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ABSTRACT

Challenges in addressing policies and wellbeing of marginalized communities and a shift from the top down approaches to pluralistic and participatory community development has led to community groups taking a more active role in development. This requires documentation of the contributions such groups are making towards development, in order to align and address the needs of the community and the households within. The purpose of this study was to investigate the role played by Collective Action Groups (CAGs) operating in Makindu sub-county in improving the socio-economic wellbeing of the community. This study utilized a correlation research design. The study area was selected purposively due its climate, number of agro-pastoral households and the existence of functional CAGs. Stratified random sampling was used to select 204 households that were members of CAGs within the seven locations of Makindu sub-county. Household heads were then interviewed using a structured interview schedule to collect both qualitative and quantitative data using a 7 point semantic differential scales. The subjective and objective responses to the 28 items used as indicators of wellbeing were then converted into scores and added together to form an index of socio-economic wellbeing (SEWB) with a Cronbach alpha of .854. The data was analyzed using both descriptive (means and frequencies) and inferential statistics (Chi-square test) in a Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 21). The study revealed that: there were 159 CAGs involved in nine different activities (financial, work sharing, training, marketing of produce, farm implements, burial activities, building materials health care and peace initiatives. The SEWB of the members was found to be low (mean of 1.99 on a scale of 1-5). The members perceived that the CAGs were significantly \( p<.05 \) useful (mean 3.96 on a scale of 1-5) in improving their SEWB. The CAGs were found to have a high contribution (mean 5.41 on a scale of 1-7) and the members who ranked the contribution highly were significantly \( \text{Chi-square } 101.64, \text{ df } 1, p=.01 \) more than the ones who ranked it as medium. The study concluded that Collective Action Groups play a significant role in improving the socio-economic wellbeing of now settled Agro-pastoralists in marginalized communities. The recommendation of the study is that, majority of the problems encountered by agro-pastoralists can be managed sustainably through Collective action groups. NGOs and the government can find a trustworthy and significant development partner in the collective action groups within Makindu sub-county.
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