

**ORGANIZATIONAL
CONSIDERATIONS
FOR INTEGRATED
RURAL
DEVELOPMENT**

Paper prepared for the 1981 Rural Project Organization and Management Course, Economic Development Institute, The World Bank.

Gene M. Owens
George H. Honadle

October 1981



Development Alternatives, Inc. 624 Ninth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20001

-1-

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	3
DEFINING INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT	4
ORGANIZATION DESIGN AS ANTICIPATION OF IMPLEMENTATION	
DIFFICULTIES	6
Controversies Surrounding Organizational	
Structure	7
Physical Size or Area Covered	8
Technology and Human Capabilities	8
Stability of the Decisionmaking	
Environment	9
Social Culture	9
Objectives, Strategies, and Key Implementation	
Activities	10
A Contingency Approach	12
CHOOSING AN ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGY	13
COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION	16
Organizational Intervention as a Process	21
Selected Bibliography	22

2-

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figures</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Organizational Placement Alternatives and Tradeoffs	14
2	Organizational Mechanisms to Increase Coordination	15
3	Force Field Assessment	17
4	Organizational Placement	18
5	Micro Design	19

INTRODUCTION

Why focus on organization? Isn't it true that if a project is economically, technically and financially sound then it will work? Unfortunately, the world is not so simple. Although organization is not the sole determinant of success, it does make a difference. As Peter Drucker has observed,

...the best structure will not guarantee results and performance. But the wrong structure is a guarantee of non-performance. All it produces is friction and frustration. The wrong organization puts the spotlight on the wrong issues, aggravates internal weaknesses and defects instead of strengths. The right organizational structure is thus a prerequisite of performance (Drucker, 1974:519).

Keeping this in mind, this paper addresses four issues of organization design for integrated rural development:

- What are the variables influencing organizational strategies for integrated rural projects in terms of project scope, complexity, substantive objectives, target group focus and other factors?
- What kind of organization should be designed--whether area-focused, functionally differentiated, or project oriented--and to whom and for what is the organization held accountable?
- How does one build an organization based on the technical and social environment in which the project operates? Then, what are the mechanisms for transforming and adapting the structure as the project unfolds? and
- Is the organization designed for the long-term? What is its capacity, not only to survive but also to continue meeting set objectives?

Selection of an organizational strategy for implementing IRD projects involves the determination of both the level of intervention and the institutional host for the IRD effort. Organizational placement is important because it determines who the subsequent decision makers in the IRD project will be, how many of them there are, and what they decide upon. It affects a project's success by determining budgetary procedures, and thus incentives,

management control, and the complexity of the decision-making process. Experience suggests that the organizational locus of IRD projects have led to serious problems during project implementation.

In essence, organizational placement determines the pattern of interactions between various actors involved in implementation. An organizational linkage, then, is any formal or informal mechanism used during implementation to bring about the coordination of the efforts of two or more organizations. The success of this coordination is the crux of the organizational linkage question. Moreover, the long run concern is how organizational placement influences the capacity, and the willingness, of communities to manage their own affairs. Thus, the aims of organization design should be to facilitate coordination through linkages and to anticipate change by building into the implementing structures the capacity for self-transformation as the project unfolds.

There is no neat formula which can be used to optimize organization design. The state of our knowledge is such that we cannot categorically state which organizational placement strategy is most appropriate given certain conditions. All strategies have their advantages and their problems. However, by examining these problems, we should be able to specify in more detail which strategies are more appropriate than others. That is the aim of this paper.

DEFINING INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The concept of integrated rural development (IRD) grew out of the several conflicting concerns of developmental theorists that early developmental strategies were not, in effect, redistributive. As international assistance programs shifted their focus from industrial to agricultural development, in the mid-1960s, they were preoccupied with increasing commercial agricultural output, virtually ignoring problems of the rural poor and disregarding the overall productivity of rural areas as components of a larger national system. As a result, food production increased only incrementally, rural-urban migration continued rapidly, and the quality of rural life deteriorated steadily. (Rondinelli, 1976:1; Grindle, 1981:2)

In addition, Vernal Ruttan notes that emerging integrated rural programs were a reaction to single focused production-oriented projects as well as frustration with isolated community development efforts which lacked either access to the materials necessary for high productivity technologies, or the knowledge and

authority to realize more efficient performance (1975:1). Yet, there were a significant number of relatively successful projects, or components of projects, to suggest that careful project design could serve not only the objective of increasing the wealth creating capacity of a rural community, but also the critical capacity of the community to bear much more of the innovative governing function so necessary for continuing economic and social development (See Luyxx, 1971; Montgomery, 1972).

Many attempts have been made to define integrated rural development; none have been exceptionally insightful, most have added more confusion than clarity, and few have proven very useful. At a general level, IRD is the process of combining multiple development services into a coherent delivery system with the aim of improving the well-being of rural populations (DAI, 1980). More specifically, there is general agreement that IRD projects have the following characteristics (Cohen, 1979). They are: 1) focused on particular geographic areas; 2) designed and implemented by outside groups, e.g., national development agencies and/or international donors; 3) mainly concerned with the coordination of public goods and services; and 4) multisectoral, though emphasizing agricultural production.

In distinguishing between agricultural development and rural development, emphasis is usually given to types of project components. Agricultural development would refer to area-based investments in inputs of capital and technology (e.g., irrigation, seeds, fertilizers, credit, feeder roads, storage) with the principal aim of achieving growth in agricultural productivity. Rural development, on the other hand, is a multi-sectoral process which includes, in addition to inputs for agricultural growth, the extension of infrastructure (schools, clinics, roads, communications, power, etc.) and the establishment of services (control of disease, improved nutrition, adult literacy) aimed at changing the structure of the rural environment. Special emphasis is given in integrated rural development to deliberately combining these many dimensions in complementary ways. Thus management of a balanced growth approach is the essence of integrated rural development. IRD, then, is complex and management intensive.

The keystone to IRD is local response to developmental initiatives. Irrespective of how effective the delivery of a mixture of development inputs, for them to be successful a behavioral response is necessary. Farmers must grow the new crop, water their fields from the new irrigation canal or plow with the new tractor. Thus, any examination of integrated rural development organization and administration must regard beneficiary behavior as a pivotal point between project failure and success. Organizational structures and management practices must be geared to support this objective; this requires that development inputs be provided in ways, and through institutional means, that support villager response (DAI, 1980).

ORGANIZATION DESIGN AS ANTICIPATION OF IMPLEMENTATION DIFFICULTIES

Numerous development theorists have commented on the difficulties and even problematic nature of IRD project implementation (Ruttan, 1975; Grindle, 1981; Siffin, 1979; Brinkerhoff, 1981). The content of IRD policies--rooted as they are in ambiguous, redistributive goals, aimed at revamping the economic and structural environment or rural poverty--presents implementers with a series of problems. While some have argued that the major requirement of IRD is that rural services and agricultural inputs be simultaneously available and that it is frequently possible for that to be achieved without administrative integration (Mosher, 1972:2), others maintain that it is the process of reorienting production supporting institutions for greater participation of the less privileged rural people at the village level and through appropriate local organizations that provided the key to the kind of rural transformation sought through IRD (Leupolt: 1977). These two paths are intimately linked in that, in large measure, IRD's appropriateness hinges upon the extent to which it is implementable.

Examination of implementation experience with IRD has surfaced the following common obstacles (DAI, 1980):

- Resistance to integration and coordination of IRD activities by participating agencies;
- Managerial skills deficiencies among project managers;
- Inadequate management information systems;
- Lack of incentives for project staff or cooperating organization personnel to act in ways that support project objectives;
- Delays due to procurement bottlenecks;
- Inappropriate use of technical assistance;
- Non-response to project initiatives by intended beneficiaries; and
- Non-continuation of project benefits after project completion.

Many of those obstacles are not specific to IRD projects alone, but must be overcome in order to implement any development effort. Montgomery's survey (1981) of IRD project managers confirms that certain of these obstacles are generic to implementation. This finding is important because it suggests that some of the costs and problems attributed to IRD are in truth costs and problems associated with implementing any sort of project or program that seeks to attain complex and multiple goals in a difficult operating environment.

Controversies Surrounding Organizational Structure

The past decade of IRD activities has generated numerous controversies over the most successful organizational design and implementation strategy. For example, some of the controversies bearing on structural design include:

- Blueprint versus a process approach--How different are IRD projects from typical infrastructure projects, which were characterized by tight definitions of project boundaries, and clear, unchanging relationships among parts and components of a project?
- New versus Old--To what extent does the innovativeness of IRD objectives, and particularly its redistributive and participative goals, require that strategies bypass existing agencies?
- Simple versus Comprehensive--Given resource-deficient environments, should IRD projects focus on a "simple is optimal" approach or gear strategies to attack the complex web of constraints which suppress rural development?
- Small versus Large--What are the advantages of a small project over a large, highly visible project? (See pp 36-46, DAI, 1980).

In addition to the above choices, there are several physical and environmental factors which have been suggested as important determinants of appropriate structures. The following factors seem to be among the most likely to have significance in the context of IRD:

- Physical size or area covered;
- Technology and human capacities;
- Stability of decision-making environment;
- Social culture;
- Objectives, strategies, and key implementation activities (i.e., critical implementation problems).

Each of these controversial choices and factors influencing organization design are briefly dealt with below. The objective of laying out the several options and potential factors influencing our organizational models is to generate what Smith and others working on rural development organization in The World Bank have termed "synthetic" thinking. Synthetic thinking demands that we take an "expansionist" or holistic view of problem solving and systems design. "We must begin looking for solutions outside the boundaries of the problem or system and bring the environment

into equal prominence with the organization." Based on the work of R. L. Ackoff (1974), Smith, Lethem, and Thoolen emphasize that, "Our problems do not come in simple unitary entities; they come in huge clusters or 'messes'." (1980,5). Solutions are likely to be equally "messy" and not easily derived. The strategy choice (and consequently the range of goals) comes down to either adapting projects to match institutional constraints or enhancing institutional capability to meet project criteria or a bit of both. Where institutional constraints are especially severe, the choice may be one of selecting project characteristics that increase the probability of implementation. In other words, this might mean projects of short duration, simple integrative features, specified target groups, while using the project as a means of gradually building institutional resources. On the other hand, where the rural setting largely defines the complexity of the project, attention would have to be given to enhancing the resources for continued leadership and management.

Physical Size or Area Covered

A large project with multiple subobjectives over a wide area will face markedly different problems of organization and management than a small one. A.F. Bottrall notes that the size of organization has always proved to be the single most important variable influencing a choice of structure or of management style, and he concludes that the larger an organization is, the more likely it is to be formalized in character and to develop specialized groups which need systematic coordination. In general, size will tend to push an organization towards a predominantly "bureaucratic" type of structure, in which procedures, rules and clear definitions of functions are necessarily important (Bottrall: 1981, 70). One can see in this statement the tensions likely to arise between organizational dynamics on the one hand, and the need for humanistic, non-bureaucratic responses to poor farmers on the other hand. This implies the need for locally established, "buffering" organizations in large scale IRD projects.

Technology and Human Capabilities

Experience suggests that the chances for successful implementation are reduced as the technologies involved shift from more simple to complex, involving untried technology and innovative organizational forms. Moreover, studies have shown that the technology of production used is an important determinant of organizational form. Contrast, for example, variable irrigation systems, one involving high cost wells using imported equipment and contractor drilling, with low-cost wells using labor-intensive drilling technologies. While the low-cost technology may promise extensive social benefits through promotion of local level organizations, it may involve unacceptable risks to donors in terms of organizational control (Donahue, 1979).

Administrative capacity and skilled manpower are to a greater or lesser degree, scarce resources in all developing countries. This factor is often the one which places the most severe limitations on the extent to which planning and management responsibilities can be delegated to lower levels of the administrative hierarchy. The nature of the technical knowledge of specialist staff (engineers, agronomists and agriculturalists) also has important implications for the horizontal structure of IRD projects. Usually lacking is the capacity to extend knowledge and techniques over wide areas and multiple sectors.

Stability of the Decisionmaking Environment

Innovative change in rural environments is a destabilizing influence. In some organizations involved in IRD, this will require the need to keep abreast of rapid changes, both among target populations and as reflected in the differing agendas of policy-makers. This situation is likely to favor the adoption of organizational forms which are adaptable and flexible. On the other hand, where the decision-making environment is relatively stable and many of the organizations activities are routine, a more "bureaucratic" form of organization is likely to be appropriate. Attempts to insulate IRD organizations from the normal interplay of political decision-making is likely to decrease its effectiveness.

Social Culture

Whenever an institution is interactive with and responsive to its social environment, it will be permeated by the structures and values of that environment. This applies both to government organizations such as agricultural extension services and to farmers' organizations at the local level (Jiggins and Hunter, 1979: 8). It is essential in the design of an organization's structure that various social norms be taken into account. The problem is that existing institutional norms may be the source of project implementation difficulty, since traditional institutional forms may be intricately linked to forms of traditional activity. What is a developer to do? Janice Jiggins and Guy Hunter suggest that incorporation of social cultural norms is a matter of degree, depending on the main objectives of a project. They suggest analyzing both before and after the projects' objectives have been defined (1979: 10-11):

- 1) How far is it necessary to take into account ascertainable social norms; and did the project design take such account, as far as possible?
- 2) How far is it possible to rely on self-managed participatory groups; and did the project design and operation rightly measure local possibilities in this respect?
- 3) What degree of external management is likely to be needed; and was this efficiently provided?

The above analysis corresponds closely to the approach of Smith, Lethem, and Thoolen, who deal with social culture as a part of the "appreciated" environment: institutions that produce activities affecting organizational performance, but that can neither be controlled nor influenced by its management (1980: 9). The aim is to use those positive social traits to effect integration, while circumventing negative social norms that might constrain the achievement of the project's main goals.

Objectives, Strategies, and Key Implementation Activities

Frequently, the design of organizational forms place too much emphasis on the need for lines of responsibility, coordination, control, clear job description, etc. Obviously, the aim of organizational design should be to build the best possible structure, but the creation of a rational organization structure should not become an end in itself at the expense of the intended purpose of the organization. A different approach is one in which the organization is built upon the technological and social environment in which the project operates. For example, in a small farmer development project the organization of services would be designed not according to a particular input function considered desirable by planners, i.e., production credit, but according to location (i.e., where people live) and to the phases of farm activities (i.e., pre-planting services, post-harvest services, etc.). In theory, therefore, it is the objectives of the farmers themselves which determines the form of organization (Howell: 1979, 22-23). While this theoretical approach may open up too much uncertainties for IRD organization design, it calls attention to the need for change in organization form as the project unfolds.

In the project cycle, the organization problem is likely to be seen as part of the "design" stage and the management problem seen as part of the "implementation" stage. As mentioned previously, the result is that as implementation problems arise there are attributed to poor management and not to ineffective organizational design. The uncertainties of IRD require that critical implementation problems be anticipated as an essential input for organization design. While not all problems can be anticipated in their detail, there is sufficient experience to suggest, generally, the critical issues IRD project implementers will face. Examination of the issues should suggest a framework for defining organizational tasks and establishing the necessary links with external institutions.

In the IRD context, projects must address the following implementation issues (DAI, 1981):

- Effecting Integration: To be successful, an IRD project requires coordination of the activities of several independent agencies or groups. Yet, actually obtaining this coordination is often very difficult. Consequently, how

an organization fits into the government's bureaucratic structure, the kinds of linkages between agencies that are required, and the methods used to facilitate coordination within a given institutional framework, are factors which assume increased importance.

- Political, Economic, and Environmental Constraints: The success of IRD projects is sometimes adversely affected by constraints which are seemingly beyond the control of the project itself to resolve. Research is needed on the causes of these external constraints and remedial actions that could be undertaken to overcome them or minimize their impact.
- Participation and Decentralization: While it is generally felt that greater participation and decentralization would promote development, it is not clear how best to implement these concepts in an IRD project setting. Research is necessary to determine what kinds of participation have been encouraged by IRD projects and the mechanisms introduced to promote it. Similarly, with respect to decentralization, it is necessary to determine how it has occurred in IRD projects and what methods have been, or could be, used to measure the extent of decentralization efforts.
- Information Systems: Historically, formal information systems, while provided for in almost all IRD project designs, are rarely implemented, and if implemented, are not effectively used. Research is needed into the reasons for this unsatisfactory performance. Further, it is necessary to investigate alternative "informal" systems that can provide the information needed in a cost-effective manner.
- Timing: Inaccurate timing estimates (usually overly optimistic) lead to serious implementation problems. Research is necessary into the causes and effects of implementation delays, as well as into how project-related activities should be phased so as to make them most effective.
- Differing Agendas: The major actors in project identification, design, implementation, and evaluation are likely to have differing purposes or agendas which may not place the highest priority on achieving project goals. It is important to determine how incentive systems might be used to modify the behavior of these actors and make it more conducive to project success.
- Managing Technical Assistance: Generous amounts of technical assistance (TA), both short and long-term, are usually built into donor-funded IRD projects. Yet, the

process of managing and structuring assistance to such complex projects is an often ignored issue. The questions that need to be addressed include the appropriate mix of long-term versus short-term TA, the changing TA needs of projects to be met as the project life-cycle unfolds, and the appropriate strategy for providing technical assistance to large multisectoral projects (i.e., the personal contract, academic, bodyshop, or management team strategy).

- Counterpart Shortages: Quite often shortages occur in the complement of host country personnel assigned during IRD project implementation to work with short and long-term expatriate technical assistance teams. As a result, projects must proceed more slowly than originally planned and the expatriate teams may take on far more implementation responsibilities than projected, at the expense of their capacity-building roles. However, assuring a full complement of host counterparts may mean diverting skilled manpower from other jobs where they are also desperately needed.
- Sustaining Project Benefits: Often the intended benefits of a rural development projects are not sustained (if ever attained) after external resource flows stop. Research into the most important constraints to sustainability is needed, along with an identification of the elements that contribute to project sustainability.

A Contingency Approach

The above environmental factors or choices do not bear on organizational design with the same intensity. In many cases the factors are not only outside of the span of control of the implementing organization, but are also not subject to its influence. They become a part of the "appreciated" environment. One means of handling these factors is termed a "contingency" approach. A contingency approach assumes that "it all depends" and that the most important task is to discover "what it depends on". Thus the idea that there can be a single best budgeting process or personnel classification system or organization design or leadership style is rejected. There is no universal/optimal mechanism to achieve certain results. At the same time, the idea that all situations are totally unique is also rejected. There are discernable patterns of environmental contingencies that influence the relative effectiveness of different interventions. Among these factors, the scale of the problem, and the resources of those who do not see the situation as problematic, are all contingencies. In fact these contingencies help identify the relative desirability of the organization development strategy chosen (Honadle and Klaus: 1979).

CHOOSING AN ORGANIZATIONAL STRATEGY

Most organizations with responsibility for executing agricultural activities, or activities which support rural development are bureaucratically structured. That is, their components are specialized according to function, control over decisions in each function is hierarchically arranged, and communication and decision making is constrained either by fixed rules or strong bureaucratic norms. Routine, non-innovative behavior is the administrative norm. The bureaucratic mode operates effectively when tasks are well defined and unchanging in nature.

When faced with new tasks for rural development projects--particularly those involving decentralization of responsibilities--experience suggests that there are four recurring types of organization strategies used:

- Working through traditional line ministries, or agencies affiliated with line ministries, at the national level;
- Working through subnational governments or government agencies;
- Working through integrated development agencies; and
- Creating special project management units.

Experience with these arrangements in actual project situations, together with the advantages and disadvantages of such arrangements, are noted in the following figure (Figure 1). Forms of linkage mechanisms are noted in Figure 2.

These tables identify both strengths and weaknesses of the placement strategies (macro design) and mechanisms (micro design) available to managers within the various placement strategies. Such factors and alternatives help managers and designers to choose among the options. However, the key to success is accurate analysis of local circumstances.

To assist with this analysis, a procedure for organization design might approximate the following:

- Conduct "force field" assessments of factors obstructing or enhancing IRD functions in the intended area with the intended clientele and considering the technologies to be used and time phasing requirements;
- Use this to help choose a placement strategy by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of each;

Figure 1. Organizational Placement Alternatives and Tradeoffs

No.	ALTERNATIVE	TRADEOFFS		
	Implementor	Major Advantages	Major Disadvantages	Supporting Conditions
1	<u>National Line Agency</u> (permanent) such as Ministry of Agriculture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides a base in a permanent institution; ● Provides high-level decision involvement; ● Sometimes appropriate for non-area focused projects; ● Often simplifies initial preparation process and resource flows. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limits sectoral focus of project strategy; ● Often there is a preoccupation with national problems rather than local variations; ● An unwillingness to delegate significant operational authority is common; ● Often accompanied by jealousy of other line agencies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High capability in appropriate agency; ● High priority on institutionalization; ● Agency has high target group orientation; ● National leadership commitment critical for success.
2	<u>Subnational Government Entity</u> (permanent) such as a region, province or district	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides local focus; ● Sometimes helps to concentrate authority over project activities; ● Can build planning and implementation capability in permanent entity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Often has low institutional and human resource capability; ● Subnational units often have little leverage over line ministries whose activities affect the project. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● High commitment to decentralization; ● Uniqueness of target area; ● High capability in appropriate agency; ● Agency has high target group orientation.
3	<u>Integrated Development Agency</u> (permanent) such as a national authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Helps comprehensiveness of project overview; ● Provides local focus with access to higher level authority; ● Can avoid overly oppressive audit and control procedures. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Line agency competition can cripple performance; ● Complex communication needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good history of inter-agency cooperation; ● Technology sensitive to lack of complementary inputs; ● High capability in appropriate agency; ● Agency has high target group orientation.
4	<u>Project Management Unit</u> (autonomous and temporary) such as those often created as part of an IRD project design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Can be used to concentrate authority in project area; ● Familiar to engineers who staff infrastructure projects; ● Can avoid oppressive audit and control procedures; ● Can avoid inappropriate boundaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Very difficult to institutionalize; ● Temporary nature creates personnel management problems. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Environment hostile to target group; ● Simple infrastructure focus; ● Standard operating procedures very cumbersome; ● Technology highly uncertain.

Figure 2. Organizational Mechanisms to Increase Coordination

	STAFF LEVEL	BENEFICIARY LEVEL
FORMAL MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Interagency coordinating or advisory committees ● Liaison office at port or central ministry ● Interagency task force ● Binding cooperative agreements ● Loaning of personnel between agencies ● Cost sharing ● Joint training and orientation courses for agency personnel ● Copies of reports sent to heads of other agencies ● Fixed reimbursement agreements ● Single report format used by two or more cooperating agencies ● Existence of an independent monitoring and evaluation entity ● Merging of agencies ● Creation of an incentive system (financial, promotional, professional) to encourage working on joint projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Beneficiary participation in decision making and/or monitoring of the project ● Formal staff participation in beneficiary organization meetings ● Orientation courses for beneficiaries ● Requiring contribution by beneficiaries to project costs, e.g., labor, money, materials, etc. ● Periodic public meetings of staff with the community
INFORMAL MECHANISMS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lending of resources (personnel, transport, etc.) by one agency to another on an informal basis ● Use of informal information systems by decision makers ● Encouragement of informal communication between agency staff (through inter-agency sports competition, weekend staff retreats, occasional seminars, etc.) ● Having participant agency offices in the same location ● Periodic meetings of agency decision makers on an informal basis ● Staff participation in agency decision making ● Use of a supportive management style by supervisors ● Use of a bargaining strategy with external actors, rather than reliance on preset rules 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Availability of staff in an office accessible to the beneficiaries (open on market days, for example) ● Encouragement of agency personnel participation in beneficiary organizations (civic, social, religious, etc.) ● Posting of project objectives, target dates, etc., where they can be viewed by beneficiaries ● Conducting business and writing reports in the beneficiary dialect.

Engage in a similar micro design exercise;

Redo the "force field" exercises and refine first the placement strategy and then the mechanisms to achieve coordination and linkages.

Figures 3, 4, and 5 illustrate a suggested format for carrying out the "force field" assessments. This type of analysis views the problem of organization selection for implementation in terms of a set of opposing forces. Group participation in force field analysis generates a range of ideas and tries to select a more limited number of alternatives for further evaluation. It has the advantage of highlighting those agencies or groups which can provide supporting linkages for implementation.

COORDINATION AND INTEGRATION

Discussion of the choices and strategies associated with various placements for IRD activities highlights the importance of inter-organizational relations. These refer to both the horizontal and vertical linkages between the implementing organization and other agencies providing supports, inputs or complementary services and the means used to coordinate and integrate these relationships.

As used here, integration is the term used to describe the structural relationships among organizations serving the rural sector or a specific IRD project. The principal difference between an integrated as opposed to a functional organization is indicated by the level where authority over the full range of organizational activities converges. In a functional organization it occurs near the top: all engineers report upward through other engineers to the minister of public works; all agriculturalists report through vertical channels to the minister of agriculture; all medical personnel are ultimately responsible to the minister of health; and only at the highest level--the president or ministerial coordinating council--does authority over the three sectors converge. In an integrated organization, on the other hand, convergence occurs closer to the bottom of the organizational hierarchy. In an integrated development project, for instance, engineers, agriculturalists and medical personnel may all be accountable to a single project manager in a subdistrict area. That is, the field level oversees all of the various functional areas within the organization. Thus, integration implies comprehensiveness (a multi-sectoral focus) and control (direct lines of authority).

Seen in this way, integration is a form of decentralization. Since an integrated structure provides a cross-functional focus at

Figure 3. Force Field Assessment

	WHO WILL SUPPORT	WHO WILL OPPOSE	STRATEGY FOR MOBILIZING SUPPORT	STRATEGY FOR MINIMIZING OPPOSITION
FUNCTIONS				
AREA				
CLIENTELE				
TECHNOLOGIES				
TIMEPHASING				

Figure 4. Organizational Placement

	PMU	LINE AGENCY	PARASTATAL OR NATIONAL BODY	SUBNATIONAL GOVT. BODY
<u>FUNCTIONS TO BE PERFORMED</u>				
<u>GEOGRAPHIC AREA TO BE COVERED</u>				
<u>CLIENTELE GROUP TO BE REACHED</u>				
<u>TECHNOLOGIES TO BE UTILIZED</u>				
<u>TIMEPHASING REQUIREMENTS FOR ACHIEVING SUSTAINABILITY</u>				

Figure 5. Micro Design

	LEGAL BASIS	BUDGET	INFO SYSTEM	STAFF	ACCOUNT- ABILITY	LINKS TO EXTERNAL SUPPORT ORGANIZA.	LINKS TO BENEFICIARIES
FUNCTIONS							
AREA							
CLIENTELE							
TECHNOLOGIES							
TIMEPHASING							

a lower level, there is a decisionmaker with a "total system" perspective located closer to the point where services are provided. Thus information about the entire scope of activities is available for field decisions. This is advantageous when activities are highly interdependent.

In reality, most strategies for integrated rural development implementation are essentially functional approaches with a mixed group of interagency personnel temporarily attached to a lead line agency. Moreover, the level of control over these personnel may be minimal. The key institutional problem of IRD is the problem of incentives. This means devising and applying an incentive strategy that will initiate and promote the kinds of linkages needed for the administrative and technical personnel and necessary organizations to come together to make the program work.

Linkages are the mechanism by which one organization is tied to or attempts to influence another (Leonard; 1981, 4). Vertical linkages are those that tie a local level project upward to sources of resources, power and commitment at intermediate (i.e., provincial), national and in some instances international (i.e., donor agency) levels. Horizontal linkages are those that tie the program to supporting local organizations, elites, target groups or beneficiaries and the technical agencies necessary for complementary and collective action at the project level.

It appears obvious that the needs of the rural poor will not be met if local organizations are left to their own separate devices. Linkages must be forged between base level organizations and the multiple institutions that comprise the "center." All of these "centers" can vary in their resources, power and commitment to the rural poor. It is apparent that the greater the resources and power committed to their cause the better for the poor majority. Commitment is the most important and problematic variable.

The nature of the implementing or "lead line" agency at the national center thus is another critical variable in determining the type of decentralization and the nature of linkages to be favored for an IRD program. Where a supportive central organization exists, the structure of implementation should build on it. Where it is missing, local autonomy is necessary.

Decentralization is one of the essential requirements of integrated rural development approaches. Decision-making authority must be located closer to the sources of action than any ministry headquarters can ever be. And local level participation in some of the substantive decisions is essential to effectiveness. There are no general recipes for solving the problem of decentralization. The problem is that the authority structures and reward systems (incentives) of typical poor countries are simply unsuited to effective decentralization of substantive decisionmaking power and responsibility to local levels.

One approach to the problem, by no means universally feasible, is to bypass the bureaucracy in distributing certain resources to the local level and give jurisdiction to small-farmer groups who may then have some leverage in dealing with the bureaucracy (Siffin: 1979, 13). While there are no general solutions, we can identify some of the important factors that bear upon the feasibility of decentralizing authority, and we can find some alternative models of decentralization. Leonard, for example, asserts that the four factors which affect the choice of linkages and the successful implementation of rural development programs also influence the ideal mode of decentralization. Thus the type of decentralization chosen depends on: (1) the programs' vulnerability to inequality; (2) the nature of the local elites and their interests; (3) the nature and variability of interests among national agencies; and (4) the distribution between national and local organizations of the capacity to meet the programs' technical and administrative requirements (1981, 35).

Organizational Intervention as a Process

In discussions of organizational placement, strategy choices have often dominated the agenda. Issues are often posed as discrete alternatives encountered at a crossroads; a road taken versus a road untaken. Such depictions confuse the issue because they miss the fact that development is not a one-time choice--it is a process. When the temporal dimension is eliminated, insights become shallow and dogma replaces understanding.

Organization design must be seen not as a single determination of an optimal strategy, but rather as a sequence of organizational forms adapting to emergent conditions; what begins as a project management unit might become a permanent agency attached to a provincial planning body. The emerging scenario, however, should be stated during design and implementation workshops used to elaborate or modify the initial idea. Thus each adopted strategy is merely a temporary emphasis within a learning experience.

Selected Bibliography

- Ackoff, R.L. 1974. Redesigning the Future: A Systems Approach to Societal Problems. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Bottrall, A.F. 1981. Comparative Study of the Management and Organization of Irrigation Projects. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 458. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W. 1981. "The Effectiveness of Integrated Rural Development: A Synthesis of Research and Experience." Washington, D.C.: Agency for International Development, Office of Rural Development and Development Administration (mimeo).
- Cohen, J. 1979. The Administration of Economic Development Programs: Baselines for Discussion No. 6. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Monograph 79-7.
- Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI). 1980. Integrated Rural Development: Making It Work? AID Project 936-5300, Washington, D.C.
- Donahue, J. 1979. "Organizational Imperatives and Technology Choice," PASITAM Design Notes No. 10. Bloomington: Indiana University, International Development Institute.
- Grindle, M.S. 1981. "Anticipating Failure: The Implementation of Rural Development Programs," Public Policy, Volume 29, No. 1 (Winter), pp. 51-74.
- Grindle, M.S., ed. 1980. Politics and Policy Implementation in the Third World. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Honadle, G.H. and Klauss, R. 1979. "Summary and Conclusion: Recipes for More Practical Planning in the Face of Uncertainty," in Honadle and Klauss, eds., International Development Administration: Implementation Analysis for Development Projects. New York: Praeger.
- Howell, J. 1979. "Assessing Management and Organisations for Agricultural Development Projects, : in Institutions, Management and Agricultural Development, Occasional Paper 3. London: Overseas Development Institute.

- Jiggins, J. and Hunter, G. 1979. "Institutions and Culture: Problems of Criteria for Rural and Agricultural Development Projects," in Institutions, Management and Agricultural Development, Occasional Paper 3. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Leonard, D. 1981. "Introduction," in "Linkages to Decentralized Units," Leonard, et al. Project on Managing Decentralization. Berkeley: University of California (Draft Report under Cooperative Agreement #AID/DSAN-CA-0199.)
- Leupolt, M. 1977. "Integrated Rural Development: Key Elements of an Integrated Rural Development Strategy," Sociologia Ruralis, Vol. XVII, No. 1/2.
- Luykx, N. 1971. "Rural Governing Institutions," East-West Center Food Institute Reprint No. 1. Honolulu: East-West Center.
- Montgomery, J.D. 1981. "On the Decentralization of Integrated Rural Development Activities." Cambridge: Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government (mimeo).
- Montgomery, J.D. 1972. "Allocation of Authority in Land Reform Programs: A Comparative Study of Administrative Processes and Outputs," Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, (March): 62-75.
- Morss, E. and Gow, D. Integrated Rural Development: Nine Critical Implementation Problems, IRD Research Note No. 1, Development Alternatives, Inc., Washington, D.C.
- Rondinelli, D.A. and Ruddle, K. 1977. "Local Organizations for Integrated Rural Development: Implementing Equity Policy in Developing Countries," International Review of Administrative Sciences, Vol. 43, No. 1: 20-30.
- Ruttan, V.W. 1975. "Integrated Rural development Programs: A Skeptical Perspective." International Development Review, Vol. 17, No. 4: 9-16.
- Siffin, W.J. 1979. "Administrative Problems and Integrated Rural Development," PASITAM Design Notes, Bloomington: Indiana University, International Development Institute.
- Smith, W.E., Lethem, F.J. and Thoolen, B.A. 1980. The Design of Organizations for Rural Development Projects--A Progress Report. World Bank Staff Working Paper No. 375. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank.