

PNAAQ-628
1211-35890

**REPORT ON RESPONSES TO
A WORKBOOK ON
SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT**

by
Leonard Joy

**IN THE CONTEXT OF
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

NASPAA Working Paper No. 10

1983

This inquiry is conducted under the auspices of the National Association of Schools of Public Affairs and Administration (NASPAA) through the support of the U.S. Agency for International Development, Bureau for Science and Technology, Office of Rural and Institutional Development. The workbook was designed by Leonard Joy with the support and counsel of Rudi Klauss and Theodore Thomas on behalf of an informal network of professionals concerned with the issues on which it focuses.

Executive Summary

Fifty-two people completed and returned the Workbook which was distributed to two hundred and fifty in the SDM network to explore the implications of SDM concepts. The responses they gave are synthesized rather than analyzed by this report. That is, the report juxtaposes the responses into a series of propositions as though they had been culled from a dialogue. In so doing, the coherence of various clusterings of perceptions is brought out and some key differentiating themes are revealed.

Four major issues are identified on which differentiation is apparent:

- (1) how material and social development aspects are perceived in programs and projects -- whether as ends or means;
- (2) the nature and extent of participation;
- (3) the approach to empowerment;
- (4) the role of the central government.

It is suggested that the answers given to specified questions on these issues define and differentiate approaches to social development management. They also have distinctive implications for such matters as the role of change agents, aid management, strategies to be pursued in promoting SDM, etc.

No attempt was made to determine consensus or majority opinion and there is no suggestion that some views are more authoritative than others. Instead, the report is designed to help identify and clarify the issues which need to be confronted and the points of view to be brought into dialogue.

The report presents the suggestions of respondents about how to proceed and notes, inter alia, that many would propose a program of action research. One of the conclusions of the report emphasizes the need to establish agreement about the performance criteria to be used in action research and the need, therefore, for prior discussion on these key questions which differentiate approaches.

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	1
	1. <u>How the project started</u>	1
	2. <u>Rationale for the workbook</u>	2
	3. <u>Form of this report</u>	5
II.	Analysis	6
	1. <u>Who responded?</u>	6
	2. What they were responding to: <u>The point of departure</u>	8
	3. How they responded: <u>Responses to statements analyzed</u>	11
	4. 'How' related to 'who':	
	(i) <u>The consultancy world view</u>	13
	(ii) <u>The donor agency world view</u>	18
	(iii) <u>Other world views</u>	19
III.	Synthesis -- The Responses as Dialogue	
	1. Visions:	
	(i) <u>How it is and how it should be</u>	25
	(ii) <u>How it will all come about</u>	33
	2. <u>What is missing?</u>	36
	3. <u>The right label</u>	39
IV.	Analysis -- Clusterings of Viewpoints	41
V.	How to Proceed?	47
	1. <u>What respondents thought</u>	47
	2. <u>Making the most use of the workbook results</u>	49
	Appendices	
	1. <u>Writings drawn upon for quotation or paraphrase</u>	52
	2. <u>List of statements included in the "Clusterings of Ideas -- drawn from writings on social learning".</u>	53

I. Introduction

1. How the project started

The idea for this project emerged at the conclusion to the workshop organized by NASPAA on Social Development Management in Washington, February 1982. It was an exciting workshop. Almost everyone present found themselves resonating to the ideas and experiences we were discussing. But what it was that we were resonating to was not very clear. It was not even clear that we were all resonating to the same themes. It thus seemed most desirable to explore what it was that was exciting us, to attempt to articulate it more clearly and to identify aspects which needed further clarification. We seemed to be on to something new but it was not entirely clear what it was. It was not assumed, however, that there would be a single common viewpoint or core to our thinking.

The proposal to develop and circulate a workbook was made to NASPAA by the author. In the exchange of correspondence the aims of the workbook were stated as:

- to find out where people stand with regard to a cluster of concepts -- "bureaucratic reorientation," "participatory management," "social learning systems," etc. -- how they interpret and appraise the various propositions with regard to these concepts;
- to discover whether, and where, there is convergence or divergence;
- to identify areas which call for clarification, testing, resolution;
- to contribute to dialogue to promote the emergence of a strategy (strategies?) for social development.

2. Rationale for the workbook

The core of the workbook was a display of forty-five statements drawn from seven pieces of writing* which seemed in their scope to more than cover the matter under discussion. Respondents were asked to use these as an aid to clarifying and distinguishing their own ideas by commenting on what they found missing, unnecessary, misleading or most important in these expressions and by qualifying them as they would wish.

The workbook has something of the appearance of a first round in a Delphi study. But there are significant differences which might briefly be referred to in presenting the rationale of the workbook and as the point of departure for the presentation of the responses it evoked.

While the Delphi process has been used in a variety of contexts, its common application has been in the exploration of consensus especially about questions of the form: "how should we regard 'x'?" or "what should we do about 'y'?" (Nuclear reactors, for example.) Typically, a range of questions is posed -- perhaps using a multiple choice format -- and successive rounds of questionnaires are circulated which focus more and more narrowly, and with more specificity, on the position statements that are most frequently endorsed until a convergence is achieved.

This process has been heavily criticized for promoting false consensus. It has been argued that there is a bias toward conformity which is used to gain consensus by telling respondents what the majority thinks and, essentially, inviting them to endorse this. It has also been observed that some Delphi inquiries have asked for opinions on matters about which facts would have been more relevant.**

* Cited in Appendix 2.

**See: Sackman, Harold. Delphi Critique: Expert Opinion, Forecasting and Group Process. Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books, 1974.

The present inquiry has consciously sought not to be of this nature, nor open to such objections. Instead of seeking consensus, its aim has been to explore the diversity of expression, to ask whether there is within this diversity a unifying concept and, if so, to define what this is. The initial problem raised by this approach, however, is summarized in the questions: "Who is invited to respond to the workbook?" and "What concepts are they invited to discuss?"

This inquiry did not start with a presumption that there was an existing authoritative or even clearly articulated concept and seek to explore potential support for, or disagreement with, a specific statement of this. Instead, it deliberately aimed to secure the differentiated perceptions of individuals. Especially, it asked for responses to statements which were intended, by their very incompleteness and unrelatedness, to provoke qualification and original expression rather than simple confirmation or denial. However, this did require decisions about the range of 'topics' relevant to defining the domain of the concept under consideration -- though respondents were encouraged to state what was missing or understated in what was presented.

In other contexts, the author has found that the question "What is missing or understated in this presentation?" encourages responses which give good indicators of the central ideas, concerns, beliefs and attitudes of respondents. Asking "What is wrong, or misleading?" similarly was also intended to stimulate personal expression and reveal how each respondent interpreted the statements and vocabulary used.

While this approach was designed to avoid forcing viewpoints, it is clear that some point of departure is necessary: some presentation to which people respond.

It is also clear that while the selection of the group of respondents governs whose views are represented some selection needs to be made. Those invited to respond were those who had participated in various workshops

held in 1982-3 around the central theme under the auspices of ASPA, NASPAA and SID and some additional individuals suggested by these people -- about 250 people.* Fifty-two of these responded, and the results relate only to these respondents. Among those who responded some will have given considerable effort to clarifying and developing their ideas on the subject; others will be coming to it with little previous direct consideration of the questions now posed.

Thus, the responses so obtained cannot be seen as either authoritative or a consensus. Instead, what they might tell us is:

- the nature of the perceptions of these individuals as they are revealed here;
- whether there are new thrusts of thinking and whether there is any coalescence of separate strands or patterns into new coherent forms.

Examination of the responses might lead to hypotheses, too, about the correlates of different perceptions: how they are related to experience, need and values. Consideration of the various standpoints might also suggest need for clarification or resolution of issues. These, at any rate, are the concerns which have guided the analysis of the responses.

However, analysis has not been the primary mode of examining the workbook responses. Instead, the completed workbooks have been taken as contributions to a discussion, and much of this report is an attempt to delineate the major contributions to this discussion. Inevitably, the way in which the various ideas have been identified and presented is subjective. Since the purpose is to present a dialogue which encompasses the central themes rather than to reach conclusions or to provide a proportional representation of ideas, it is hoped that this will add to rather than detract from the usefulness of the report.

*ASPA: American Society for Public Administration; SID: Society for International Development.

3. Form of this report

This report continues first with a section which analyzes who the respondents were, what it was they responded to and how they responded, and how their response related to who they were in relation to development aid and technical assistance. Next is a section of synthesis which sets out key perceptions about "what is" and visions of "what should be" as the elements of a dialogue, followed by the various stories that people might tell about how their vision might come to pass. To cast further light on how people see the central issues, there are sections on perceptions of 'what is missing' (from the workbook) and on how, briefly, we might name our concerns. An attempt is then made to identify the themes which unite and divide people and which provide the dimensions by which people can be located in an ideas space map. Finally, the question is posed "where now?" and the responses to this question are given together with some thoughts about how this report might be further used.

A.	Self improvement; keeping up (What's going on? How do I appraise it? also: self questioning about personal role).	12
B.	Non-specified (general?) dissatis- faction with aid/technical assistance. (The old ways don't work. Are there better ways?)	4
C.	Specified dissatisfaction or concerns with regard to aid/technical assistance (international or domestic):	
	1. concern to be more effective; have more lasting impact	11
	2. poverty concerns (help/uplift the poor; reduce poverty; social justice)	12
	3. improve ways in which people relate: - 'donors' to 'recipients'	8
	- within a community (including its bureaucracy	11
	4. concern that development efforts should respect human (humanistic, humanitarian) values (e.g. "working with" rather than "delivering to"; "respecting other values rather than imposing own"; etc.)	6

(N.B. some respondents are recorded as apparently having more than one 'primary' concern.)

Prominent among the more specific concerns expressed with regard to aid, technical assistance and poverty oriented projects were the following:

o projects fail:

- designs are poor; little understanding of needs or specific circumstances; inflexible;
- no commitment by political and/or bureaucratic powers; project process fails to persuade or achieve support or acceptance of responsibility for project goals;
- no sense of ownership by intended beneficiaries;
- no power with intended beneficiaries to resist subversion and secure access to the goods and services provided;

o undesirable and/or ineffective role relationships and attitudes:

- benefactor/patron/expert/planner roles especially;
- humanizing development versus human resource development.

But both wider and narrower concerns also surfaced: Several were concerned about strategies for social change and/or finding new structures and processes for effective social governance locally and globally; some were concerned about the role of women or about securing 'right brain' inputs to decision making.

2. The point of departure

As indicated above, a key section of the workbook focussed on a set of forty-five statements to which responses were invited. These were variously quoted or paraphrased from the seven sources cited (Appendix 2). These seven sources were taken as treating the subject under consideration albeit at differing levels of generality, differing

degrees of resolution and differing emphases of concern. The statements used cannot be made to add up to the argument of any one of the writings which suggested them, but it would be disingenuous to suggest that no argument is contained by them. Even though form has to be imposed upon the statements to make them cohere -- and even though it would be difficult, if not impossible, to use all statements in a coherent whole -- there does seem to be an argument implicit in their totality.

First there are a number of more or less explicit value statements or inferences: that coercion or dependency are bad; that autonomy and personal development are good. (Though readers are left to provide their own notions of what these might mean.) Second, there are judgements: that centrally planned and managed bureaucracies are characterized by coercion and dependency; that scientific objectivity and expert planners are the instruments of such bureaucracies and are, at least partly, responsible for these undesirable consequences; that detailed preplanning by central bureaucracies is inherently unworkable in addition to being undesirable. Third, an alternative is suggested: the formation of loose non-hierarchical local groups with a high degree of autonomy linked to a (national?) bureaucracy whose role is to facilitate local action and provide a communication network informing local groups of other goals and action plans. Planning then becomes a social learning process dealing with community problem solving and erstwhile isolated planners become the direct expert consultants to client groups; plans are no longer detailed, centrally produced blueprints for local compliance but action statements by local groups resulting from local discussion (and dialogue with planners?); performance monitoring and local self-correction replace pre-planning and central control; local groups are organized on the basis of adaptive traditional social patterns. Local groups are involved in design and responsible for the actions taken (projects) and share the consequential risks of these actions with government staff. The social patterns which provide the basis of group organization are themselves changed by the process of social learning; individuals are linked through groups to larger coalitions for commitment to action. Finally,

promotion of this alternative requires the strengthening of intermediate human-scale institutions to mediate between the individual and the megastructure; it requires the strengthening of feedback systems for self direction and direct participation and loosening central control; it requires a better understanding of social learning processes; it requires a recognition that not all knowledge is 'scientific' knowledge and that 'social knowledge' will be important too in the design of new structures (frameworks) and processes.

This seems a plausible -- if crude -- construction of a central argument. About half of the forty-five statements cover these points. The remaining statements might conceivably be seen as relating to them as elaborations (e.g. "success not judged by adherence to blue print") or additions to the argument or its premises (e.g. about science or management) or as anomalous or requiring qualification to the central argument ('involvement of the masses may be dysfunctional'). The intention of all these statements is to provide materials from which respondents can sketch their own conceptual maps by agreement, disagreement, qualification, rejection as irrelevant and substitution. If the result is to achieve any degree of coherence this is a most demanding task. Where ideas are not already clear, where the various pieces are not related, the effort required to clarify and integrate will be great. Indeed, even where ideas are well thought out the workbook will not necessarily induce the effort necessary to present them. To some extent, therefore, the completed workbooks understate the ideas of their authors. They do seem, however, to present very effective summaries of points of view, motivations, concerns and tenets. Each represents something of a dialogue between an individual respondent and the workbook with its anonymous and incomplete expressions. From the several responses a broader dialogue can be synthesized. The next section of this report attempts to synthesize such a dialogue based on a classification of viewpoints. In doing so, it is hoped to review the range of preceptions encountered and the questions to which they give rise. No attempt is made here to weight the different viewpoints. The intent is a dialogue, not an opinion poll.

3. Responses to statements analyzed

One approach to identifying the ideas around which agreement, or disagreement, is marked is to analyze the responses to the statements. Such a summary analysis is presented in Appendix 2. Such analysis has been attempted and some part of it is presented here. Overall, however, it was found necessary to read these responses in the context of the qualifying comments with which they were offered. Primarily quantitative analysis seemed to produce neither clear nor meaningful interpretations.

The findings of the quantitative analysis that do seem of interest are presented briefly in what follows.

First, three people did not choose to comment directly on the statements as presented and seven declined to identify those that were "most important".* The rest identified, on average, more than 9 statements which were "most important". The ten most commonly checked statements were: (Parentheses show numbers checking these)

*The workbook context in which this phrase is to be read is: "I find that the ideas ^{(do/}do not) broadly express relevant themes. Most important among these are: (#'s.....)".

Statement

#

- 17 (16) we need to strengthen intermediate human-scale institutions which perform a mediating role between individual and megastructure and facilitate local problem solving and creative innovation
- 19 (16) effective participation involves clients in the design of action not simply in implementation
- 36 (16) efforts to eliminate error by detailed preplanning and central control presume more knowledge than exists and eliminates the very learning on which effective action depends
- 34 (15) we need not replicable models but frameworks for understanding the dynamics of the system involved and the processes by which local action can best be designed
- 44 (15) good governance is that which supports man's personal development
- 42 (14) avoiding perpetuating or creating dependency is a critical problem with village assistance programs
- 26 (14) success in implementing plans should not be judged by degree of adherence to a priori blueprints; this is appropriate to physical engineering, not to social change
- 6 (13) social learning can occur in loosely linked network structures consisting of small, temporary, non-hierarchical task-oriented working groups
- 16 (13) social learning emphasizes central facilitation over central control, performance monitoring and self correction over pre-planning

31 (12) we need a fusion of scientific/technical knowledge with personal/subjective knowledge

Ten respondents checked five or more of these statements as "most important". Examining them as a possible core of consensus about what is or is not desirable with regard to planning and government, we have six statements of what we are aiming for (17, 19, 44, 6, 16, 31) and three on what we would wish to avoid (36, 42, 26). We also have one statement (34) about the nature of the understanding we should seek to achieve in order to promote what we are aiming for.

The interest that this information has for us is in what it says about the orientation of the sample of opinions used to typify the various points of view delineated and presented as contributions to the dialogue which follows:

4. (i) The consultancy world view

Several of those who returned the workbook did so from the point of view of a consultant. Not that all of these had fully congruent views or even coincident concerns. Between them, however, they expressed concerns related to the following broad themes: the nature of their contractual relationships with donor agencies, recipient governments, counterpart administrators and client beneficiaries; the nature of their tasks, role relationships, required skills, contract management procedures, expected achievement and performance evaluation. Few of these issues were explicitly treated in the workbook. Yet in various ways and in response to different questions posed ("what is missing?" "what are we talking about?" "what are the unanswered questions?" "what are relevant performance criteria?") people managed to express those concerns which were central to them in such a way that it was possible to ask of each: "what vision does this person seek?"

Curiously, while many revealed their concerns to stem directly from their world view as consultants, only a few of these were explicit

about the consultant-client relationship. Yet the focus of at least one response was the vision of consultants working with clients who were clear, or becoming clear, about their goals and who owned the plans evolved with the assistance of the consultants. This vision sees the consultant having a contractual relationship directly with local community groups.

Seen from this world view the great need is to develop a generalizable practice which works: generalizable not in the sense of the same sequence of events being promoted in every situation, but in the sense of a broad framework which guides the categorization of different situations and allows the choice of the most suitable approach in any particular situation. The argument seems to be that there is no one approach that will work in all situations. Therefore, we need to know how to classify any particular situation and to know which approach will work in such a situation.

Success is thought to be unlikely where the approach taken is culturally incongruous or lacks the support of key powerful figures. Better training of consultants is expected to increase social sensitivity: knowing whose support to get, how to get it and how to design processes for project development which will be culturally acceptable. Those who emphasize these points would wish especially to see those with technical expertise trained also in social science and applied behavioral science skills. There is also an apparent presumption here that experts who are better trained in this manner will in fact be better able to design projects and programs that work, and better able to listen to people and to use their local understanding in that design. Thus, the further presumption seems to be that experts will indeed be the designers and that they will become more skilled in knowing how to get the information they need in order to make better designs. However, it is sometimes emphatically recognized that the skill required by such experts will not be by any means academic. It will need to be practical. Knowing how societies, or management

organizations, or politics work is no substitute for knowing how to make them work the way they are supposed to.

But there is something of a distinction to be made between those who see the consultant's task as one of providing effective designs through skillful and empathic understanding and those who see it assisting others to work effectively in producing their own designs. Among the respondents to the workbook, there was a preponderance of those who saw the consultant's job as one of assisting in building local capacity. Probably everyone would subscribe to the idea that there was need to build local capacity to manage projects and most, too, would probably argue for building local capacity for project design. Others would go further and note the need for local capacity to define goals as well as actions. These incremental differences seem quite significant. Not only do they imply different roles and tasks for change agents, they also reflect different views of the development that assistance seeks to promote.

On the one hand there is a view that development is about people and that only people can develop themselves; on the other hand there is a view that development might be measured in terms of the number of successful projects. But this in turn raises the question: what is project success? Various criteria are offered: providing basic human needs; improving the quality of life; generating incomes; responsively serving the needs of the poor; securing equitable (and even equal) distribution of benefits are all mentioned, and cost effectiveness is mentioned by several. Yet there are some who do not mention these consequences or, if they do, it is only a qualifier of other goals that are apparently put first. In these cases, the overriding concern is institution building, and in the short run, at any rate, success in institution building -- or the effectiveness of the change agent's role in promoting this -- is not necessarily to be judged by these criteria. To some, the consultant's role is to teach people problem-solving techniques which can then be applied by individuals and groups. Others would add to that developing the ability to define goals -- including the ability to negotiate goals where interests are in conflict. This

further implies creating or developing the processes and structures that bring people together, and provide the means, by negotiation or otherwise, for resolving conflict, articulating social goals and identifying need and actions. By this view, the role of consultants is not so much to be better designers but to become better facilitators and, perhaps, mediators or trainers in negotiation. A clear distinction emerges between those who would see the consultant's job as one of defining people's needs, having listened to them carefully, and those who see the job as one of helping people to listen to themselves and others, and to take initiatives in defining their own needs.

But who are the people whose needs are to be defined? For some, it is simply the poor. By this view groups of poor people are to be assisted by consultants to define their needs and to find solutions to the problems of how to satisfy them; to mobilize the resources necessary for this and to overcome opposition, subversion, and attempts at cooptation by the wealthy and powerful. However, of those who see such an approach as desirable, several point to the realities of the distribution of resources and power, to political opposition, to bureaucratic lack of interest or motivation, and to the reality that attempts to mobilize the poor would be met by violence in many parts of the world. This, some judge, is particularly likely to occur where success in mobilizing the poor extends beyond assisting them to become productive or to gain access to health services, to success in mobilizing them as a political force which threatens the existing power structure.

This possibility gives rise to different responses. Those whose prime concern is for effective projects to improve the material lot of the poor would seek to minimize the threat of political challenge for fear both of failure in lesser aims and of causing even greater harm. Others would wish to challenge, or appraise, empowerment as an aim of aid projects or as a strategy for social transformation. But this concern, considered later, is not prominent among those with a consultant's world view.

By and large, however, the consultancy view sees the poor as beneficiaries rather than as clients. It does not seem that the beneficiary is seen also to be the client towards whom there is a contractual responsibility and relationship. This seems to hold even where the beneficiary is seen as a local community or group whose capacity for planning and management is to be developed. However, at least one respondent was explicit that all interventions should be contractual in a context which implied that change agents should not act for presumed beneficiaries except on the basis of a direct contract with them.

It might reasonably be supposed that consultants most commonly work under contract to aid agencies or governments. While this agency is undoubtedly a client, there is in reality a hierarchy of clients which might well include clients at different levels of the recipient government and the ultimate intended clients -- the beneficiaries of the intervention who may be people outside government or formally contracting agencies.

The desire expressed by some respondents to have direct contractual responsibility to ultimate clients, or beneficiaries seen as clients, poses questions about the management of aid and technical assistance programs with regard to structures of accountability between all the parties involved. This raises particular problems when conflicts of interest emerge among clients.

Conflicts of interest might well be found in situations where intervention was designed to build community capability. The issue that is raised, and which was indeed raised by many respondents, is: "what is meant by community in this context?" Does it make sense to talk about improving a community's capability to reduce poverty in situations which would involve addressing opposition to specific measures for this purpose and which might be expressed by powerful elements in the community itself? Alternatively, is one building community capability if one simply helps poor sections of a community to better take care of themselves?

Some respondents felt it necessary to define community: necessary in the sense that they were unable to say whether or not they agreed or disagreed with the idea of 'community empowerment' or 'building community capability' unless this was first clarified. For some, however, this was not a problem for they saw the consultant's role as limited to a contractual liability to building administrative (=bureaucratic) capacity for working with communities or groups to develop programs or projects in ways which involved the beneficiaries in planning for themselves. Some stressed most particularly that community involvement in planning should start with the determination of goals. But whether or not this was intended to include the determination of who the beneficiaries should be, and involve, in some sense, the 'total' community in this decision was not clear. Others simply stressed the importance of involving beneficiaries in design and in securing accountability to beneficiaries without concern for who determined who should be the beneficiaries. Building bureaucratic capability to work with communities raises questions about the roles of bureaucrats and who they are serving as well as about the structure of the bureaucracy overall.

Where the consultant's role is to develop community capability, flexibility in project implementation is seen to be desirable. But how detailed should a plan be in order to secure approval for the release of funds? And who determines whether the reasons given for a deviation from the plan are valid? These questions are not answered. One senses that consultants trust their own pragmatism.

4.(ii) The donor agency world view

This theme of flexibility was important to the donor agency world view where there was a recognition that, as far as the United States was concerned, Congress itself would need to be reeducated if adherence to blue-print project plans was not to be held as criteria for accountability. There was recognition, too, that rate of return and cost-effectiveness criteria are also in question here.

There seemed, however, to be no evident conflict between the consulting and the donor agency world views -- though there were some differences in emphasis. Both were concerned for results in terms of output: raising the standard of living; basic human needs; generating incomes; providing services to the poor. A particular concern was that projects and programs should be sustained once the impetus of aid had stopped. The concept of 'ownership' -- the willingness of someone (necessarily the beneficiaries?) to take care of and take responsibility for a project -- was important in this context. But it was doubted that this could be achieved without changes in the attitudes of politicians. It was also regarded as insufficient to secure ownership at the local level and by beneficiaries. Higher levels of government would also need to "own" what was happening. But the implications for consultancy contracts were felt to be unclear. There was not, at present, seen to be a pool of consultants with the approaches and skills necessary for securing local ownership and it was recognized that, even if there were, the consultancy process might be lengthy and thus call for an acceptance of slower disbursements. At worst, however, it might prove so change-agent intensive that it would never prove generally practicable.

4.(iii) Other world views

While some questions and statements seemed to emerge directly from those taking the roles of consultants, or donor agencies, there were many statements made and questions posed from much wider world views. No other primary occupational group, however, revealed enough consistency to be analyzed as a group. Thus, the remainder of this discussion is concerned with general views of particular issues. Overall, a very consistent vision of what was desired from aid and technical assistance emerged. There was a concern that it should be effective. There were concerns, too, that it should be human, relevant, responsive to the needs of the poor, humble, enabling rather than delivering, working 'with' rather than 'for', socially sensitive and above all not imposed.

The sense that it was desirable that aid should be channeled through local agencies was strong. But the question of who speaks for a community and who defines a community remained unresolved.

A composite vision of the ideal bureaucracy emerged from the responses to the workbooks. Not only does the ideal bureaucracy use resources well, it makes appropriate management responses to development tasks and development situations. It does so by mobilizing community self-reliance which it supports and nurtures without coercion. While it may take a leadership role in offering innovative ideas, its prime task is communicative -- providing liaison and coherence to the overall pattern of community and government activities through as loose a central control as possible. Its task is to listen to the needs of the people and to articulate, and help people articulate, these needs. It has a role in planning, but the nature of this role is not at all clear except that the planning that is undertaken should be less detailed and more flexible and should be carried out through a process which involves beneficiaries. It was recognized that the bureaucracy is a hierarchy which should be assigned different responsibilities at different levels. The question of which responsibilities should be assigned to different levels was thought an important question to resolve: and one, apparently, to which a generally valid answer was reasonably to be expected.

All in all, this was a vision of a bureaucracy as a servant of the social will which it was entrusted to express -- not, however, through the control of a mandated or autocratic central government, but by the central orchestration of the many separate initiatives of the different communities which the bureaucracy served.

But not all are agreed, for this is a thought that greatly worries some people. Decentralization, they say, is not panacea. Indeed, strong central direction of local administration may be the one protection that communities have against those who wield a power so strong locally that an expression of local community will would be an expression of their interests. In such a case, any loosening of the authority of the

central administration would lead to the subversion of the local administration by those local powers. But is the choice thus between the imposition of central plans and the subversion of the local administration by local power elites?

There was apparent divergence over the desirability or otherwise of the hierarchical organization of administration. On the one hand, loose non-hierarchical structures are advocated -- seen apparently as the antithesis to centrally directed hierarchical administrative control. Yet, on the other hand, the need is seen for a central coordinating function and a role is seen for a bureaucracy, and, in a large country at least, this might be presumed to have hierarchical structure.

What seems to be entirely missing from the visions presented is a concept of a policy-making and planning system which relates local activity into a coherent national pattern. While the need for this is clearly seen, the possibility of it existing without it having the characteristics of central authoritarian control and imposed planning seems to be doubted. Thus the emphasis of many on the need to define the relationship between local level project planning and the overall administrative process and structure which integrates this into a coherent national policy. The question which seems to be posed is whether or not it is possible to have a national policy which is not authoritarian and imposed but is rather a synthesis of local initiatives. Related to this is the insistence that discussion of process must be linked to discussion of structure.

Many of the comments made by respondents reflect a view of society at large and of the social goals to which development efforts should be directed. It should be said that there appears to be some divergence on this matter, too. On the one hand, there are those who would maintain that we ought to know what it is we are trying to promote when we are in the business of promoting development. But then there are also those who would see this as tantamount to imposing values upon aid or technical assistance recipients and who would wish, it seems, to be

value free, possibly undiscriminating. However, for those who are explicit about the development goals they would wish to see pursued, equity and social justice are predominantly mentioned, as are the concepts of self-determination and the negotiation of conflicting goals. Humanitarian values are espoused; these have also been explicitly described as 'Kantian' which, briefly, is interpreted as meaning 'treating human beings as ends in themselves'. A corollary of this view is that nobody should be excluded from having a voice in decisions which affect them. In the good society, everybody would feel that they participated in the ownership of social projects and accept their responsibility for this participation. The concept of stewardship is also mentioned, especially in relation to natural resources. It is held desirable that actions should be 'people-centered' and 'people-designed'. There would be active community, and private, problem solving rather than simply a reliance upon corporate commercial development and government imposed services -- though several made the point that the private sector has a role and that not all social action should derive from local participation programs.

While the good society would be people-oriented, decision making processes would still aim to be 'objective'. However, objectivity would be related to explicit human values. One consequence of this would be that self-interest would be related to social well-being. One respondent had a vision of a society 'based on love rather than on will', but conflict was not expected to disappear, and the ability for society to resolve conflict was seen as key to its success. In such a society, individuals and society as a whole would be continually searching for meaning. It would be a spiritual society continually exploring its soul.

The idea of autonomy was a recurrent theme: autonomy of both the individual and of social groups. Commonly, it was linked to the necessity for a reciprocal responsibility to others. For some, a criterion of development was that of increasing choice which was therefore seen to relate growth and individual autonomy. Others,

however, quite explicitly rejected a philosophy of individualism as either a reasonable or a desirable interpretation of autonomy.

Power, and the distribution of resources to which it related, was commonly seen to be in need of restructuring and, as mentioned earlier, it is around the question of power that many have reservations.

Not everybody was explicit about development goals and social values. And many who were expressed more concern for the reduction of poverty, for satisfying basic human needs, for improving the physical quality of life, and generating incomes and were prepared to measure progress by these achievements rather than by evidence of changes in human relationships or in social ethos. It was among these, especially, that it was argued that current power structures would, in many countries, lead to the rejection or failure of participatory planning and management approaches. While some saw bureaucratic reorientation as a strategy for social change, others felt that it was either unrealistic to consider it as such, or even not what was at issue. For them, what was at issue was whether or not it was an effective way of securing certain material ends: the delivery of services to the poor, the provision of basic human needs, the generation of incomes, etc. With these concerns one might question whether involving people was really necessary, or at least whether we might not be unwise to involve them more than was absolutely necessary. Especially, we should ask whether the attempt to involve people was not prejudicial to achieving the true objectives since those with power may see their power threatened and have power enough to stop things going ahead.

Others differ in seeing the participatory approach as a strategy for social change: the true objective. For them, the scenario seems to be one in which small groups of people at a local level are encouraged to participate in the design and management and advocacy skills and become a political effective group -- demanding a greater say, for themselves and others, in social decision making. On this view, one of the performance criteria for a project would be the extent to which the poor became a more effective political force. To others, this criterion might be unnecessary or undesirable, as well as, perhaps, an inexpedient criterion to express in aid programs.

III. Synthesis -- The Responses as Dialogue

1.(i) How it is and how it should be

The previous section presented a broad synoptic view of different viewpoints. This section attempts a more systematic analysis of the components of these approaches. No merit is seen in treating the responses as though they were an opinion poll or deriving from them a sense of "what the majority thinks". Instead, each respondent is seen as contributing to a dialogue. Thus, in this section an attempt is made to create a dialogue from the responses given. However, instead of presenting a script in which speakers respond to one another in a flowing sequence of arguments, it offers a series of propositions about "what is" and "what should be" with regard to the planning process, central-local relationships and so on. So far as possible, the spirit and intent of respondents' expressions have been captured even where the words have been modified (inevitably, where the expressions of different people have been grouped together). In some cases, there was no explicit statement available to match one half of the "is" and "should be" dyad and an implied or possible partner has therefore been supplied (and marked *). Occasionally, this addition has been drafted provocatively in order to challenge an inference.

It is hoped that by presenting a series of propositions in this way it will be possible to extend the dialogue and to more clearly express, identify and distinguish the differing viewpoints.

"WHAT IS"

"WHAT SHOULD BE"

A. Characteristics of the planning process

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Planning process does not directly involve local people in responsibility for design/ action/goal setting. | Local people participate directly with responsibility for design/action/goal setting. |
| 2. The effect of excluding people from the planning process is to alienate them from the government and its schemes which they do not own. | People accept that they have a responsibility for the decisions taken and feel ownership of plans and projects. |
| 3. The planning process is managed by the central government (with or without involvement/assistance of outside agency) and planned projects are imposed. | The local planning process is locally self-managed though there will be interaction with other agencies and perhaps assistance from them. The local process is integrated with a national planning process. |
| 4. Projects aim to be materially enriching by delivering goods and services. Central government creates dependency. | Central government support is for local planning and is enabling/empowering; encourages local self-reliance. |

B. Central-local planning relationships

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. National policy defines national goals which are applied (imposed?) locally. | Local goals defined locally; national policy expresses negotiated synthesis of local goals. |
|---|---|

"WHAT IS"

"WHAT SHOULD BE"

-
- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>2. At both national and local levels, experts undertake 'needs assessments', diagnosis of problems and proposed solutions. Experts may be local or expatriates. They may listen to local administrators and even, sometimes, citizens.</p> | <p>Goal setting and design of action replaces 'needs assessment', and diagnosis of problems. It is undertaken by the community (or representative) who take account of local realities (including organizational/cultural) in designing action to meet goals. Expert may facilitate dialogue and negotiations on goals and actions and may also propose questions for inquiry and report experience elsewhere but goals and designs are the community's.</p> |
| <p>3. All planning and action initiated by central government.</p> | <p>Ideas for local programs and projects may be prompted by center but local action is initiated locally.</p> |
| <p>4. Without an initiative by the central government nothing happens.</p> | <p>Without an initiative from local government nothing happens. (*)</p> |
| <p>5. Programs and projects are defined by ministries and focused on the ministries' areas of responsibility, technical expertise and function. Program and project proposals centrally appraised by contribution to stated national goals. (*)</p> | <p>Programs and projects defined by local communities, possibly borrowing concepts worked out centrally or elsewhere. Appraised as appropriate responses to local needs/opportunity.</p> |

- | | |
|--|---|
| 6. Government intervenes locally by providing programs and projects determined to contribute to meeting national objectives. | Government intervenes locally with provision of support services to client community (groups in community; assists community/group mobilization, goals setting, program/project design and management/implementation. |
| 7. Process of plan/implementation undertaken wholly by professionals: experts, planners, administrators. | Planning process largely undertaken by citizens with professional assistance. Implementation may be largely the responsibility of service agencies but citizens involved in the feedback and management process. |

C. Goals

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Aimed at poverty elimination meeting basic human needs, employment generation, production increase, etc. | As defined by people (which people?). |
| 2. Goals are material-centered (formulated in terms of resources, technology, production, distribution). | Goals are people-centered: responding to the condition of people as individuals and as community. Community, institutions and role relationships are nurtured. |
| 3. Goals focus on project results which are to be secured as | Goals are open-ended and subject to evolution. Projects |

"WHAT IS"

"WHAT SHOULD BE"

soon as possible (delay in realization of benefits stream reduces present value estimate).

may be designed to alleviate problems that people experience and urgency may be felt to implement them but not in order to increase the rate of return. Planning and action contribute to building self-reliance (self-reliance seen as development). Institution building interpreted as communities becoming effectively self-caring.

4. The project is the prime focus of intervention.

Intervention is primarily to build local capability and self-caring. Project focus may be instrumental in this but is not the only or necessary point of departure.

D. The relationship between process and structure

1. The planning/implementation process is carried out by the administrative hierarchy under central control with the assistance of expert consultants.

At local levels people other than administrators and experts are involved in planning and decision making. More power is given to local administrations to manage their service provision in support of community action. The role of the center is more in orchestration and the management of policy dialogue than it is control.

-
- | | |
|--|---|
| 2. Structure and process separate planning from management. While many projects may be locally administered, the administrators are not the planners. These functions are carried out in separate offices and communications between them may not be good. | Participation of client groups in all phases of design and action provides better integration. Planning is treated as an aspect of management; both goals and performance under review. (*) |
|--|---|

E. Feedback and evaluation

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Progress and performance monitoring feeds information to senior administrators and planners. Information provides rate of return criteria for future resource allocation and data for future feasibility studies for planners. Administrators review management in light of feedback. Concern is principally cost-effectiveness. (*) | In addition to what happens now there will also be monitoring of process. Evaluation will consider both means and ends. The process is open to the public. This sustains a sense of ownership and avoids alienation. Cost-effectiveness of service delivery may be subsidiary to concerns for contribution of activities to institution building. |
| 2. Projects are subject to evaluation by comparing performance with target. Evaluation also determines future resource allocation to this activity by comparison with alternatives. Standardized indicators are | The evaluation process asks: Are we going where we want? Can we get there in any better way? The focus is not on resource allocation. Decisions on what to do have resource allocation implications rather than |

"WHAT IS"

"WHAT SHOULD BE"

sought to provide common basis for comparisons. This also includes attempt to maintain constant weightings of objectives to secure consistency. This is equated with objectivity which is protected against erosion by "subjective" and "political" considerations. (*)

decisions on resource allocations having implications for what to do. Choices are not made by attempting to make them comparable and therefore subject to objective rationality. Consistency is of no significance. Evaluation asks "what have we learned?" Effectiveness (including effectiveness of resource use) is important, but efficiency is not a central concern. What is important is to 'embrace error", to reassess direction and to determine how to proceed.

3. Planning is rational. Effective decision making is equated with maximization of resource returns or optimization of complex utility functions.

Planning is through goal negotiation and the choice of appropriate action to pursue goals. There is no attempt at, or implicit use of, weighted objective functions. Community cohesion may be most significant indicator of effective decision making.

4. Hard evidence of cause and effect relationships are sought.

Evidence of cause and effect relationships still relevant and sought but effects tend to be more broadly defined. Qualitative evidence is also accepted.

5. A major concern is replicability and routinization.

Concern is for learning how to proceed in specific situations

"WHAT IS"

"WHAT SHOULD BE"

-
- | | |
|---|---|
| 6. Evaluation is to appraise success. Success is about achieving stated goals as planned. | Evaluation less important than 'embracing error'. |
|---|---|

F. Accountability

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. Line ministries accountable to the Ministry of Finance and central planners; lower echelons in ministries accountable to higher echelons for performing specified administrative and planning functions and for achieving targets. | Ministries accountable to client communities and to the Ministry of Finance and planners for the effectiveness of those services. Ministries provide planning consultants for local communities. They are accountable for effective participation in planning process but not accountable for meeting targets. (*) |
|---|--|

G. Continuity and obligation

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Ministries are frequently irresponsible with regard to maintaining continuity of services and support for projects and programs. Local community inputs are commonly neither sought nor given. | Provision of central funds or ministry services are made on a contractual basis which defines the nature of mutual obligations. (*) |
|---|---|

H. Risk-bearing

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Operations of projects and programs impose risks on people even without their consultation.
(*) | Risk-bearing is consciously undertaken and may be shared by contractual obligation. |
|---|---|

I. Characteristic attitudes

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Public dialogue has little role in or impact on planning process. | Dialogue which invites the public is the essence of the planning process and the basis for action. |
| 2. Goodwill is desirable/essential from those who might otherwise block, subvert, or co-opt project/plans. But goodwill cannot be relied on and is no basis for planning. | Goodwill is essential to maintaining dialogue process and negotiation and for successful projects and programs. |
| 3. Cultural superiority is the unspoken premise when planning is non-participatory and projects are imposed. | Cultural equality is a premise of participatory planning. |
| 4. Cultural empathy is invaluable to planners seeking information. | Cultural empathy is essential for successful consulting intervention. |
| 5. Planners are autocratic or at best paternal. | Planning experts act as planning consultants relating to local planners as colleagues and friends. |

The propositions set out above attempt to provide, from respondents' views, a basis for defining what is meant by social learning (or whatever label is adopted) -- "what should be". What these propositions do not cover in any detail are statements with regard to the conduct of aid and technical assistance. While such propositions might be formulated fairly readily by inference there was insufficient material in the responses to justify this in a report on the workbooks. However, any attempt to draw up such propositions would benefit from reference to the workbooks.

1.(ii) How will it all come about?

It is clear that there are a number of visions of the future ideal explicit or implicit in the responses provided. It is equally clear that there are several strategies -- explicit and implicit -- for proceeding.

Broadly, however, strategies may be grouped under three headings:

1. Try harder, do better.
2. Try a new approach to development assistance.
3. Revolution.

Under the first heading the story runs something like this: We improve our training of change agents. They become not only more technically competent (practical; broader) but more socially and politically savvy. They become better at getting information and invest more in this (They learn languages and spend time in villages.) They inquire of local people, not only technocrats and bureaucrats. They inquire not only about technical matters but also about social and political matters and personal needs and preferences. They thus improve their analyses, diagnoses and project designs. Aid projects work better and last longer because people really want them. Incomes, employment, basic human needs, the Physical Quality of Life Index and the range of material choices all improve.

Under the second heading it runs rather like this: Change agents plan with rather than for people and occupy new roles in helping people articulate and negotiate their goals. The process by which planning occurs and the way people relate to one another -- including the way that bureaucrats relate to ordinary citizens -- is more important than the quality of the plans produced. Nevertheless, the ideas and designs that emerge turn out to be well conceived and adapted to local circumstances because they are informed by local understanding. They are also wanted by the people concerned and accepted as something they share responsibility for. Shortcomings in initial planning are not disastrous since flexibility is permitted in implementation as learning occurs.

Bureaucrats are happier with their new service roles and are ready to act as advocates on behalf of local communities to central government. Central governments find plan implementation more effective and increasingly leave more responsibility for planning and implementation in local hands while retaining overall control of disbursements and the orchestration of local development efforts into coherent national policies. Central government also supports local officials in resisting opposition by local elites to local plans to improve the condition of the people. Initial local successes set a new pattern for planning and implementation so that roles and processes are formally modified and both officials and ordinary citizens are trained for these. Initiatives for this process come from a few professional international consultants who advocate it and who persuade aid agencies to test its effectiveness. In so doing, they develop their own codes of conduct, operating procedures and techniques and learn to generalize about what works in different situations. They also develop a body of theory, and experience in its application, which provides the basis for a new approach to development planning and administration which displaces old 'economic' approaches and becomes widely accepted.

The third strategy is revolution. Recognizing that no significant progress can be made in reducing inequity with existing power

structures a strategy is adopted which seeks to confront power with power. It is a strategy for the political mobilization of the masses behind an ideology and a committed leadership so as to challenge the existing rules of political process and the existing distribution of material resources. It is not clear whether this strategy, when successful, would lead to the inception of planning and government processes such as those envisaged in the second strategy.

Of course, these statements caricature the points of view that they represent, and they also ignore a number of variations and combinations of the central themes. Yet they do seem crudely to cover the range of stories envisioned by respondents about the way things might work -- except, that is, for those who do not see a way ahead. And some clearly do not believe that "trying harder" will take us where we want to go, yet eschew revolution and are skeptical that it is realistic to expect that "social learning" will be acceptable either to governments or to aid agencies.

One of the scenarios not brought out by the above caricatures is a combination of two of them. In this scenario local successes with social learning result not only in effective projects but in political mobilization. Thus, "social learning" becomes a strategy for revolution. Or, perhaps, for avoiding revolution. What is not clear here is what opposition is expected to such a movement; nor how such opposition would be met.

Perhaps the most striking of the three scenarios presented -- in this context at least -- is the first: "do better; try harder". What it says is that some respondents, if they accept the concept of 'social learning' at all, interpret it to mean that planners need to be more socially aware if they are to design effective plans (projects?). This means better training so that technical competence is married to competence in social analysis, and it means that planners should spend more time in villages. But this would be rejected as inadequate by those who are working on the second scenario. And while both might agree about the need for technical specialists to have a greater social

awareness, the role training implied for the first scenario is significantly different from that implied for the second.

But these scenarios have been largely inferred, and their categorization under three broad headings does rough justice to individuals' views. Nevertheless, more detailed responses to these should prove very enlightening.

2. What is missing?

The workbook asked what was missing or under-emphasized by the workbook. This question was considered likely to evoke those concepts or values most significant to the respondent and thus provide further clues to their central concerns.

One respondent found the workbook deficient in that it did not provide a "precise definition of what it is we are trying to assist". Others also noted the lack of content given to terms used: "social learning", 'social development' and 'social development management", specifically. One of these thought that the essential characteristic of "social learning" -- namely equality -- should have been stated.

Several found the need for concreteness and/or a defined context to make sense of the discussion (though they did not supply their own). And in another expression of concern about generalizations, it was pointed out that reality had a richness and complexity overlooked in the workbook.

Some had concerns that specific aspects of reality were being ignored: aspects of conflict, power, suppression, exploitation, deprivation, violence (especially as a reaction to ideas of participation) and corruption. Central governments exercise strong control. Participation has fundamental political implications: political contexts do not permit changes in either bureaucratic behavior or of the aid relationship to promote participation. Advocates of participation also need

to recognize those conflicts that exist between planners and clients, between different parts of government and between social groups. The cultural context does not always favor participatory organizations. Participation raises "the distribution question" which should be explicitly dealt with. The reality that economies are generally weak makes "the distribution question" more acute.

Several respondents were concerned that structural questions had not been faced. 'Structural questions' seem to mean different things to different respondents. Some seem to refer to the structure of power, others to the structure of the bureaucracy -- especially with reference to the relationships between levels of the bureaucratic hierarchy and between center and locality.

Some thought that the workbook wrongly assumed that it was possible to discuss the process of decision making without making explicit the administrative structure engaged in the process or the authority which governed it. Thus, to them, what was missing was an opportunity to discuss the relationship between structure and process.

Some looked for a classification of functions related to the level of government at which decision making authority should reside. It was noted that not all functions or decisions could be subject to local control. One respondent thought that we were in danger of developing local level government while leaving scientists to control the globe. Several thought that the role of central government and central planning had been neglected. (Though one person thought that we had not been clear, as we should be, about rejecting the inadequacies and consequences of central control and another that we should reject the notion of centralized bureaucratic intelligence.) The role of central planning -- modelling to provide an overview of the national economy -- should not be neglected. The role of central government as coordinator or orchestrator of local level planning needed also to be recognized as did, by another view, the concept of administrative penetration. Central government also had a protective role which had been neglected: protecting the weak against the powerful at the local level.

Related to this, it was stated that "the trick is to balance local and national objectives". Others expressed the notion that what was missing was the recognition of interdependence as the counterpart which made sense of autonomy. Autonomy was not desirable, or to be promoted, except in the context of managing and respecting interdependence. One person wrote of the "needed tension between the growth in autonomy and the growth in solidarity".

One person thought that the idea that development should be seen as the growth of autonomy was not sufficiently stressed.

"Participation" evoked comments: one thought that it should be explicitly rejected as a panacea; another that it should be recognized that participation was relevant only at certain levels of government. But other comments were about the need for specifics on how to proceed in the development of community groups or the need to emphasize culture (traditional?) as the basis for organizational change or the need to emphasize shared values, rather than simply common goals, as the organizing principle.

Another organizing principle which was seen as neglected was that of accountability as the basis for reward and promotion. Indeed, the whole question of motivation was seen by some to have been neglected. Some felt that good will was erroneously expected to be latent and available to be harnessed. We needed to define how attitudes needed to be changed and how to secure this change. The need to move away from self-centered attitudes especially called for a strategy of change. It was thought that this could not be done without an ideology and a committed leadership.

Another topic found to be neglected was that of how to justify decisions based on subjectivity. Others expressed similar thoughts, suggesting that attention to procedures for blending analysis and group process or scientific and social learning was needed.

Finally some thought, variously, that management technologies and communication technologies needed more specific attention; that the dilemmas of social development managers had not been brought out; that the importance of interpersonal skills was understressed and that action research and training needed particular emphasis.

It is evident not only that different people have different concerns but that these different concerns reflect different perceptions which are not always compatible. This begins to clarify for each of us the nature of the task we confront in communication; even with each other.

3. The right label

An attempt was made to avoid too narrow a definition of the subject matter of the workbook or appearing to indicate any specific orientation towards it. While the phrase 'Social Development Management' was used in the title of the workbook, other phrases -- "participatory management" and "social learning systems" were used in the introduction. Later, when respondents were asked to suggest a term which best conveyed the substance of the matter the terms "social learning" and "bureaucratic reorientation" were used as examples.

What was sought at that point was both an identification of what people perceived as the core of substance and a label which would communicate that. In the event, it now seems probable that had people been asked directly to choose a label they would have responded differently.

The responses they did give were rather diverse. They are listed as follows (the numbers in parentheses show the numbers making suggestions):

- social learning (15)
- bureaucratic reorientation (8)
- social development (5)
- social development management (5)
- social transformation (2)

- adaptive management (2)
- social development facilitation (1)
- social development administration (1)
- developmental and organizational learning (1)
- community learning and management (1)
- humanistic participative management (1)
- participatory management (1)
- local participation (1)
- democratic, local, community development (1)
- empowering rural communities (1)
- inductive planning (1)
- responsive bureaucracy (1)
- person-centered systems (1)
- community capacity building (1)
- building institutional capacity (1)
- organic development (1)
- motivational redirection (1)
- restructuring power (1)

Two people thought that no label could be satisfactory.

It will be noticed that there are different verbs/activities, adverbs/adjectives and subjects/objects (explicit and implicit) and that all suggestions are combinations of these which are listed separately below. (Numbers in parentheses show frequency of use.)

<u>SUBJECTS/OBJECTS</u>	<u>VERBS/ACTIVITIES</u>	<u>ADVERBS/ADJECTIVES</u>
social (=society) (29)	capacity building (1)	adaptive (2)
bureaucracy (=bureau- tic) (9)	learning (17)	developmental (1)
community (also rural) (4)	redirection (1)	organizational (1)
	reorientation (8)	motivational (1)
	development (14)	humanistic (1)
local(s)(2)	participation (1)	participative (=par- ticipatory)(2)
systems (1)	transformation (2)	

planning (1)	democratic (1)
facilitation (1)	responsive (1)
administration (1)	person-centered (1)
empowering (1)	inductive (1)
restructuring power (1)	organic (1)
creating (implicit)(2)	

Some of the combinations proposed leave unclear who is doing what to whom, e.g., local participation. But clarity is not easy in a brief phrase. For this reason, no doubt, some opted to spell things out at greater length, thus: "reorienting bureaucracy through the social learning method for people centered development" and "flexible management in adaptive institutions for holistic development" or to encapsulate the elements in a slogan: "Efficiency, equity, empowerment".

It will be seen that these labels reveal both clusterings of ideas and some significant differences of emphasis or of substance.

IV. Analysis -- Clusterings of viewpoints

Examination of each of the workbooks taken as a whole leaves a strong impression that while people come from different directions they yet share some common concerns. But having noted the concerns that many have in common and the things on which people can agree -- what is in the end most striking is that there are differences between them which are fundamental in their implications.

One aspect of this differentiation is that while some are primarily concerned for material progress yet recognize the need for attention to social organization as a means to that end, others are primarily concerned for social progress (defined in terms of how people relate to one another and handle their own lives) and see material concerns as the means of focusing on the management of social change.

Interpreting these viewpoints is sometimes a matter of inference but the attempt at interpretation, while hazardous, raises issues which seem to call for further attention. Those who have a material orientation appear to be saying such things as: when poverty is as serious as indeed it is, basic human (material) needs come first; equity is more realistically pursued when there is more to be distributed; whatever anyone's ends are (and we should not presume to know what other people's ends are or should be) the better the resource and technology base the easier these ends will be to attain; development is to be measured by the extent of material choice.

Those who focus instead on social development seem to be saying: it is not so much the increase of material wealth or the advancement of technology that matters as the way that individuals and society use resources and technology; more is not always better than less -- what

technology; development is the growth of responsible autonomy of individuals and groups; development is characterized by concern for values as well as (rather than?) by success in achieving goals.

From these different viewpoints both groups are concerned about freedom from central government (any government?) control: those of the first group emphasize organization to achieve effectiveness in resource utilization and those of the second group emphasize organization to achieve dialogue about responsible interdependence and needed social action. On the face of it, it would appear that this is, in part, a matter of differing perceptions about the relationship between private and social good as well as with regard to the role of market forces.

Part of the difference seems also to relate to perceptions about the role of dialogue in social organization as a means of exploring values, articulating goals and reconciling interests. While it is possible that members of the first group could be strong advocates of participatory processes, they seem not to wish to make this the end of aid intervention but rather to appraise participation as means to other ends defined in material terms. The existence of conflict is recognized by many in this group but, rather than offering a direct approach to its management or resolution, the response is to seek to ameliorate its effects. Indeed, it may be that the first group does not see social action as having a major role except by groups of people having common personal interests, the empowerment of the disadvantaged being advocated as a means of offsetting the undesirable social effects of using the market to allocate resources in situations where resources are inequitably distributed.

The second group on the other hand may be seen to comprise those who would, with varying degrees of emphasis, see the development of dialogue as the basis for social organization on those issues that they see as requiring social action. They see this as involving negotiation or mediation with the parties in conflict participating in the definition of goals. However, there seem to be differences about how encompassing

participation might be, and some place more emphasis on empowerment and advocacy -- the development of countervailing power for disadvantaged groups with common interests. Others, however, would not find such cooperation for self-interested power enhancement compatible with a Kantian view which would treat the humanity in all people, equally, 'as an end withall'. Those would therefore seek participation by everybody in mediation of conflict and in social decision making.

There are some who seem not to recognize the existence of, or potential for, conflict and make no reference to how it might be approached.

Another distinction around which clusters may be defined is that with regard to the relationship between central government and local government or groups. While some have a concept of hierarchical interdependence of agencies of governance, in which the center plays a coordinating and overall policy synthesizing role, others do not make any explicit reference to suggest that local activities need be related to national policy formulation or implementation in any way. This latter group appears to seek not only a reduction of central government power and action but also less government action overall. Related to this, some respondents seem to favor project planning but not national planning or, for that matter, regional or local planning.

The distinction between 'blueprint planning' and 'social learning' did not come out strongly yet the distinction does seem to be a principle for distinguishing clusters. That this distinction did not emerge seems to be because everybody recognizes (a) the virtue of flexibility; (b) the relevance of 'social information' for effective planning. Nobody argues that planning must be done solely by experts or that implementers should be without a degree of autonomy -- executing a plan strictly according to orders. But not everybody sees the alternative as 'self-management' or 'social management' or a 'social learning process'. Those who do not press for such an alternative seem to seek to improve plans and to increase local discretionary powers in implementation. They would wish to enhance planners' expertise through close contact with the

target population, to enhance the acceptability of their plans by patient persuasion, and to improve the adaptability of project management by instituting procedures for popular feedback. But it would be wrong to suggest that anyone explicitly proposes this as an alternative strategy to other 'reorientation' approaches.

It is also true that nobody makes an explicit comprehensive statement of what they see as the meaning of 'social learning'. For many, as much as can be inferred is that they would wish to see popular participation in project design and management. However, very few are explicit enough to be counted as advocating working towards 'double loop learning' (reflection on, and reappraisal of, goals) as compared to 'single loop learning' (reflection on, and reappraisal of, project operation).

Summarizing even more crudely, the themes which provide the dimensions along which respondents might be located appear to be:

- the material-social dimension:

- is more attention to be paid to social organization because it may, in some cases, be the means to improve material achievement, or is social development the true concern (end) which might be fostered by the way material issues are approached? Is 'participation' means or ends?

- degree of participation:

is everyone in the community involved? or just groups with common interests?

- do they relate as cooperators with a specific goal or from a much more broadly based commitment to one another?
- do people participate by being party to dialogue or by having a vote?

- is discussion about plans prepared by experts for acceptance or rejection, or about planning (with the assistance of experts -- including local bureaucrats)?
- is there discussion about ends or only about means?
- the approach to empowerment:
 - Is the approach to ameliorate the consequences of powerlessness by providing goods and services?
 - or to speak for the powerless?
 - or to empower the powerless? with regard to specific needs or politically?
 - or to provide for negotiation of conflict of interest?
 - or for mediation?
- the role of the central government:
 - should it accept, and be regarded as having full responsibility for initiating, planning and implementing all social action? or should it simply have a coordinating and service role?
 - what responsibility should be accorded to, and accepted by, local groups for taking care of themselves?
 - what things should be planned by government? central government?

It is suggested that the answers given to questions such as the above would definitively locate any particular view on a conceptual map of this subject. Each location would be sufficiently defined to make it

possible to broadly specify the implications with regard to such matters as the role of change agents, aid management, strategies to be pursued etc.

No doubt, in the attempt to answer these questions, to examine their implications and to explain our answers to others, we would find it necessary to examine more basic issues. The effect of this might be more sharply to distinguish the clusterings of viewpoints and to focus debate on the questions which most critically test whether or not we differ or agree.

V. **How to Proceed?**

1. What respondents thought

Only one person thought that the next step was to plan a strategy. From the rest of the responses it might be concluded that the appropriate strategy is to involve everyone with a concern and to try everything conceivable. Some argued that particular activities or particular audiences were key. Networking, dialogue and forming groups (defined by specific interest and/or by region) were common suggestions. NASPAA was often assigned a key role as convenor. There were also suggestions that we(?) should create "futures centers" or research and training centers.

One person believed that we should create a non-hierarchical organization -- thus learning by doing and persuading by example. However, it is not clear from other responses that there is consensus about the meaning, or the necessity, of non-hierarchical structures as a characteristic of 'the new approach'. This seems an agenda item for discussion.

Apart from the question of how, or whether, we should structure or institutionalize ourselves, however, there are questions about what should be done. Ideas which had several mentions include:

- action research: more attempts to exemplify what is being proposed, to document and analyze relevant experience; new efforts should be planned to explore a range of contexts and styles suitably matched;

and varying support was expressed for the following activities:

- examine state of knowledge about such related questions as "how large scale organizations learn", conflict resolution;

- invite commentaries from appropriate disciplines (anthropology, social psychology, political science, management science) on social learning and related approaches;
- develop a research agenda
- clarify (by network communication, using regional and 'expert workgroups'; further, more specific, 'workbook' inquiry) values, concepts, theory, attitudes, methods, and definitions;
- define success, effectiveness, performance criteria;
- develop a vision;
- create a mass ideology;
- develop a taxonomy of approaches and their suitability (or unsuitability) in different situations (this should be wider than simply 'bureaucratic reorientation' and should also subsume narrower approaches, e.g., "BRO without empowerment");
- develop methods: for 'bureaucratic de-orientation'; for community mobilization;
- persuade: (aid agencies, administrations/bureaucracies/governments, third world leaders, women's groups) that current approaches to aid and technical assistance do not work; that new styles of aid and T.A. are called for; that present management values are wrong (inappropriate? ineffective/immoral?);
- orient and train: (aid agencies, bureaucrats, consultants, field workers) in new style and methods; in problem solving;
- train disciplinary and professional specialists working in rural development in political analysis and in listening to the people;

- organize implementation improvement retreats for managers and participants in projects;
- promote conditions and forces predisposing to acceptance of new ideas -- political stability, creating elites, convinced political leadership;
- press for changes in academic tenure rules to allow academics to engage in activities consistent with perceived new action research roles.

2. Making the most use of the workbook results

While the attempt to complete the workbook might have had some value for those who responded, the value of this project is likely to be in the contribution that it makes to the overall dialogue. The fifty-two people who responded to the invitation to give their views have provided material which help us understand what they believe. They were not selected as having a particular point of view, and it is not surprising that they exhibit a wide range of beliefs. Nevertheless, there is convergence among groups of them. Some of that convergence appears to be around the beliefs held by those who are recognized proponents of 'social development management'. Some of it is around beliefs which do not seem compatible with those views.

What matters now is that the core features of distinctive positions should be identified and that there should be debate about the key differentiating propositions. This report has made a small step in identifying these key propositions. What is important is that they be examined and that there should emerge coherent statements of the different positions offered by those who propound them.

What is needed is to:

- identify key propositions for different positions;
- clarify these and present them as a whole thus defining each of the various viewpoints;

- examine and clarify the premises on which these distinguishing propositions stand;
- examine and spell out the corollaries in terms of professional practice (in aid, consultancy, research and teaching).

All this is at the level of debate and discussion. At the practical level, the need is to test overall approaches and some of their specific components. However, before embarking on this, it is necessary to recognize that the performance criteria considered important to people with different approaches may be different so that what constitutes a test for one party is not recognized by another. Thus, even 'action research' and 'field testing' may not get us much further towards widening the scope of agreement about approaches to be pursued. While testing is essential, widening the scope of agreement may depend primarily on effective discussion about fundamentals.

This report might contribute to this in the following ways: First, many of the potentially key propositions are raised, in one form or another in Section 3.1 (i) ("what is" and "what should be"). These might be offered for comment to those prepared to join a corresponding network on this subject. They might be asked to draft their own propositions and elaborate and argue them. More detailed, and sometimes additional aspects (e.g., the roles of consultants) are raised elsewhere in the report. Again the statements used could be the basis for comment either in relation to a structured set of questions or not. If more detailed responses of this sort were envisaged then an index and referencing system would be a helpful addition to the report.

A series of critiques and position statements might result from this. These, again, might be put together in synoptic form and circulated for further comment. In all probability one or more people will feel impelled to develop a statement of either one particular approach or a comparison of approaches. This might be encouraged.

On the basis of this more detailed exposition of principles -- and their practical implications -- proposals for specific action research projects designed to exemplify and test one or more approaches could be developed and performance criteria determined to reflect the questions posed by the debate.

Inevitably, many of those who responded to the workbook will not find their ideas adequately reflected: inevitably because, while all views were read in the context of their overall presentation, no single view has been presented in its totality and many of the viewpoints reported on were generalized with regard to several such viewpoints. This will not matter if people are now encouraged to say more precisely what their views are.

The use of the workbook was intended to find out 'where people stand', to discover convergence and divergence and to identify areas for clarification, testing and resolution. With regard to those who responded, it seems to have succeeded in these intentions. However, those who responded, while they include some whose names are associated with contributions in this field, do not represent a selected group of such people. One consequence of this is that the range of views may be greater than would have been found in such a group. Another is that the coherence of views may have been less thoroughly developed. It might be concluded that the responses obtained will therefore fail to represent ideas that have been worked on by some, raising issues which have already been dealt with. Yet this does not seem likely. All the ideas provided merit response. What is lacking at this stage is the more detailed elaboration of the implications of these approaches with regard to professional change-agent behavior. But the ground work is being laid for this. As the broader issues become clarified it will be important to proceed to a discussion of "so what? what does it mean for us?"

Appendix 1

Writings drawn upon for quotation or paraphrase.*

Denhart, Robert B. Toward a Critical Theory of Public Organization.
Public Administration Review. Nov/Dec 1981.

Friedmann, John and Hudson, Barclay. Knowledge and Action: A Guide
to Planning Theory. AIP Journal. January, 1974.

Habermas, Jurgen. Knowledge and Human Interests. Boston: Beacon Press,
1968.

Honadle, George. Development Administration in the Eighties: New
Agendas or Old Perspectives? Public Administration Review. Mar/
Apr 1982.

Korten, David C. and Alfonso, Felipe B. Bureaucracy and the Poor:
Closing the Gap. McGraw Hill. 1981.

Korten, David C. The Management of Social Transformation. Public Ad-
ministration Review. Nov/Dec 1981.

Smith, Karen H. and Hollnsteiner, Mary Racelis. Community Participa-
tion: The UNICEF Approach. UNICEF, 1982 (mimeo).

Note that the statements used were not always direct quotations from these sources. Where paraphrase was used, the object was not to represent the author's precise ideas but rather to trigger responses to key ideas found in these writings. The range of ideas presented was intended to more than cover the core issues in order to reveal cases where the heart of the matter, as seen by individuals, was not where it was expected to be.

* See page 8 and Appendix 2.

Appendix 2

List of statements included in the
"Clusterings of Ideas -- drawn from writings on social learning"

	<u># marking as:</u>	
	<u>Unnecessary/ Misleading</u>	<u>MOST IMPORTANT</u>
1. planning is best conceived of as a process of social learning	0	10
2. the usable blueprints for social action are not found on pieces of paper but in the value systems and structures of organizations; they are only changed by a process of social learning	1	8
3. we need new management techniques or, perhaps, new approaches with known techniques	1	6
4. planning should aim at innovative adaptation of social organizations	1	9
5. social learning occurs through spoken dialogue	7	8
6. social learning can occur in loosely linked network structures consisting of small, temporary, non-hierarchical task-oriented working groups	2	13
7. conventional planning tends to treat every social problem as a problem in the allocation of public	3	8

#marking as:	
Unnecessary/ Misleading	MOST IMPORTANT

funds even where the problem is predominantly organizational		
8. the role of the expert should be expressed in interpersonal transactions with client group	4	7
9. planners who are 'experts' become isolated from people	3	7
10 we need to narrow the gap between bureaucrats and the poor	3	3
11. the area development approach to planning can be very supportive of participation	3	5
12. risk sharing and strong two-way communication between government staff and beneficiaries has characterized successful development projects	2	12
13. participation improves cost effectiveness	5	5
14. the key to social learning is not analytical method but organizational process	4	7
15. planning can be seen as problem solving which community members can practice rather than an esoteric and incomprehensible practice beyond their control	1	11

	# marking as:	
	Unnecessary/ Misleading	MOST IMPORTANT
16. social learning emphasizes central facilitation over central control, performance monitoring and self correction over pre-planning	3	13
17. we need to strengthen intermediate human-scale institutions which perform a mediating role between individual and megastructure and facilitate local problem solving and creative innovation	0	16
18. an individual vote is a poor substitute for more direct participation	3	5
19. effective participation involves clients in the design of action not simply in implementation	0	16
20. social learning clusters and networks should link individuals in larger coalitions and collect commitment to appropriate action	1	6
21. the answer rests in loosening central control and strengthening the feedback systems that increase potentials for self direction and direct participation at local levels	5	13
22. in an ideal information system, objectives, goals and action plans would inform rather than direct	0	8

# marking as:	
Unnecessary/ Misleading	MOST IMPORTANT

adjacent levels which would actually set their own goals

23. central bureaucracies are inherently incapable of comprehensive overview of large, complex and rapidly changing social systems	5	5
24. planning by experts leads to central bureaucratic direction	7	2
25. implementation of conventional plans necessarily relies on essentially coercive measures to achieve bottom-up compliance with top-down direction	5	7
26. success in implementing plans should not be judged by degree of adherence to <u>a priori</u> blueprint; this is appropriate to physical engineering, not to social change	2	14
27. the combination of increasing "objectivity" and decreasing reflexivity produces alienation both within and from the bureaucracy	2	4
28. management control is achieved by treating people as data to be manipulated or as functionaries to be directed	8	3

	# marking as:	
	Unnecessary/ Misleading	MOST IMPORTANT
29. management techniques are intended to manipulate people and materials to secure a predictable outcome	8	4
30. science provides the basis for control: first of nature, later of human beings	6	2
31. we need a fusion of scientific/technical knowledge with personal/subjective knowledge	0	12
32. the distinction between scientific knowledge and social knowledge is of particular importance for the creation of new frameworks and methodologies for problem identification and solution processes at both individual and institutional levels	3	10
33. public discussion is not required to solve technical questions: indeed, the involvement of the masses may be dysfunctional	11	1
34. we need not replicable models but frameworks for understanding the dynamics of the system involved and the processes by which local action can best be designed	0	15

	# marking as:	
	Unnecessary/ Misleading	MOST IMPORTANT
35. the idea of government by central bureaucratic intelligence is to be rejected	1	7
36. efforts to eliminate error by detailed pre-planning and central control presume more knowledge than exists and eliminate the very learning on which effective action depends	2	16
37. democratized structures would to some extent restore a proper relationship between purposive-rational and communicative interaction	3	3
38. there is an essential connection between personal and societal self-reflection and personal and societal development	0	6
39. managers are distracted from self reflection	4	5
40. in self-reflection knowledge for the sake of knowledge attains congruence with the interest in autonomy and responsibility	1	2
41. development is growth in autonomy	6	6
42. avoiding perpetuating or creating dependency is a critical problem with village assistance programs	0	14

	# marking as:	
	Unnecessary/ Misleading	MOST IMPORTANT
43. the classical dichotomy between ends and means is given new meaning in the social learning approach to the development process	0	6
44. good governance is that which supports man's personal development	3	15
45. most problems of global scope can be resolved only through creative local action	7	7