to them, the concepts and propositions of social capital theory are questionable. Reportedly, the concept of capital has antisocial and exploitative connotations. It may also be used for misleading and manipulative purposes by the political right. For these reasons, they recommend replacing the concept of social capital with other less

politically charged concepts such as: trust, networks, collective action, norms, relationships, social capacity, community capacity, social networks, or communities. In spite of such criticisms, the construct of social capital continues to be widely used.

Other studies are concerned with the emergence, development and maintenance of social capital. Pillai, Díaz, Basham, and Ramirez-Johnson (2011), for instance, conducted a study suggesting that democratic attitudes had a significant positive effect on social capital even in rural settings, and that social capital increased as democratic attitudes improved. De Zuñiga (2012), in his study, found that seeking information through electronic social networks “is a positive and significant predictor of people’s social capital and civic and political participatory behaviors” (p. 319).

Glaeser, Laibson, and Sacerdote (2002), in turn, found that social capital first arises and then falls with age, that it declines with expected mobility, that it rises in occupations with greater returns to social skills, that it is higher among home owners, and that it falls sharply with physical distance. They also found that people who invest in human capital also invest in social capital.

Benefits of Social Capital

According to Baum and Ziersch (2003), epidemiological studies and in-depth qualitative studies have linked elements of social capital to positive health status. Felicio, Couto, and Caiado (2014) propose that the social capital associated with players external to an organization is positively associated with raising resources and building trust in such organizations. Furthermore, they point to the fact that human capital and social capital are consistently correlated with improved organizational performance.

Pringle and Welsh (2001) propose that social capital holds organizations together. Bowles and Gintis (2002) propose that social capital contributes to enhanced community governance. In their view, social capital implies the willingness of community members to abide by the rules and norms of the respective community, and coerces into obedience those who refuse to comply with such norms. Furthermore, social capital should increase the community’s capacity to solve problems.

Jin (2013) examines the effects of various social capital relational components on the promotion of pro-environmental behavior in five key public policy areas: recycling, food purchasing behavior, gasoline, energy conservation, and water use. "Findings suggest that the components of social capital work differently and that each component's influence also varies depending on the context of the environmental issue" (p. 40).

According to Yoon and Wang (2011), organizational citizenship behaviors and social capital influence knowledge sharing in virtual communities. Organizational citizenship behaviors include altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, courtesy, and civic virtue. A significant finding was that "social interaction ties and identification of social capital have a strong impact on member's knowledge-sharing intentions and knowledge quality in virtual communities" (p. 106).

Tsasis, Cooke-Lauder, and Evans (2015) make reference to the influence of interpersonal and interprofessional ties (social capital) on the nature and tone of inter-organizational relations. Reportedly, "social capital provides both tangible and intangible benefits to collaborative work" (p. 546). Furthermore, Couto and Guthrie (1999) propose that social capital may serve as a mediating structure that may enhance the functioning of democracy and may help enhance social and economic equality.

An ethical issue suggested by the emergence of the five areas model proposed in this article is who gets to define development, democracy or other measures of well-being. Easterly (2006) suggests that people are poor, not simply because western NGOs and governments are not doing enough to uplift them, but because of the inability of development initiatives to empower these.

The qualitative approach used in this article comes partly in response to criticism of Western theories and mostly positivistic research approaches. Easterly (2006), for instance, challenges the appropriateness of using Western development theories and intervention models given that such theories and models may be culturally biased and inconsistent with the socio-cultural, political and economic reality of non-Western cultures and countries. In his view, the position of Sachs (2005) is presumptuous and culturally arrogant. Reportedly, Sachs presumes a full understanding of development phenomena. He attempts

to outline and develop in detail “key practical solutions to almost all of their [extreme poor countries] problems” (p. 52). The inductive qualitative approach goes a long way in responding to these concerns, given that it stems from the experiences of people, their perceptions, and their reports.

“Developed” or industrialized nations could have a great impact on the eradication of extreme poverty around the world by providing the necessary resources for development efforts. The end of poverty will undoubtedly require a global network of cooperation among people who do not know each other and who do not necessarily trust each other. Meaningful collaboration between developed and developing countries and among development workers and targeted populations is essential (Sachs, 2005). The 2015 United Nations Millennium Development Goals or Agenda is expected to produce great transformations (Sachs, 2005; United Nations, 2015) and lead to sustainability of life. Sachs (2005) and other supporters of the millennial agenda believe that the proposed strategies covering basic health, education, governmental power, infrastructure, transportation and communications services will eradicate poverty.

Easterly (2006), however, challenges Sachs’ (2005) premises and labels his worldview as mistaken. Easterly asks what are the appropriate ways of serving the so-called poor nations, particularly the notion of *providing aid to the poor* (Easterly, 2006). He suggests looking at the issue of underdevelopment from the poor nations’ viewpoints. He proposes adopting a “searcher’s” worldview, which is very consistent with the qualitative or phenomenological approach. Easterly further proposes changing the aid philosophy and moving from the role of “planners” to the role of “searchers.” “Planners work from the top down, mostly talking to other planners. They see global solutions and mobilize for them” (Easterly, 2006, p. 5). On the other hand, “searchers” begin by asking what is the view of the so-called under-developed country before determining what the under-developed country needs (Easterly, 2006, p. 5).

Planners transform multifaceted, global development challenges, seeking to simplify them following predetermined Western developed theories of development, as the ones informing social capital theories. Searchers, on the other hand, seek an understanding of development from the bottom up. Searchers collaborate with native actors with the goal of enabling local efforts

to promote their own version of development. Subsequently, they try out tentatively identified solutions, while identifying and documenting what seems to work in a given local context. An example of localized initiatives for indigenous and self-directed development are the “gang of four Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan” who achieved significant economic development without Western directives (Easterly, 2006, p. 27). Easterly suggests that the best prospect for poor nations is to be their own searchers and to “borrow ideas and technology” (2006, p. 28) from the West when it suits them.

Easterly’s cow metaphor seeks to illustrate the disparity between the ideas of prescribed development path suggested by Sachs versus his self-directed searcher approach. Cows do not, cannot, and will not win a horse race like the Kentucky Derby. Easterly suggests that development agencies are more like cows than horses, thus they need to ask—“what kinds of useful things can your cow do?” and create goals that suit such approaches (Easterly, 2006, p. 11).

The Ethics of Emotions and Feelings

Myers (2011), following a careful analysis of Easterly (2006) and Sachs (2005), as well as others not covered here, asserts that

Contrasting “planners” with “searchers,” Easterly believes social problems are better solved as close to the action as possible by innovators who try and fail and try again (searchers). Planners, on the other hand, live in Washington DC, London, and Peking and assume they know enough to be able to figure out global solutions and then determine what needs to be supplied. Searchers know they will never know enough and instead look for what is being demanded and try to meet that need. Planners provide solutions that are developed a long way from the front line; searchers look for what is working locally and try to make it better. (Myers, 2011, p. 36)

Myers (2011) clarifies that Christian development agencies rely on development strategies that often feel “secular.”

Christians who separate the physical and spiritual realms tend to be God-centered in their spiritual lives and human-centered when they think and act in the physical world.

For our spiritual work, we turn to the church and our Bibles; for development work, we turn to the social sciences. This goes a long way in explaining why development practices of Christian development agencies often feel “secular.” (p. 11)

Consistent with Myers’ statement, we propose that the ethical conflict in development work comes at the attitudinal, feelings and values levels.

The relationships of the poor do not work for the well-being of the poor because of spiritual values held by others and by the poor that do not enhance and support life. Selfishness, love of power, and feelings of ordained privilege express themselves in god complexes. Loss of hope, opportunity, and recognition mar the identity of the poor. Racism, ethnocentrism, and ostracism erode the intended blessing of having many cultures. Fear of spirits and belief in gods that cannot save obscure the offer of the God who desires to save. At the end of the day, the causes of poverty are spiritual. (Myers, 2011, p. 15)

The Western “notion of ordained privilege” that Easterly calls “white man’s burden,” frames the development efforts of the West. Thus what looks similar to a theoretical paradigm is, after all, a gut feeling and assumption of superiority and assumed universal logic.

Myers goes further in his analysis; feelings are also framing the responses of the receivers. “Loss of hope,” “fear of spirits,” and “belief in gods” are all defined as sentiments, feelings that define people’s motives and actions. Values, after all, are associated with feelings. Myers calls these feelings spiritual in nature. Here, we define spiritual as the feelings and values held by developers and by those seeking development. After all, Myers (2011) is not oblivious to the idea that spirituality is connected to values and feelings, a psychological construct, in his words:

Less expected by the researchers, many of the manifestations of well-being were psychological in nature (Narayan-Parker et al. 2000, 26-27). A desire to feel better about oneself and a wish for a sense of dignity and respect were heard. Peace of mind, lack of anxiety, being God-fearing, and being happy or satisfied with life were named as elements of human well-being. Somewhat to the surprise of the Western researchers, a spiritual life and religious observance are woven into other aspects of well-being. (Myers, 2011, p. 32)

The “desire to feel better about oneself and a wish for a sense of dignity and respect” are central to the agenda of the recipients of development services: “Poor people feel nonexistent, valueless, and humiliated” (Wink, 1992, p. 101). As much as the development agencies and the theoretical framework workers of social capital and other development-like theories think their theories follow universal logics, their theories are bound by their values and their values follow their feelings. This was the implied trust of Walter Wink’s ideas when he asked, “how can we oppose evil without creating new evils and being made evil ourselves?” (Wink, 1992, p. 3).

As concluded by Narayan-Parker and colleagues (2000), the most important elements for development are not measured in dollars, but instead are measured in self-respect and dignity; when described by poor people themselves, this “means being able to live without being a burden to others” (Narayan-Parker, Chambers, Shaw, & Petesch, 2000, p. 27) and “living without extending one’s hand; living without being subservient to anybody; and being able to bury dead family members decently” (Narayan-Parker et al. 2000, p. 27). Of course, we all can see the financial implications of these requests for dignity, but money is not the real currency at stake. The currency is psychological—well-being, human dignity, and relationships in community—all crucial feelings people around the world need.

From Myers we conclude that the centrality of feelings comes about because of relationships: “Ultimately, the effectiveness of transformational development comes down, not to theory, principles, or tools, but to people. Transformation is about transforming relationships, and relationships are transformed by people” (Myers, 2011, p. 219)—people who belong, believe and behave according to their values and are guided by their feelings.

Ethics of Feelings as Spiritual Force for Development Rationale

To fight the top down approach to development work, Myers (2011) and those who follow him have called upon spiritual values that are religious in nature.

Said another way, the process by which we work with the community is not just a problem-solving or appreciative exercise. It must be a spiritual exercise, an exercise in discernment.

We need to integrate the methods of the spiritual disciplines into our development activities and use them as part of the development process. We must learn to be as spiritually discerning as we are professionally discerning. (p. 248)

This article proposes that the operational underlying logic of such conclusions is always associated to values and feelings. Just like capitalism was shown long time ago as being based on Christian values. In relation to capitalism, Weber stated:

At the same time it expresses a type of feeling which is closely connected with certain religious ideas. If we thus ask, why should "money be made out of men", Benjamin Franklin himself, although he was a colorless deist, answers in his autobiography with a quotation from the Bible, which his strict Calvinistic father drummed into him again and again in his youth: "Seest thou a man diligent in his business? He shall stand before kings" (Proverbs 22:29). The earning of money within the modern economic order is, so long as it is done legally, the result and the expression of virtue and proficiency in a calling; and this virtue and proficiency are, as it is now not difficult to see, the real Alpha and Omega of Franklin's ethic, as expressed in the passages we have quoted, as well as in all his works without exception. (Weber, 2001, p. 53)

Max Weber's ideas about capitalism were founded on the feelings he interpreted from the words of the parents of American capitalism, who in turn had Christian ideas or motivations stemming from biblical texts and even deists like Benjamin Franklin. We propose that Myers' spiritual values are rooted in feelings. This proposition does not attempt to legitimize or delegitimize the Christian spiritual values of Myers or to judge the religious values of the development agencies and or the development recipients. Based on these ideas, this article proposes that a simple match of values and feelings between funders and recipients will facilitate working relationships that can in turn be translated into a bottom up approach, or searcher mentality, or what Myers called "walking with the poor: principles and practices of transformational development" (2011, p. i).

How Would It Look Like?

An ethical model has been developed based on data and information obtained from study participants in the four Latin American countries. The multidimensional model described earlier proposes that if development agencies share, for instance, the value of water as primary, then such agencies can begin the value matching process with participant communities (Diaz et al., 2008). Obviously nothing is simple or one sided; we propose, however, that everything is value-laden and feelings-focused, even if the feelings are hidden in theoretical layers of social sciences jargon.

In our view, development agencies need to begin their work by advertising their values, truest feelings and guiding principles. All proposed development work ought to stem from the values and deep feelings of the indigenous populations. Christian development organizations are encouraged to share their values and feelings, even as they try to reach out to non-Christian populations. Development organizations, as well as members of targeted populations, are encouraged to rely on feelings and values as guiding principles, and not necessarily on beliefs and doctrines. We contend that a good match of intrinsic values and feelings can foster an effective working relationship and sustainable development more effectively than particular sociological theories.

Nations and organizations promoting socio-economic development must start their work by clearly communicating what they are seeking to gain or accomplish. They should substitute the *White Man's Burden* described by Easterly with the values and feelings that power such burden and communicate it in an upfront manner. They should seek to identify the values and feelings of service recipients and highlight those that represent common ground. The logic of feelings and values, not one of social science's preconceived notions, ought to overtly guide development work. Seeking to attain as close a value and feelings match as possible is a basis for development work. This will be likely to facilitate working relationships of equality and exponentially increase the possibility of success in development work.

References

- Aldrich, D. P., & Meyer, M. A. (2015). Social capital and community resilience. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(2), 254–269.
- Barrett, S. (2009). *Anthropology: A student's guide to theory and method*. University of Toronto Press. Kindle Edition.
- Baum, F. E., & Ziersch, A. M. (2003). Social capital. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 57(5), 320–323. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25570000>
- Bordieu, P. (1985). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241–258). New York: Greenwood.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (2002). Social capital and community governance. *The Economic Journal*, 112(483), 419–436. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/798455
- Carbajal, J., Parsons, J., Pillai, V., Sahelin, M., & Sharma, B. (2012). The effects of participation and resources on democratic attitudes: Role of social capital in four Latin and South American countries. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 38(3), 330–341.
- Couto, R., & Guthrie, C. S. (1999). *Making democracy work better: Mediating structures, social capital, and the democratic prospect*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.
- De Zuñiga, H. G. (2012). Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17, 319–336.
- Díaz, H. L., Ramírez-Johnson, J., Basham, R., & Pillai, V. K. (2008). *Strengthening democracy through community capacity building: A study of four Latin American countries*. Spokane, WA: Marquette Books.
- Durlauf, S. N., & Fafchamps, M. (2004). Social capital. *NBER Working Paper Series, Working Paper 10485*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w10485>
- Easterly, W. (2006). *White man's burden*. New York: Penguin.
- Enderle, G. (2010). Wealth creation in China and some lessons for development ethics: Corporate responsibility and sustainability. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 96, 1–15.
- Felicio, J. A., Couto, E., & Caiado, J. (2014). Human capital, social capital and organizational performance. *Management Decision*, 52(2), 350–364.
- Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D., & Sacerdote, B. (2002). An economic approach to social capital. *The Economic Journal*, 112(483), 437–458. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/798456

- Hanifan, L. J. (1916). The rural school community center. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 67, 130-138.
- Jin, M. (2013). Does social capital promote pro-environmental behaviors? Implications for collaborative governance. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 36(6), 397-407. DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2013.773038.
- Lin, N. (2001). *Social capital: A theory of social structure and action*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers, B. L. (2011). *Walking with the poor: Principles and practices of transformational development* (rev. and expanded ed.). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Narayan-Parker, D., Chambers, R., Shaw, M., & Petesch, P. (2000). *Voices of the poor: Crying out for change*. New York: Oxford University Press for the World Bank.
- Pawar, M. (2006). "Social" "capital"? *The Social Science Journal*, 43, 211-226.
- Pillai, V. K., Díaz, H. L., Basham, R. E., & Ramirez-Johnson, J. (2011). Democratic attitudes and social capital in Latin America. *International Social Work*, 54(6), 767-779.
- Pringle, M., & Welsh, T. (2001). Social capital. *British Medical Journal*, 323(7306), 177. Retrieved from <http://www.bmj.com/archive/>
- Putnam, R. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sachs, J. D. (2005). *The end of poverty: The economic possibilities of our time*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Tsasis, P., Cooke-Lauder, J., & Evans, J. M. (2015). Working together in a complex environment: Collaborative behaviors and social capital. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 38(8), 544-552, DOI: 10.1080/01900692.2014.949749.
- United Nations. (2015). *We can end poverty: Millennium development goals beyond 2015*. New York: United Nations. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>
- Weber, M. (2001). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* (T. Parsons, Trans.). London: Routledge Classics.
- Wink, W. (1992). *Engaging the powers: Discernment and resistance in a world of domination*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Yoon, C., & Wang, Z. (2011). The role of citizenship behaviors and social capital in virtual communities. *Journal of Computer Information*, 52(1), 106-115.