

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY

Batch 66

1. SUBJECT CLASSI- FICATION	A. PRIMARY Food production and nutrition	AE30-0000-G730
	B. SECONDARY Development--Pakistan	

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE
Success and failure in technical assistance, a case study

3. AUTHOR(S)
Green, J.W.

4. DOCUMENT DATE 1961	5. NUMBER OF PAGES 11p.	6. AID NUMBER ARC
--------------------------	----------------------------	----------------------

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS
AID/ASIA/USAID/Pakistan

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES (Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)
(In Human organization, v.20, no.1, p.2-10)

9. ABSTRACT

10. CONTROL NUMBER PN-AAE-323	11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT
12. DESCRIPTORS AID Case studies Pakistan Technical assistance	13. PROJECT NUMBER
	14. CONTRACT NUMBER AID/ASIA/USAID/Pakistan
	15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT

AID/ASIA/US.AID./RICKSTON
PN-AAE-303

**Success and Failure in Technical Assistance:
A Case Study**

James W. Green

Reprinted from *Human Organization*, Volume 20, No. 1
Spring, 1961

Success and Failure in Technical Assistance: A Case Study

James W. Green*

The objective of this paper is to describe an attempt by technical assistance personnel to bring about a basic change in a national program of community development, the successes and failures attendant on this attempt, their approximate causes, and some unanticipated consequences.

It is an example of achieving apparent spectacular success at one stage of a program followed by fewer lasting results of the type anticipated but accompanied by other positive values not originally expected. The procedure used here is to describe an initial problem situation, recount the steps by which the apparent success was achieved, explain why the results were not as lasting as had been hoped for, and give a summary of lessons learned from both successes and failures.

It is hoped that it will contribute to the growing literature of case studies on planned change on the basis of which more valid and reliable generalizations may be made. The description itself may provide some insight into the problems of the several thousand agents of planned change now with the International Cooperation Administration, foundations, the United Nations, etc., working in underdeveloped countries around the world.

The Program

In 1953 the Pakistan government had embarked upon an ambitious national program of coordinated development of its villages in which lived 85 percent of the population. Full descriptions and analyses of this program may be found else-

where.¹ Suffice it to say that this program grew out of a number of previous attempts at village development extending back into the days of British rule, all of which had failed to make appreciable progress owing to several reasons. Chief among these were: 1) the lack of coordination between technical departments each of which worked alone within its own limited technical perspective, with inadequate knowledge of, and skill in, effective methods of approach to the villagers, resulting in an attempt to divide village life into segments in the same manner that the government was departmentalized; 2) lack of sufficient resources by the technical departments which resulted in spasmodic efforts of the "campaign" type; 3) imposition of programs from the top with the result that they were not accepted by the villagers but remained the "government's program"; 4) the secondary place of development activities which were always subordinated in government to the maintenance of law and order and the collection of taxes.

In order to avoid these errors and to obtain coordination of effort and concentration of resources, it was decided to create a new governmental agency which would serve as the common extension arm at the village level of all the technical ministries and agencies of government—agriculture, animal husbandry, cooperatives, adult literacy, preventive public health, cottage industries, etc. The rationale of the new approach was democratic, beginning with the villagers' definitions of their needs and proceeding to assist them in planning and action to achieve their goals—in other words, the process of community development. The principal means of providing this assistance was the multi-purpose, village-level worker who would live in one village and work in the four or five others nearest to his village of residence. Thirty of these workers and the villages they served constituted a development area in charge of a development officer assisted by a staff of technicians, each representing one of the technical

This article is cleared for publication by the International Cooperation Administration. The data, analyses and conclusions are presentations of the author and not necessarily those of ICA.

* From 1954 to 1959 James W. Green, a sociologist, was assigned to the U.S. Operations Mission to Pakistan, serving first as Associate Chief and then Chief Community Development Advisor to the Government of Pakistan.

The author wishes to thank Allan Holmberg for encouraging him to undertake this article in the midst of a busy schedule while a visiting professor at Cornell University. He is also much indebted to William F. Whyte for his constructive remarks and suggestions for improvement of the manuscript. As a reader will note, the liberty has been taken of directly incorporating into the text and footnotes some of Editor Whyte's more sagacious comments.

1. Village AID Administration, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Government of Paki-tan, *Village AID Five Year Plan*, Government of Pakistan Press, Karachi, 1956 and James W. Green, "Rural Community Development in Paki-tan: The Village AID Program," *Community Development Review*, VI (September, 1957), 45-69.

departments.² According to the plan, the development officer was the coordinator, while the technicians were technical backstoppers of the village workers, supposed to assist them with technical problems beyond their capacity and to give them additional technical training to increase their competence gradually to deal with different and more complex problems of the villagers as they emerged. The village worker was to act as "educator—organizer—planner—friend—philosopher—guide" to the villagers in: 1) defining their needs and problems, 2) organizing themselves for planning and action to meet needs and solve problems, and 3) executing these plans with a maximum of reliance upon village resources supplemented when necessary by services and material from governmental agencies. Thus he was to be the link between the villagers on the one hand and the several technical departments on the other.

The Problem

By early 1955, a total of nine training institutes scattered throughout the country had been established, each giving a year of pre-service training to selected young men and a much smaller number of women, designed to fit them to be village-level workers. Several of these institutes had graduated classes in 1954, enough to establish eight development areas. In the eyes of the Village AID officials these institutes were adequately performing the functions for which they were created, it being assumed that minor alterations and modifications in curricula, administration, etc., would be necessary from time to time.

However, a different view was held by several of the ICA agriculturalists, home economists, and public health (sanitation) technicians assigned to the training institutes as advisors. They were generally agreed that both the method and content of teaching were very inadequate to prepare the trainees to become proficient village workers. Most of these advisors felt that their own efforts to bring about improvement were only marginally successful; here and there an institute instructor or principal would accept some assistance and there would be a little improvement. But even in the best of situations the appraisal was that the hard core of the problem remained. There were various definitions of the problem but they generally added up to an almost exclusive use by institute instructors of the lecture method with the result that skills, both of the manipulative type (cropping practices, animal inoculation, castration, etc.) and the human-relations type (initiation of first projects, formation and functioning of village councils, youth clubs, etc.) were not learned. Instead the trainees left the institutes at the end of the year with a certificate and a notebook filled with notes garnered from the instructors' lectures, which, as one principal remarked:

. . . had been copied by these instructors during college lectures given by college professors whose notes had been obtained in the same manner.

Occasional practical application of the ideas taught was

2. However, as late as 1959 only a few of the technicians had actually been assigned.

delegated to a "demonstrator," a junior member of the staff who often had little skill himself.

A further complicating factor was the use of the periods supposed to be devoted to practical application for labor on the institute grounds and on the farmland attached to the institute instead, since the beauty and orderliness of lawns, gardens, etc., were major criteria of success to the visiting officials. There was a constant stream of such visitors, both domestic and foreign, and the "progress" made on buildings, grounds, farms and the accumulation of audio-visual aids, etc., elicited a great amount of praise from them. The visits were themselves the occasion for misuse of instructional time which on the day or two prior to arrival of the visitor was devoted to preparation of the physical setting and on the day of the visit to the repetition by each instructor of a particularly appealing (from the visitor's viewpoint) period of instruction which was staged over and over again for succeeding groups of visitors. Audio-visual aids, which were seldom if ever used otherwise, were brought into play and students were coached on answers to the instructor's questions and those usually asked by visitors. It was difficult not to be impressed unless one chanced to visit the institute more than once or on days when no visitor was expected.³ However dysfunctional these staging practices were in maximizing preparation of the trainees for their roles as village workers, they were not performed solely to gain administrative approval. The officers concerned believed they were necessary to gain for the new agency the approval of the public and the support of the visiting high government officials and members of the provincial and national legislatures without which the agency might not survive. The practices used were quite consistent with those used by other educational institutions in the country.

There was little opportunity for the senior community development advisors assigned to the project to offer advice on the matter as there was no disposition on the part of the institute principals, their superiors the regional directors, or the provincial and central administrators to take seriously such criticism and advice. To have done so would not only have meant an acknowledgment of present error and deficiency, but a tacit admission that the entire system of lecture education which had produced these officials themselves was lacking in its ability to inculcate skills. The inference should not be drawn that there was any disposition to argue the case; on the contrary the matter was ignored, or it was dismissed with statements that this was only a passing stage in the maturing of the institute staff and faculty. As final "proof," the accomplishments of certain villages in which village workers had been placed were proudly pointed out to the visitors. Some of these accomplishments were quite genuine while others were as staged as the class sessions described above.

Field Investigation of Roles

In early 1955, in an effort to break through this apathy, one of the senior advisors (the author) decided to spend

3. This description is a composite of dysfunctional practices from all of the institutes and is not necessarily a description of practices in any one of them.

several months in the villages of the development areas to study the graduates of the training institutes—the village workers. Since it was impossible to bring about change by direct attack on the institute as a social system, the strategy of piecemeal analysis of the system products was employed. It was hoped that the results of such an analysis might provide the entree to the system itself—just how was not foreseen at the time.

The enquiry employed the method of role analysis. Workers to be interviewed were selected from lists provided by development officers who were asked to list all of their workers in order of quality of performance. Three to four were selected from the top third, and an equal number from the lower third. If time permitted, one or more from the middle third were also visited. The procedure consisted of a semi-structured interview using open-ended questions and lasting from two to four hours.

The chronological approach was found to be most useful in eliciting uninhibited responses and thus revealing the extent to which the worker felt adequately prepared to perform in consonance with his own expectations and those of the villagers and his supervisors. Essentially this approach consisted of asking the worker to recall, in order, each act related to his job performed since entering the village, beginning with the day of entry. As each event was recounted nondirective questions of the type "Tell me more about that," and "What made you do it that way?" were asked to procure a full response regarding the worker's own rationale for his action. He was encouraged to talk freely about any phase of his work which occurred to him, the interviewer using some such question as "What did you do next?" to bring about a transition from phase to phase.

In almost all cases respondents accepted the interviewer's explanation for the study to the effect that, as a foreign advisor, he could not give sound advice to the government on training and administration unless he could understand the key role in the entire program, the village worker's, all other roles having their *raison d'être* in supporting it. As the interview proceeded and the interviewee became preoccupied with remembering, he became much less inhibited and gave information concerning his actions and motivations and those of the villagers which was very frank and could not have been elicited by direct questioning. Usually in the course of the interview the worker would appraise various aspects of the training he had received at the training institute in explaining why he did or did not take the actions under discussion. At the conclusion of the interview he was asked to evaluate his training in terms of the demands of the situation as he had experienced them. In a final attempt to get at the adequacy of his training, he was asked to construct an ideal curriculum and to outline methods of teaching for three months of special study at a training institute which he believed would better prepare him to meet the expectations of his role.

In order to provide further insight into the worker's role and as a check on the accuracy of his role description, the interview was followed by a tour of his villages (at this stage he had usually worked in only one or two of them) during the course of which each project mentioned by him, such as the construction of a road, school, dispensary, or street drains,

the establishment of agricultural demonstrations, the organization of a youth club and village council, etc., was visited. The village people were given an opportunity to discuss the projects and the role of the worker in them. In some instances they volunteered opinions which had a bearing on the type of further training they believed the worker should be given in order to make him more useful to their village.

Role Analyses

Analyses of these interviews and observations in general supported the descriptions made earlier of the institute training programs. For example, in one orcharding area village workers had been posted for more than a year. Yet there were no demonstrations or other evidences of efforts to teach the orchardists how to prune their trees. The reason for this soon became evident when the workers described their training at the institute as consisting only of lectures on pruning. No demonstrations had been given during this training nor had they had an opportunity to practice any of the principles taught in the classroom. Consequently, the workers were quite without confidence in their ability to give assistance in meeting the needs which a number of orchardists had expressed for this type of help. A later visit to the horticulturalist instructor at the institute at which the workers had been trained revealed the reason for the lack of functional training. This instructor was a bright young man, holder of a B.Sc. degree in horticulture from an agricultural college and eager to give the best instruction he could. When presented with the evidence of the inability of his former students to perform, he candidly admitted that he himself was quite as unable as his students to prune trees. As he explained it, he too had been trained only in the theory of pruning and had been given no practical training in the art of selecting and cutting. He, like they, did not dare to take the responsibility for possible mutilation of trees which constituted the source of livelihood of the orchardists.

The results were much the same in other sectors of the village worker's role. He had been taught to cull poultry—but without touching a hen. He had been told how to organize village councils, youth clubs and literacy classes, but had not been given an opportunity to practice these skills under the supervision of the institute instructors, either in mock sessions or in village situations. As a consequence his level of confidence in himself was often too low for him to initiate action with the village people in areas of primary concern to them.

Lest it be thought that there had been no real accomplishments in the villages, further observations are required. In village after village substantial progress was in evidence. There were roads connecting villages to main roads where only footpaths had served for hundreds of years. There were new school buildings in villages with 95 percent illiteracy. Some new varieties of crops were being grown, the demand for artificial fertilizer had greatly increased, small-pox vaccination campaigns had resulted in high rates of population coverage, etc. In spite of the village worker's obvious inadequacies, he had been able to stimulate action where only inaction and apathy had reigned for generations. However, this was not so much due to his skill as to the long pent-up

demand for these services, a demand which was coupled with villagers' willingness to give of their land for road and school sites, of their labor to build these and other amenities, etc. The village worker seemed to serve as an organizer and "legitimizing" for these activities, functions which were given additional validity in the eyes of the villagers by the availability of grant-in-aid funds to assist village projects which could gain the support of the people and the recommendation of the worker. In spite of these accomplishments the workers and their supervisors were aware that the "original-demand" type of projects was rapidly being exhausted and that the type of skills required by workers for the long pull were not in evidence.

The Plan: Teaching-Methods Workshops

As the field work and analyses of village worker roles were completed for a province, the results in the form of a brief written report were presented to the chief administrator by the senior advisor who had made the study. A total of four were eventually submitted. Each was organized in essentially the same manner beginning with a designation of the development areas studied, followed by a description of the method of field work and analysis, a list of the chief findings, and general recommendations for correcting deficiencies. Content was remarkably alike for all four. It depicted village workers of several degrees of effectiveness, but nearly all deficient in most of the basic manual and human-relations skills recognized by the workers themselves as essential for long-term effectiveness. Descriptions by the workers of the training they had received in the institutes showed almost exclusive reliance on the lecture method by their instructors and, in general, affirmed the definitions of the training situation reported earlier by the advisors.

The first of these reports was ignored by the chief administrator except for a perfunctory acknowledgment. However, the second one found its mark and produced a rather violent explosion in the form of a denial of the validity of the data and the analyses. After all he, the chief administrator, had spent a great deal of time in touring both institutes and development areas and he *knew* the situation to be very different from that reported. However, he did calm down eventually and listen to the explanation of the procedure used and to the rather blunt statement that he too would see the same things if he adopted the approach of the seeker of insight and understanding of the village workers, rather than that of the touring high official who heard only what his subordinates and the villagers believed he wanted to hear. As stark as it was, this advice was accepted.⁴ On his next tour, he delved much deeper than before with the purpose of gaining an appreciation of the roles of the workers as they themselves had experienced them.

By the time of the arrival of the third and fourth reports, the chief's attitude had changed markedly and he was eager to discuss the matter and to ask for help from the advisory staff in preparing the workers to perform their roles properly. The analyses had clearly indicated that little improvement was likely unless the system of institute teaching was radically changed from the prevailing lectures to a functional type designed to inculcate both manipulative and human relations skills. It was also obvious that the desired changes could not occur simply by giving individual instructors new techniques; it was necessary to change the social system, the institute of which they were a part. This was true because in functional teaching the explanatory step, the demonstration, the supervised application, and the practical testing should follow each other as closely as possible in order to maximize learning. Thus the usual 45- or 50-minute period common in the institutes had to be changed and a schedule devised each week based on requirements of each skill to be taught. For example, in teaching a simple skill in first aid it is possible to give an explanation, demonstration, have the students practice under supervision, and even conclude with a practical test and critique all in about one and one-half hours, whereas teaching the previously-referred-to skill of orchard pruning may require an entire day or even two days, especially if the orchard is some distance from the institute and considerable time is required in getting back and forth. For the same reasons the requirement for scheduling blocks of time applies to all instructional visits to villages for the teaching of organizational and other human-relations skills, and to most of the remaining curricula.

Aside from scheduling, a second major reason for dealing with the institute as a whole was the necessity for establishing a new set of goals for training, of functional standards of evaluation, of norms regarding the amount of preparation and the conduct of teaching, etc. The amount of work involved for the instructor in functional teaching is obviously much greater than in simple lecturing. Unless this larger quantum of work became the norm, it was reasoned, the instructors would soon revert to the lecture method.

Accordingly, it was proposed to the chief administrator, in response to his request for assistance, that the entire faculty of each institute be given training as a group in the functional method of teaching. This was readily agreed to and a letter was issued to each of the provincial directors informing him of the decision and asking that he cooperate with the group of advisors who had consented to perform this task.

The issuance of this letter had been preceded by informal conversations between the chief administrator and the provincial directors but they had not been involved formally in making the decision. Although the provinces were semiautonomous units, the community development program depended upon the central government for more than half of its support. This factor, together with the high personal esteem in which the chief was held, produced a willing agreement on the part of the directors, although very little involvement in the process of decision-making itself. This lack of involvement proved later to be a critical factor in institutionalizing the change.

4. The editor's observations on this point contained in a letter to the author are instructive: "You go on to describe a rather blunt confrontation which apparently got results. Since many consultants see themselves as rather permissive types, this departure from their expectations is quite significant. This confrontation approach, however, is not unprecedented in the literature, as Chris Argyris explicitly takes this line in a recent article, 'Creating Effective Research Relationships in Organizations,' *Human Organization*, XVII, No. 1 (Spring, 1958).

Conduct of the Workshops

The instructional group consisted of three ICA advisors who carried the brunt of the teaching load, with four other advisors in the role of assistant instructors. A period of three weeks was found to be the minimum required for the instruction. This was usually scheduled during the interval between training cycles at an institute after one "batch" of trainees had completed their training and before the arrival of the next. The usual pre-workshop procedure was to discuss the training with the provincial director and the principal and to gain their approval of the overall instructional plan.

As previously mentioned, the objective of the instruction was to make the principal and institute instructors (a total of eight to fourteen per institute) proficient in the application of the functional teaching method in everyday instruction at the institute, and to bring about such changes in the institute as a social system as would permit this application. The subject matter of instruction of the workshop consisted of the five steps in the functional teaching method: 1) thorough preparation on the part of the instructor and his assistants; 2) a brief explanation designed to motivate and to provide a scientific or other explanation of the skill to be taught; 3) an accurate demonstration of the skill [steps (2) and (3) were sometimes combined]; 4) supervised practical application by the students; and 5) a practical and theoretical test of the student's ability to understand and to perform the skill.

In carrying out instructions on each of these steps, the advisor-instructors meticulously followed each of the five steps. For example in teaching step 1, preparation, the advisor-instructors thoroughly prepared themselves and the assistant instructors; prepared a lesson plan, training aids, etc.; gave a brief explanation of the bases and methods of preparation; performed a thorough demonstration of how to prepare a particular skill for teaching; supervised the class as they prepared a lesson plan and made ready for two skills in their own field of specialization; and finally, gave a test, in two parts, on preparation, one on the theory and the other consisting of a lesson plan for a third skill in their field. The whole was followed by a critique of the entire teaching process concerned with preparation (step 1). Each of the other steps was similarly treated, the members of the class following through with the three skills from their own fields as described for step 1, preparation.

The whole process of instruction was carried on in a highly permissive atmosphere which was very different from the almost complete authoritarian pattern followed in the schools and colleges from which the workshop participants (institute faculties) had come and which they used in their own classes at the institutes. For example, participants were encouraged to ask questions at any time, to express disagreement with any views, and above all to check on the performance of the instructor to determine the extent of conformity or deviation of his performance from the ideal patterns established for each step. To ensure that participants would actually measure the instructor's performance, each participant was given a score card with weighted criteria. At the end of each presentation, time was allotted for discussion of the performance of the instructor and of each class member. The old saw "If the student has not learned, the teacher has not taught" was

adopted as the literal motto of the workshops and was used as the most important measure of the quality of teaching.

After the second workshop, it was possible to predict with considerable accuracy the changes in participant response. At first they were extremely polite, a protective device to mask their considerable fear of the whole procedure. After all, they were to be graded upon their performance and the grades were to be sent to higher headquarters which evidently attached very great importance to them. As soon as it was apparent that the advisor-instructors were not going to impose sanctions for free expression, but in fact demanded it, fear began to give way to pent-up expressions of frustration and indignity. The principals and senior instructors were particularly resentful that they, with their many years of experience, seniority and often a master's degree, were being popped into a classroom as if they were schoolboys again. However, by the time the third step, demonstration, was reached the participants had become quite fully involved in the whole process and were increasingly committing themselves to full effort to meet the class expectations and those of the small work groups to which they were assigned.

It was also at about this time that several of the participants became panic-stricken in trying to select a skill in their own field which they dared demonstrate before the class. It had been relatively easy to work up lesson plans and to give explanations of skills, but it became quite another thing to follow through with a demonstration in front of their colleagues each of whom was scoring the performance. The first two required only verbal skills, but the demonstration required an ability to perform the skill, step by step, with a degree of proficiency gained only through considerable experience. The panic resulted in attempts to have the advisor-instructors assume the responsibility of selection. When this failed, a number of the participants let down all barriers and confessed to the advisor-assistant teachers that they did not feel confident enough of their ability to demonstrate a single skill in their own technical field! The explanation was simple: they themselves had been trained in a lecture system and had never performed the skill, or had done so only once or twice. There were veterinarians who had never castrated a bull calf; animal husbandry men who had never culled poultry; horticulturists who had never pruned a tree; extension-methods educators who had never organized any kind of activity, club or council in the village, etc.

Confessions of this sort were always given in confidence to the advisor-teachers who then sought to help the participant analyze his field, select those skills with which he had had the greatest amount of experience, and practice these privately until he had gained the requisite level of confidence in his ability. This led to successful demonstrations before the class which brought about a radical change in attitudes—from one of carping criticism to pride of accomplishment, from fear and panic to confidence in his technical and professional competence. This change was further enhanced during the fourth and fifth steps, supervised application and testing, when to technical and professional competence were added confidence in their own teaching ability. Groups of trainees had been retained at the institute for the duration of the workshop for use of the participants. Each participant presented each step (explanation, demonstration, etc.) to the trainees with

the other participants seated in the rear. As the workshop progressed to the application and testing stages it became evident to the participants that the functional method actually produced the results claimed for it: in an amazingly short period of time the trainees were able not only to perform the skill with efficiency but to teach it to others. Thus it was not uncommon to have "testimonies" given during evaluation sessions by the participants to the effect that they had "never really taught before this workshop" but had only "lectured at" the trainees.

Curricula Reconstruction

As indicated above, it had been obvious from the beginning that functional teaching could not be practiced successfully within a framework of 45- to 50-minute periods but required scheduling of each period to meet its own peculiar time and timing demands. Accordingly, two to three days were set aside at the end of the workshop for this purpose. First, each member of the institute faculty listed all of the skills in his field which he thought necessary for the training of the village workers, the blocks of time required for teaching each skill to maximize learning, and the time of the year when it should be taught. Using our previous example of the tree-pruning skill, it might be decided to devote an entire day to the four steps of the teaching process on the assumption that it requires eight hours for complete teaching of the skill. This might be divided as follows: explanation—30 minutes; demonstration—60 minutes; supervised practical work—5 hours; and testing and critique—90 minutes. Devotion of an entire day would be particularly desirable if the orchards were distant from the institute. On the other hand, if the orchards were adjacent, the practical work might be divided into halves thus making two four-hour periods scheduled on successive days. Other skills such as organizing a village council might require a succession of visits to a village in the evenings for about three hours each when the villagers were available. Other skills are adaptable to all sorts of hour combinations such as 1—3, 2—4—1, etc.

When all skills were listed by all instructors and a total obtained of the hours required, it was usually found to be fifty to one hundred percent greater than the hours available in a year's course. This made it necessary for each instructor to rank his skills in order of priority of importance. When this had been done a review board composed of the institute principal, the regional (provincial) director when available, one or two development officers, and one or two advisors was convened. Each instructor in turn presented his proposed curriculum to the review board and defended it as best he could against cuts. In some instances hours were added to the instructional time for certain skills which the board considered of highest priority, especially when it was evident that the instructor had not taught this skill before and had no base of experience upon which to judge the time required. More commonly, the board eliminated so-called skills which were considered marginal to the needs of the village workers. Through this process the offerings of the instructors was brought into line with the hours available.

The final procedure was one of teaching the principal and instructors how to put together a schedule made up of

the various time blocks required by the skills to be taught at a particular season. One of the advisors had had experience in such schedule making while serving as a staff officer in the army and had presumed that the technique could be learned easily, an assumption which proved to be quite false. In addition to this factor, both the advisors and faculty were quite exhausted from the arduous work of the workshop. Other demands, deferred during the workshop, were making themselves felt especially on the principal and the advisors. As a result, far too little time was scheduled for this exercise and even less given to it. In terms of our functional teaching model, instruction had progressed little beyond the demonstration stage and the institute was usually left with only two or three weeks of a schedule worked out and ready for application. Before this period had expired, the advisory group, including the advisors assigned to the institute, were usually off to another teaching-methods or other type of workshop and were not available either to stimulate the faculty to undertake further schedule construction or to assist them with its mechanics.

The author agrees with the comments made by the editor at this point:

I suspect that your advisors were happiest when they were actually teaching and demonstrating and looked upon curriculum revision as more of a chore. Quite naturally they underestimated the complexities of the task involved in curriculum revision. The workshop could be handled on a direct person-to-person basis. Curriculum revision really involves redesigning the whole institution, including reshaping of the interpersonal relations among the members of the teaching faculty and between teachers and principal.⁵

Apparent Success and Failure

Although these workshops were very demanding on the advisory group, their morale was high. Their feeling of accomplishment was great for they had seen take place far greater changes in the competence of the faculties than had been observable since the institutes opened. They felt that their efforts were highly important in raising the quality of a program whose basic values they shared. There was no doubt in their minds that the changes they had helped to bring about were permanent because they had followed all the "rules" in making the changes possible.

As further proof of accomplishment the advisors were recipients of earnest requests from participants for assistance in conducting subject-matter workshops on skills in the various fields represented by the participants—agronomy, animal husbandry, health, cottage industry, adult literacy, program planning, youth work, home economics, etc. These requests represented a complete about-face from the prevailing attitudes before the workshop. To have admitted previously that one needed to have additional subject-matter training was impossible, but now it was accepted by practically all that each one needed to increase his technical competence. Thus the advisors came into great demand for arranging a highly effective method of technical assistance which continued

5. Contained in a personal letter to the author.

for several years, a result which had not been anticipated before the first workshops were held. From the position of being largely tolerated, the advisors were suddenly in great demand. Although the accounts of these subject-matter workshops is not a part of our present story, it may be noted that many series of such were held not only for institute principals and instructors but also for administrators, development officers, and specialists from the various agencies involved in community development such as communications media, agriculture, etc.

Yet, a year after completion of the teaching-methods workshop series a survey revealed that all institutes were back on the old 45- or 50-minute period schedule, altered to be sure to permit more time in the field but not conforming to the basic prerequisites of functional teaching methods.

What then was the explanation for this apparent failure of the institute as a social system to change when such large resources of time and manpower had been invested; when the canons of good planning and good teaching had been followed; when marked changes in individual attitudes and in the level of competencies had been observed? The answer to this question was not difficult to find; in fact, it became evident during the process of discovering the failure.

The first and probably most important reason was insufficient involvement in the project of the significant power figures, the provincial directors. As indicated above, these directors were the immediate superiors of the institute principals and as such largely determined institute policy. The position of institute principal was a rather high and sought after one in the Village AID hierarchy. However, since the agency itself was temporary, the principal had no long-term right to his position but could be removed at the will of the director. [Only some years later were the positions filled under civil service rules.] Thus at this time the principals largely took their cues from the directors.

Involvement of the directors was insufficient in two respects: the decision to have the workshops and the actual conduct of the workshops themselves. At the conclusion of the initial field analysis of worker roles in each region, the advisor had discussed the results with the region's director. But the decision to run workshops was made later entirely by the chief administrator who told the directors of his intentions and obtained their consent. Not being satisfied themselves with the institutes they readily agreed particularly since the work was to be done by others. Each one was invited to the opening exercises of the workshop in his institutes, but he was not encouraged to stay as it was felt that the participants (principal and instructors) would be intimidated by his presence. It might be added that it is highly unlikely that any of the directors would have participated as students or even as observers since they were extremely busy administrators with many duties other than those pertaining to the institutes. Each of the directors was invited to the last sessions of their institutes for reconstruction of the curricula but only two of the five were able to come. As a result, the directors failed to change their criteria for judging the institute performance to include measures of either functional teaching or of block scheduling which would make such teaching possible. Since the director did not follow through with requirements for the institutes, the principal

could see no point in going to all the trouble involved. Besides things were never quite so orderly and systematic under this procedure with classes often scattered far and wide. For example, it was not possible to gather them quickly and to put on the usual impressive show for visitors arriving on short notice.

A second reason, perhaps of equal importance with the first, for nonadoption was the lack of sufficient skill by the principal and faculty in constructing the schedules. This was aggravated by the almost continuous absence from the institutes of the assigned advisors in the weeks following the completion of the workshops when they might have consolidated the gains made. Although their knowledge of the scheduling procedure was not entirely adequate, they would probably have been able to assist the principal and faculty in its mechanics. But even more importantly they would have provided an impetus to continue it. Their participation in the workshop in most cases had considerably raised their status with the principal and staff who had been their students. Also to some extent they were now identified as agents of the chief administrator and it was obviously his desire that the results of the workshop be applied. However, this was not to be, as all available advisors were pressed into service to complete this series of workshops at other institutes or to arrange for other series on subject matter, a strong demand for which had been generated by the first. Thus the advisors swept on from workshop to workshop usually with the feeling of great accomplishment in upgrading the competencies of the participants, but with no one at home "minding the store."⁶

These additional series of workshops further served to unsettle the institutes and to make more difficult but by no means impossible, the application of the new procedure. Each required from two to three weeks which, according to the principals, so reduced their already inadequate faculties that they could not continue the system. In some instances this was quite valid in that the absent instructor was the only one who had really learned the process of functional scheduling. In others it was only an attempt to shift responsibility for not doing something they felt only marginally competent to do. Besides it required more work which was apparently not sufficiently appreciated by the directors.

In addition to these observable causes, it is probable that there was a latent element of aversion remaining from the first few days of the workshop experience. As explained earlier, considerable apprehension and fear of the workshop was felt by the participants which eventually found expression during later workshop sessions. After all the workshop represented a direct attack upon some of their most fundamental

6. The editor's comment here is most appropriate: "This experience also suggests a further general point. In a country which needs men of the skill of these advisors so badly, the chances are that whenever they achieve a success at one location, they are likely to be in great demand to go elsewhere and do the same task in another location. In other words, the administrative pressures to spread the program rapidly weigh against the need to stay with a given local situation until the new ways of doing things are firmly established. I suspect this is a very general problem. Related to this is probably the very natural reaction of the advisors who found the workshop experience highly rewarding psychologically. Having achieved such a tremendous success here, they were naturally inclined to repeat the psychologically rewarding experiences rather than becoming involved in the less exciting complexities of curriculum revision."

and cherished assumptions about their own status and the basic functions they performed. In addition, in spite of the radical change which did occur in attitudes and overt behavior during the sessions, the workshops always remained an imposition from the top. Since the participants had not been consulted and sold on the idea before its initiation (which would probably have been impossible to do) they were anxious to complete their formal obligations. These they felt, were ended with conclusion of the workshop. Thus the authoritative approach which had brought about the workshop itself may also have been a factor in lack of follow-up action once the basic requirements of the authorities had been met.

A fifth and final factor will be mentioned, the inevitable relaxation of effort following three weeks of very strenuous work—declared by many participants to be the most arduous of their lives.

Unanticipated Consequences

It should not be thought that, because the avowed purposes of the workshop had been only partially achieved, there were no positive, although unanticipated, results. In fact, later evaluations showed the workshops to be the turning point in V-AID history—the point when improved quality became a goal, and training at all levels the accepted method.

First of these specific consequences was a much greater acceptance by the V-AID administration of the methods of scientific analysis and evaluation as tools of administration. It was recognized that the workshop could not have taken place without the analyses of the roles of village workers which preceded it and which were compelling forces on the chief administrator to order them in the face of the contrary forces of traditional education. As mentioned above, his own subsequent behavior was considerably altered in the approach to lower-level echelons in the administration, especially the village workers and villagers. From the visiting high official and inspector he became more of an enquirer, a seeker after the kind of understandings which the village worker and the villagers had, less inclined to take the usual symbols of progress at their face value. The same may be said for some of the immediate superiors of the village workers, the supervisors and development officers who were present for many of the interviews of their workers. It was obvious that they too were gaining a great deal of new information, and in many cases were reforming their judgments of the village workers and reconstructing their conceptions of his role. Even more important, they were gaining a respect for the point of view of their workers and an appreciation for the method of investigation which produced these insights. However, it is not known to what extent they applied the method in the subsequent conduct of their daily supervision.

The second, and perhaps the most significant, result of the workshops was the almost complete change in the acceptance of the advisors and the use made of them. From one of toleration, attitudes shifted to active seeking of assistance. Quite suddenly, advisors were in great demand to arrange other workshops and short courses to assist in evaluating other phases of the field work and to advise on all aspects of the program. In the following three years they were kept so busy that vacations and ordinary leisure became only

memories. For those who had been there in the pre-workshop days, the change was almost intoxicating—to feel wanted, to have one's capacities used to the utmost, to be able to see drastic changes taking place in individual capacities and in the ability of sub-units to function more effectively.

However, the opportunity to use the advisors' talents required their display. The workshops had set very high standards of performance and these were used by the Pakistanis to judge the contributions of the advisors. This proved to be the undoing of a number of them, especially those whose training was in technical agriculture and whose experience had been confined to the teaching of agriculture in an American high school or to the role of county agricultural agent. Their "practical" skills had made them quite useful in the early years of the program for ordering and assembling farm machinery and equipment, for assisting in the construction of the institutes, for establishing the basic curricula, in short for "getting the program started." During the teaching methods workshops these advisors were used as assistant teachers under the close supervision of two senior advisors and their performance generally met expectations. But as they began to move out on their own and to be confronted with problems with which they had not previously dealt, the inadequacies of their frames of reference and of their training in the scientific methods of analysis and problem-solving became painfully evident. They had no ready-made answers and no means of finding answers to such problems as: 1) instituting systems of personnel management which would be democratically oriented and permissive enough to encourage the type of initiative required for development, as opposed to the authoritarian type which had worked quite well in a system dedicated to preservation of law and order and the collection of taxes; 2) the establishment of procedures for self-evaluation in the development areas and of *ad hoc* units for somewhat more formal evaluations at the regional and provincial levels; 3) the creation of staff training centers for training development officers, specialists and administrators to administer a program in such a manner, for example, as to keep open the channels of communication from the village upward on which the whole rationale of the program rested; 4) the analytical procedures for long-range comprehensive program planning at the lower levels as a basis for constructing national "five-year" plans and bringing about operational coordination with the field representatives of the ministries of agriculture, health, industry, cooperatives, etc., which the V-AID organization was created to serve, and whose personnel were more often than not jealous and afraid of this new agency.

There were two or three exceptions: intelligent individuals who were able to grow somewhat with the situation and to exploit unique phases of their previous training and experience. But for the most part these types of advisors, not only in agriculture but to a lesser extent in health, cottage industry, and home economics, were found wanting and few were asked to return for a second tour. Instead sociologists, anthropologists, and public administrators were in demand, based partly on the performance of the few such individuals in Pakistan and partly on contacts made with university professors during training in the United States.

The editor's summary comment at this point is quite valid:

. . . perhaps in the beginning stages of such a program, there is a great demand for people who know specific techniques. At a later stage, the man who only knows techniques is of little help, and the demand is for men with skills in planning, organizing, and administering.⁷

Not only did the teaching-methods workshops lead to instruction in substantive technical areas, but they were invaluable guides in the formulation of curricula and methods for training abroad of the institute principals and teachers, development officers, directors, etc. The workshop experience made it possible to construct tailor-made programs of training at American universities, and in third countries, which would have been impossible without the insight acquired through prolonged and intensive interaction in the workshops.

Retrospect

It is probably obvious that field investigation and analysis at the lowest levels of the bureaucracy were essential to initiation of any change in the system. There was comparatively little resistance to analysis at this level as it seemed to pose little or no threat to those interviewed. The method used, role analysis, was actually enjoyed by many of the respondents. It is a highly personalized approach consistent with the norms of a primary group society. It proved to be a powerful tool for procuring insights not otherwise obtainable (many of which were not described in the above account.)

Thus, research of this operational *ad hoc* type may be necessary to the success of the change agent. Research techniques must be adapted to the problem context to meet current needs and not for the sake of research or for meeting the publication needs of the researcher. In fact, the agent must usually be willing to forego publication until it can in no way be viewed by the administrators as damaging to either themselves or to their organization.

Training as a means of instituting change is most effective when the entire instructional process can be controlled and directed toward one goal. This is necessary to be able to create new norms which can be accepted and applied by all the members. For example, the instructors learned a number of new skills which they wanted to practice. Many of these skills required them to get their hands dirty and to perform menial operations, both of which were inconsistent with the usual norms considered appropriate to their status as men of superior education occupying government positions. For two years they had observed the examples of advisors carrying out such operations as removing manure and building compost pits without being moved to do so themselves. But they were not only willing, even eager, to engage in dirty-hands jobs when all of their colleagues did likewise and when the

functional necessities of doing so became apparent to them in the workshops.

A final observation may be made on the "success" side concerning the effectiveness of the five-stage functional teaching method. In the workshops it was found to be as highly efficient in teaching both the manipulative and human-relations skills as it had been in the allied armies during World War II. Perhaps its more widespread use would similarly result in reducing the time required for the underdeveloped countries to train their millions in the multiple skills required for reaching the takeoff into sustained economic growth before they are inundated by their own population increase.

Let us turn now to a final examination of the failure to institutionalize the complete process of functional teaching for which the workshops were initiated. In looking back, it is easy enough to point out the deficiencies in procedures followed and to state that had this or that been done, or done in a different manner, or not done, the consequences would have contributed better to the attainment of the goals sought. However, it is by no means certain that the central "error" could have been avoided and the directors brought into a more positive commitment to the decision to hold the workshops or to have participated more fully in them. This is because of the suspicion and fear in which four of the five directors held the advisor who made the village-worker role analyses. Since he was known to be a trained sociologist intent upon analyzing their personnel, he posed a threat to them, especially as his findings were to go to the very top of the administrative hierarchy. This fear and suspicion were not dispelled by the advisor's disclaimers that his findings were only for the purpose of gaining a better understanding for policy guidance and not a tool of administrative inspection.

The central point here is that the directors did not change their attitudes to the advisor until after the teaching-methods workshops, and some of the technical ones which followed, had demonstrated that these were positive tools for use by the directors and not potential punitive measures. Thus it would probably not have been possible to have gained their enthusiastic support at the particular time required to institutionalize the workshop results. Perhaps the lesson here is that in technical assistance we should not expect to bring about so drastic a change as the one attempted and described in this paper by means of one sequence of actions no matter how well planned and executed, because *certain actions of a sequence may be dependent for their execution upon a change which can occur only consequent to the actions themselves*. This does not argue for less thoroughness in planning and in execution, for less effort to involve in the planning all those required in execution, for application in full measure of the best teaching techniques we know, etc. Rather, the conclusion is that we may expect success only up to the point where actions are to occur which are not dependent upon subsequent actions, and that we may expect other positive results which are not fully or at all anticipated.

7. Contained in a personal letter to the author.