

Review of: "Exploring the Role of Social, Economic, and Cultural Factors in Community Development: A Social Work Perspective in T/A Chimwala, Mangochi"

Rajeshwar Mishra

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Exploring the role of Social, Economic, and Cultural Factors in Community Development: Social Work Perspective in T/A Chimwala, Mangochi

Christina Mercy Zaipa, Daniel Devoted Matemba

This is an important contribution of the authors. The Traditional Authority (TA) approach in the emerging socio-economic dynamics more so in the aftermath of new economic development policy is an ambitious effort. I appreciate authors' priority in a region which has significant influence of the TA. I would like to offer my thoughts on the important components of the paper:

1. The strengths (individual and community) based approach underlies important facet of development which is mediated by socio-economic factors such as education, occupation, social structure etc. There are score of publications covering these. The paper would be more powerful and relevant if the authors could underline saliences which make the effort more poignant and relevance. Review of more literature could have helped comparing the proposed paper. Also, T/A perspective could have been defined and elaborated to make them align with the socio-economic factors,
2. Methodologically, some more work is needed i.e. 'quantitative research with a descriptive design' need to be defined and elaborated. Are the authors talking of a 'qualitative and quantitative' mix? The data is only quantitative. Needs some more clarity on this and accordingly the result need to examined,
3. The 'target population' -what is this-the sample of male and female 18 years and above. The 18 and above is good range -what is the extreme say 18 and 80? If this be so then the response would need to be analyzed accordingly for different age group. A sample belonging to 18-30 category would have a different perspective than something say 50-70 age. They intricacy needs to be understood in the first place and the data analyzed. The sample size is not clear.
4. The variables analyzed on the basis of percentages do not predict level of development -which is more dynamic considering the TA and Strengths perspective and framework. Use of some cases/ anecdotal evidences could have made the findings more realistic.
5. Lack of participation and engagement has been pointed out to be a critical factor in determining the extent of sustainable development. Participation just does not happen! There are catalysts and determinants which need to be understood. Engagement is one such instrument which fosters and facilitates participation. There is rich literature on engagement. Recently Australian Center for Agriculture Research (ACIAR) has used this perspective in their epoch-

making research -SIAGI. They can be accessed to referred to.

6. Some useful references such as Manford and Sanders (2011) are missing from the reference. Revisit them before finalizing.

Considering the above I would suggest revisiting the paper with some additional work on methods and research tools. This can make the paper much more powerful and relevant to the existing literature.