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The study used 102 selected evaluation reports of international development projects funded by the Agency for International Development (AID) beginning in 1980 and ending with the most recent evaluation report available in 1992. The reports were examined to determine whether they described ten participation variables: linkage to local organizations, beneficiary group creation, active involvement of women, use of indigenous knowledge or practices, on-farm collaborative research, beneficiary contribution to projects, beneficiary-involved media use, beneficiary training in participation, private commercial-sector participation, and decentralized project administration.

Decentralization was the most frequently observed variable in AID projects followed by linkage to local
organizations and beneficiary group creation. Decentralization was effected mostly through non-
governmental organizations (NGOs) and observed to be more successful when it involved NGOs rather than government.

Of the 102 projects, 96 aimed at some aspect of participation. The evaluation reports were used to analyze the success of each variable and its relationship to overall project success. Correlation strengths were assessed using Kendall’s Tau-b.

The theoretical framework predicts that a greater beneficiary-benefactor interaction through the above variables leads to greater suitability of development messages to beneficiary needs, eventually contributing to greater success in achieving development objectives.

The correlation observed between mere presence of each participation variable considered separately and overall project success varied from being relatively slight to moderately positive. However, the correlations between each variable’s success and overall project success were positive and for eight were relatively strong. The correlation between the number of variables in a project (independent of a variable’s success) and overall project success was positive and strong as was the correlation between the number of successful variables in a project and overall project success. The correlation between overt beneficiary decision-making in variables and overall project success was
small but positive except for the use of indigenous practices, which was negatively correlated. Several variables were negatively correlated with both Gross National Product (GNP) per capita and the Human Development Index (HDI). The major exception to this was beneficiary contribution to project, which was positively correlated with both.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Participation in Development

The notion that effective development communication requires participation by the beneficiaries is central to the theory and the hypotheses of this study. The study is confined to recent rural development projects which have been sponsored by the United States Agency for International Development (AID). The researcher expects AID to be responsive to the recent scholarly attention paid to the issue of participation in development. He also expects the experience of AID to show a correlation between participation and project success. Moreover, the study provides an opportunity to examine the success of decentralized development administration, comparing projects administered directly by governments with those implemented through non-governmental organizations. The researcher also hopes to identify reasons that have contributed to the failure of participatory actions within AID projects.

Communication and Development

A remarkable improvement in human life since the Renaissance has been the unprecedented opportunity available to commoners to enjoy fruits of human achievements.
Literacy and schooling became more widespread in many parts of the world. New technology reached a larger number of people than ever before. These changes, accompanied by high levels of economic growth, particularly in the United States and Western Europe, led to the emergence of the technologically advanced modern societies of the nineteenth century. Technological innovations were expanding the means of transportation and communications. Many of the elite who took charge of this human advancement wanted to spread the new concept of development to the rest of the world that was lagging behind. This has been called the "development idea" (Schramm, 1988, p. 324).

The advancement of communication technology resulting from the industrial revolution was leading the way to a communication revolution. By the middle of the twentieth century electronic media were present in the greater part of the world. Communication became an integral part of development.

The early conception of communication and development was based purely on the mechanistic idea of transmission of messages involving a top-down structure aiming to inform or influence people. Effective communication was considered the utilization of all the available channels to diffuse new information to the people. The mass media too, therefore, were a necessary part of the system. Extension services in such fields as agriculture and health were expected to use
mass media. International aid agencies such as AID, United Nations agencies, and the World Bank were contributing resources and expertise in a world-wide effort to bring about national development in less developed countries. Because these efforts had mixed results, in the late 1960s some scholars argued for an alternative approach to communication and development (Mowlana & Wilson, 1990). In part, this newly emerging vision of development was springing from the arguments directed against the imbalance of international communication structure supposedly created in part by the Western news agencies, economic dependency, and poor economic growth evident in many developing countries in spite of the continuous development aid.

The allegation of media imperialism (Schiller, 1984) emerged through the debate on the "New World Information Order" (Mowlana & Wilson, 1990, p. 58) sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the mid-1970s. Subsequently UNESCO, through its various resolutions and recommendations, favored the participation of the people at large in development with an aim of providing opportunities for each member country to choose freely the development path that corresponds most closely to its aspirations. In the context of mass media use, participation meant public involvement in production and operation of the media.
Certain development communication projects of the late 1970s encompassed this new perspective. The choice of development messages in such programs was based on immediate problems facing the community. One such example reported in the literature is the peasant educator project launched in Bolivia. This project used a small radio station owned by a local non-governmental organization (a Catholic church) to provide opportunities for broad-based participation in decision-making. Its program format included participation by local organizations such as trade unions, cooperatives, rural schools, and adult education groups. The program production involved visits and interviews with people at the grassroots who presented ideas and opinions relevant to local problems. This approach was expected to help the peasants study their own reality and approach problems with minimal guidance from outside agents. As a result new leadership at the grassroots level became evident in some communities. Horizontal communication was strengthened and people began to see that others shared their problems (O'Sullivan-Ryan & Kaplun, 1981). Another successful experience with participatory development cited in the literature is the "Grameen bank" in Bangladesh (Food & Agriculture Organization, 1987, p. 6). This experience was a result of a participatory action research program aimed to extend credit to landless men and women and to empower them to achieve a self-sustained growth. According to the
initiators of this project, the success is mainly attributable to the long learning process created through active participation of the bank officials and the poor. The success of the project was so great that in 1983 the project was transformed into an independent bank and called "Grameen" bank, which in local language meant "village" bank. In 1983, it had 200,000 members, 71 percent of whom were women. There were 248 branch offices disbursing 1.3 million US dollars in loans per month. The project initially started with the formation of community groups which consisted of homogenous members who joined together on their own. Group members selected the group leaders, who held the positions only for one year. Thus all the members had the opportunity to learn management and participatory action needed for development. Furthermore, the members also participated in a training program and a common saving fund. There were regularly scheduled communications with bank officials and group members. The two-way communication process increased mutual trust between the poor and the bank and reinforced a relationship of accountability among the participants. Personal conflicts in the community were solved within the social framework of the group, sometimes with the assistance of a bank worker. The bank workers have become trusted friends of the members and regarded with affection. Shared interests and mutual trust, achieved through participatory communication, have been the basis for
the success of this project (Food and Agricultural Organization, 1987).

Theoretical Perspectives of Communication and Development

At least three categories of approaches to communication and development have dominated the fields of communication and development over the last four decades. The first, prevalent in the 1950s and the 1960s, views communication and development in a cause-effect relationship. Lerner (1958), McClelland (1961), Rostow (1961), and Hagen (1962) perceived a process of modernization with exposure to mass media. For example, Lerner's development model suggests a sequence of institutional developments leading to growth and modernization. The sequence includes urbanization, increase in literacy, and political participation. In terms of individual attitude change, Lerner uses the concept of empathy, which he defined as the ability of a person to imagine a significant positive change in his own status. Such an attitude change is facilitated by the mass media, which act as agents of change.

The second approach deals primarily with what might be called cost-benefit analysis, or utilitarianism. Within this approach information and its conduit, information technology, are seen as vital to the development process. Richard Butler (1986), Secretary General of the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), in his article
on "Modern Telecommunication Technology for Development," argues that judicious use of high technology may solve the problem of development stagnation. This approach to development is based on the idea that investment in information technology could help developing countries "leapfrog" into the "information age" (Shields & Servaes, 1990, p. 48). Here the role of a specific media or communication strategy is to develop effective communication networking for information transfer and exchange. Hudson (1984), for example, emphasizes the potential of interactive communication technologies for improving the functioning of markets and organizations in developing countries. Illustrations of the utilitarianism-based communication approach to development are project SITE (Stover, 1984), inaugurated in 1975 to use a communication satellite for direct broadcasting to reach remote villages in India, and the launching of Palpa I satellite (Chu & Alfian, 1980) in 1976 for the Indonesian government, primarily for the purpose of national integration and development.

The third approach in the communication and development literature deals primarily with infrastructural analysis. Within this approach, political economy, cultural identity, and value systems are linked with communication and development. This approach examines the infrastructure of the communication system to determine whether it impedes or promotes development. In other words, it perceives
communication as the infrastructure of and precondition for economic growth and development (Nordenstreng, 1968; Beltran, 1975; Mattelart, 1979; Hamelink, 1983; Schiller, 1984; Mowlana & Wilson, 1990).

The structural approach or the infrastructural analysis of communication and development is relatively new when compared with the causal and utilitarian approaches. An early manifestation of this approach was dependency theory. The ideas related to dependency, emerging from Latin America and the rest of the developing world, created a strong challenge to Western thought of modernization (Servaes, 1986):

According to the dependency theory, the most important hindrances to development are not the shortages of capital or management as the modernization theorists contend, but the present international system. The obstacles are thus not internal but external. This also means that the development in the center determines and maintains the underdevelopment in the periphery. The two poles are structurally connected to each other. (p. 208)

While there are wide differences in theories within the dependency model, there is a tendency for it to be perceived basically as a neo-Marxist model because of its direct challenge to the industrialized capitalist sector, which it identified as the center.

Considering the variety of writing on the relationship between communication and development, one is also able to identify three major categories of models. They may be listed as (a) liberal/capitalist models (also often cited as
the dominant model), (b) Marxist/socialist models, and (c) monistic/emancipatory models (Mowlana & Wilson, 1990). The first set of dominant models of communication and development is the liberal models, based more or less on the notion of modernization (Lerner, 1958; McClelland, 1961; Rostow, 1961; Hagen, 1962). Basically these theories emphasize the role of the economic elite in development, while paying attention to the factors of information, knowledge and innovation. The important characteristics of these types of models include less concern with the indigenous culture, placing emphasis instead on rational bureaucracy and formal institutions, as found in contemporary Western governmental systems. In a classical sense this means that state institutions rule societal conduct and behavior without belonging to a political power. Within state institutions is the machinery called public administration, which assumes the roles of both regulator and provider. This model, therefore, places the locus of policy-making with permanent and technical experts in formal administrative agencies. The experts make decisions in terms of what they perceive to be in the best interest, rather than the preferences, of the public and in the form the public would prefer if it had the necessary information and perspective. The model is based on the assumption that in many policy areas a large portion of the public does not
have the information available for making reasonably intelligent policy decisions (Doerksen & Pierce, 1975).

Communication scholars such as Rogers (1969), Schramm (1964), and Rao (1966) conceived developmental approaches within this model, emphasizing the need to transfer technical information via multi-media from experts to the ignorant. For example, Everett Rogers (1962) initially introduced the diffusion theory based on his studies with Iowa farmers who were expected to grow new hybrid varieties of corn. The model implied that innovations should be introduced strategically for effective diffusion. It was largely a one-way communication model. Schramm (1964) and Rao (1966) investigated the relationship between mass communication and modernization practices and institutions. They stressed the role of media as mobilizers or multipliers of change toward modernity (Servaes, 1986; Fair, 1989).

On the other hand, the classical Marxists argued for class struggle within national borders and functioning of Marxist ideology for liberated development (Servaes, 1986). Mowlana and Wilson (1990) identify the Marxist/socialist model, from a development communication perspective, as one that emphasizes propaganda, agitation, organization, mobilization, and self-criticism as essential and primary functions of communication channels, especially the mass media. This model also views a high level of interpersonal and group communication, especially through the political
party apparatus, as prerequisite to the formation and implementation of development plans, objectives, and strategies. Both liberal/capitalist and Marxist models are oriented toward the modern nation-state system. Within both models state intervention, in different forms, would play a prominent role to achieve progress.

Midway through the 1960s the Western modernization model of development, particularly the top-down approach, was severely put into question. The experience in developing countries often did not show a correlation between information transfer from the top and productive performance at the bottom, particularly in the rural sector. Therefore, development scholars began to cast doubts about the usefulness of modernization perceived within the liberal/capitalist system (Bryant & White, 1980; Dwivedi & Nef, 1982; Rondinelli, Nellis, & Cheema, 1985; Cernea, 1985; Chambers, 1986; Black, 1991).

Participatory development. As the 1970s began, a new development agenda was surfacing, in response to the criticism of major traditional theories of development (modernization, and Marxist and neo-Marxist theories), giving more thought to the appropriateness of technology, labor-using strategies, self-reliance, and equitable growth and income distribution. In contrast to the major traditional theories, the newly forming vision of development was essentially multi-dimensional, meaning that
it was encompassing many facets such as culture, indigenous knowledge, human rights, and democracy in association with development. Mowlana and Wilson (1990) identify this model as a monistic/participatory model because of the humanistic as well as the spiritual movements associated with this approach to development. Although there are variations of this model which might be tailored to fit the specific cultural and social setting of different societies, the writings in this vein basically endorse active people's participation (Freire, 1973; Beltran, 1975; Rogers, 1976; Dias Bordenave, 1976; Goulet, 1978; Kearl, 1978; Gran 1983).

The hierarchical, bureaucratic, and sender-oriented communication model of development is replaced in the participatory model with a more horizontal, participative, receiver-oriented model. The definitions of development began to evolve to reflect the recognition of the newer ideology. A good example comes from the work of Everett Rogers. In 1969 he defined development as "a type of social change in which new ideas are introduced into a social system in order to produce higher per capita incomes and levels of living through more modern production methods and improved social organization" (1969, pp. 8-9). His updated definition was "a widely participatory process of social change and material advancement (including greater equality, freedom, and other valued qualities) for the majority of the
people through their gaining greater control over their environment" (Rogers, 1976, p. 133).

International Development

In relation to foreign assistance for development, Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989) conclude that the humanitarian rationale for participation was made explicit in the creation of the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) in 1969 and later through The New Directions legislation mandated by the U.S. Congress in 1973. Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin further state that the basic human needs doctrine enunciated during the mid-seventies by World Bank President Robert McNamara to redirect the organization's priorities brought participation in development projects to center stage in official circles. This theme of popular participation in development is reflected in the policy pronouncements of AID (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977, 1980; Korten, 1980). AID has conducted workshops on participation of rural poor in development and supported field studies on participation in Kenya and Paraguay (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977).

In 1979, the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) officially declared the need to involve rural people at the grassroots, particularly the least advantaged, when designing policies and programs for agricultural development (Eisman & Uphoff, 1984). Anthropologist DeWalt (1988), who advocates a cultural ecology perspective for development, states that many of the
policy makers in the aid-giving organizations, such as AID, the World Bank, and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), now acknowledge that:

(1) Old conceptions of how development should proceed often contained a large number of ethnocentric biases;
(2) Previous policies designed to achieve maximum economic growth were faulty because the benefits of this growth did not "trickle down" as expected, thus exacerbating existing inequalities in the society;
(3) Direct technology transfer from developed countries is often inappropriate for developing countries; and
(4) Sustainability is a key issue to be considered in planned change. (DeWalt, 1988, p. 113)

The new thinking deriving from the above acknowledgments is often expressed in such terms as "development from below," "development based on needs," "autonomous and self-reliant development," "development from within," and "development centered on people" (Tri, 1986, p. 11).

The Definition of the Problem

While there have been increased arguments favoring bottom-up and participatory development, some scholars have criticized the lack of application of the concepts in either research or implementation (Sewell & Phillips, 1979; Mansel, 81/82; Cernea, 1985; Fair, 1989; UNDP, 1990; Black, 1991; Thomas, 1993). According to Nair and White (1987a), "full participation of the peasant/farmer in decision-making, including inputs of indigenous expert knowledge, has been largely a fantasy, with only lip-service given to its importance" (p. 4). As far as the research is concerned,
"much of the literature on participation in development has been of a general, advocacy nature, and not very empirical" (Finsterbusch & Van Wicklin, 1897, p. 5). The researcher also observed the same phenomenon through an analysis of 90 articles written on development communication between 1980 and 1990. Many articles favoring an active participatory approach in contrast to the dominant top-down model of development communication were theoretical in nature without supporting data. The authors expressed their views based on concepts, models, or others' theories, without quantitative data to support their conclusions (Hewavitharana, 1993). The dearth of dependable data for analysis could be one major constraint to achieving research support for many of the hypotheses that have been linked to the concept of participation.

Participatory projects could suffer from the lack of understanding of the relationship between participation variables and project success. Without such knowledge it may not be possible to effect sufficient reforms in the techno-bureaucracies to accommodate participatory decision making. The lack of empirical testing of participation in development, therefore, could be one major factor which hinders wide adoption of participatory approaches for development in the less developed world.

As a result of accumulated experience and as a matter of policy, AID, with its mandate from the Foreign Assistance
Act of the United States Congress, has made participation of the poor majority in the development process a central concern in its program (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977, 1980). Therefore, the researcher believes that it is appropriate to consider a sample of AID-sponsored rural development projects in developing countries for the purpose of the study.

AID is the foreign assistance agency of the United States. It administers economic assistance through grants, loans, technical advice, and training to more than 70 developing nations (Block, 1985). The AID projects in the sample for the present study are limited mainly to agriculture and health improvement because those two dimensions of development are very much associated with rural development. The study will be limited to AID-sponsored development projects implemented from 1980 through 1990.

The Purpose of the Study

The researcher primarily aims to find, using AID-sponsored rural development projects in a number of developing countries, the relationship of participation variables to project success. He expects that projects which are designed to provide greater opportunities for beneficiary-benefactor interaction will show a higher degree of overall project success. The theoretical model of the study is the transactional development communication model
conceptualized by Nair and White (1987a). According to this model, participation assumes a transactional communication perspective.

Project success, for the purpose of the study, is assessed according to the information available from the project evaluation reports. These reports are prepared by teams of experts including AID personnel who visit the project sites and use either systematic surveys or other techniques to assess project progress at the time of evaluation. Often such evaluations are used as inputs to modify project activities or urge further funding and extension of project duration. Ten participation variables that are considered to provide the infrastructure conducive to a communication transaction will be considered for the study. Those consist of the following: (a) linkage of project to existing local organizations, (b) creation of beneficiary groups by the project, (c) getting women involved in the project as active participants, (d) utilization of indigenous technical knowledge and/or practices for the project, (e) volunteer beneficiary contribution of cash, labor, materials, and other important items for project actions, (f) conduct of collaborative on-farm research/trials in the case of agricultural projects, (g) beneficiary involvement in media production as a component of the project, (h) training of beneficiaries for active participation in the project, (i) private commercial-
sector participation for input supply necessary for functioning of the project, and (j) effecting a decentralized project administration. Each of these participatory variables is also assessed for its individual success according to the information present in the report.

The success of the projects (overall project success) will be compared under five conditions:

(1) Projects with a particular participation variable compared with projects without that particular variable.

In general, it is expected that each participation variable will be directly correlated with overall project success.

(2) Projects with a particular participation variable functioning successfully compared with projects with that particular variable functioning poorly.

The participatory activity that is designed in a project could be hindered by several factors. Therefore, an aim of the study is also to examine the correlation of participation and project success through examining the correlation between individual participatory variable success and overall project success.

(3) Projects with a larger number of the participation variables compared with projects containing fewer variables.

Because each participatory activity is expected to contribute to a communication interaction, a greater number
of participatory variables will facilitate a greater amount of information exchange and greater success.

(4) Projects with a larger number of the successfully functioning participation variables compared with projects containing fewer successfully functioning variables.

If participation success is contributing to project effectiveness, the cumulative success of participatory activities designed in a project will be positively correlated with overall project success.

(5) Projects with a particular participation variable indicating obvious beneficiary decision-making compared with projects with that particular variable not indicating obvious beneficiary decision-making.

An aspect of the study is to examine the participation variables for indication of obvious beneficiary decision-making. If any participation variable of the study clearly indicates active decision-making by beneficiaries, the researcher expects such a variable to be more directly correlated with overall project success than a participation variable which does not show such an obvious indication.

The successful functioning of each participatory variable (participation variable success) will be compared under the development levels of host-countries:

(1) Projects in countries with a higher gross national product (GNP) compared with projects in countries with a lower gross national product.
(2) Projects in countries higher on the Human Development Index compared with projects in countries lower on the Human Development Index.

An aim of the study is to examine the influence of host country development level on participation success based purely on an economic index such as GNP per capita, as well as on a more comprehensive index such as Human Development Index (HDI), which is formulated by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP, 1990).

Apart from the other participation variables, decentralized project administration will be compared under two conditions: (a) when decentralization involves non-governmental organizations and (b) when decentralization involves only governmental organizations. An aim of the study is to determine whether the type of decentralization is related to decentralization success.

Limitations

Limitations associated with obtaining necessary data could reduce the validity of any empirical study. The researcher expects that if AID project personnel have been concerned about active beneficiary participation in development, then the evaluation reports should address such activities in some detail. However, the reports may omit relevant information regarding such variables. This is the major limitation that the study is expected to confront.
Although the opinions and judgments stated in the evaluation reports are not those of AID, there is a possibility that an evaluation team would be reluctant to rate a project as extremely unsuccessful. Another limitation of the study is the variability of the type of evaluation reports available for the study. Some of the reports are interim evaluations of projects, and therefore those are more concerned with recommendations needed to modify the project than assessing the overall success of the project.

**The Importance of Participation**

There are many logical arguments for active beneficiary participation in development projects. Among them the most important argument is that participation gives beneficiaries the ability to shape development projects to their specific needs in ways that outside planners cannot. From the beneficiaries' perspective, development actions thus become self-fulfilling and satisfying. For example, Sewell and Phillips (1979), focusing on several models designed to evaluate public participation in development programs in North America, criticized the lack of attention paid to the assessment of satisfaction that participants derive from participatory programs. According to the researchers' experience in North America, citizen groups have often stressed the therapeutic values of participation in addition to the pragmatic values.
Participation will reduce the condition of dependency, it is argued, and will improve the sustainability of development, leading to self-reliance. Based on the experience of the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) with participatory development projects, Alamgir (1989) states:

A major strength of participatory development lies in the innate wisdom and knowledge of the rural poor concerning the environment with which they are intimately familiar. When matched to careful external assistance, this indigenous intelligence can result in projects which are manageable in scope, do not rely unduly on imported technology, have low recurrent cost expenses and which beneficiaries themselves can voluntarily maintain after the project has been completed. (pp. 5-6)

Because projects designed to facilitate active participation will enable beneficiaries to take part in decision-making, they become accountable and committed to development actions. Moreover, due to the transactional nature of participation between beneficiaries and benefactors, it is hoped that all the actors will have a greater sense of responsibility toward achieving common objectives. Thus participation will help to resolve conflict of interests between micro and macro levels.

A participatory approach will also facilitate the organization and empowerment of women and alienated poor, who rarely have been benefitted that way through top-down development approaches.
Usefulness of the Study

Binnendijk (1989), through a selective review of about 90 evaluation publications produced by AID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) which address aspects or programs in agricultural or rural development fields, confirms the importance of some form of beneficiary participation in project management decisions for successful project performance and sustainability. Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989), after examining the relationship between participation and project effectiveness in 52 AID projects, concluded that participation is beneficial and should be encouraged in development projects as a general rule. Their study used Pearson zero-order correlations to indicate strength of correlation between participation variables and project effectiveness. They found five of the 15 participation variables of their study strongly correlated to overall project success: (a) participation in project maintenance, (b) beneficiary commitment to project, (c) adequacy of communication from project team to beneficiaries, (d) degree to which control/ownership of facilities become local, and (e) extent the project increased beneficiary capacity. It is expected that the anticipated study could support some of those observations with further empirical data.

Current literature emphasizes the need for comprehensive policies encouraging people's participation in
development to enable the people to set their goals (Bryant & White, 1980; Cohen & Uphoff, 1980; Korten, 1980; Whyte, 1981; Esman & Uphoff, 1984; Cernea, 1985; Chambers, 1986; Goulet, 1978, 1989a; Black, 1991). Thus it is relevant and important to evaluate how far the efforts of a major international development agency, such as AID, have been successful with advocating beneficiary participation. If the results of the study support the hypotheses, then the claim of participation advocates will be reinforced. Revelations from these kinds of studies are useful to encourage policies that will hand over development responsibilities to non-governmental organizations and also to seek international assistance for projects that have been designed through participation.

The variables that are considered in this study could perhaps become standardized participatory components incorporated into future rural development projects to promote participation. When designing and redesigning projects, both beneficiaries and benefactors could look into each of those aspects of participation to institutionalize active beneficiary involvement in the decision-making process. With the accommodation of a number of such participatory actions, development actors may be able to predict project success with reliability.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Aspects and Perspectives of Participation

During the past 20 years or so, a growing concern has been expressed by development specialists over the concept of participation in development. Although studies in public administration and planning, in developed countries, have referred to participation of citizens in development decision-making as far back as the 1930s, the concept really gained momentum in the 1970s with arguments resulting from the critical analysis of the dominant top-down development paradigm.

Writings of scholars such as Freire (1973), Goulet (1978, 1989a), and Chambers (1986), along with the reported success of indigenous participatory development efforts such as the "Grameen" bank in Bangladesh (Food and Agricultural Organization, 1987) and the "Harambee" settlement scheme in Kenya (Chambers, 1986), reinforced the value of participation as a concept in the context of social development. The literature review in this chapter focuses on the apparent ambiguity of this concept, its relevance to power sharing, its use as a means of knowledge development,
its advantages, its assessment, and some of the problems it faces.

The Many Meanings of Participation

Meanings of participation observed in the development literature may be classified in several ways. There are instances in which the intention of participatory action is not clear enough to let us determine whether the intention refers to collaboration or manipulation. As a result participation in relation to development at times tends to have many meanings. For example, Heath (1988) identified two principal forms of participation in mass media in Kenya, namely commercial participation, and voluntary agency participation, notably religious broadcasts. She observed that commercial participation in the form of sponsored programs over Voice of Kenya was expected to promote the government's ideology related to modernization. Religious broadcasting was permitted only to the religious organizations which were recognized by the government so that only large, fairly prosperous, established religious institutions--those most likely to support the state--would be heard.

Another of participation's less customary meanings occurs in Mexico. Sinclair (1986) identified as private sector participation in the media a phenomenon which involved the use of state power given to the elite private sector solely for commercial advantage. In such situations
media elites are likely to manipulate media for their own interest, namely for profits. The private sector is participating, but without the primary intent of empowering the people.

Chambers (1986), a proponent of people's active participation for rural development, observes that in many developing countries the self-help projects represent a bottom-up initiative of development. Such self-help groups in Africa have been effective in forwarding a barrage of demands to civil servants, particularly in community development. Chambers also observes, though, that some of these self-help projects are highly political in nature and tend to assume an authoritarian style. This phenomenon had changed the view of self-help, in certain instances, from a purely spontaneous voluntary movement to a semi-compulsory form of quasi-local government.

In the development communication literature there are instances in which the term participation refers to political activism such as voter turnout (Weaver, Buddenbaum, & Fair, 1985), visits by citizens to political officials (Bales, 1980), and supply of political information to the masses (Hague, 1986). While political participation is a step toward development decision-making by the people, the amount of actual decision-making available to individuals would, of course, depend on the national government structure as well as other factors.
Lerner (1958), in his book, *The Passing of Traditional Society*, emphatically states that "traditional society is nonparticipant," while "modern society" is participatory (p. 50). Lerner views development as the movement of a society along a traditional-modern continuum. This continuum is bounded on opposite ends by ideal typical conceptions of social systems. On one end, presumably near which all societies start, is the traditional type of society. At the opposite end is the modern society, whose characteristics are similar to those of Western industrialized societies. Lerner suggests that the movement from traditional societies toward the modern end of the continuum can be explained in terms of four key variables, namely, urbanization, literacy, mass media exposure, and political participation. In the same tradition the early Rogerian diffusion-adopter model (Rogers, 1962) tends to imply participation as the end result of a development effort, or in other words, the adoption of innovations. The author seemed to expect, before his 1976 change of definition (Rogers, 1976), participation to involve yielding to goals set by others. His model, too, focuses on literacy, mass media exposure, cosmopoliteness, and intervening factors such as empathy, achievement motivation, and fatalism, as affecting the people's participation in development.

Rahnema (1992), who is critical about the way participation as a construct is used in the development
literature, states: "participation could be either transitive or intransitive; either moral or immoral; either forced or free; either manipulative or spontaneous" (p. 116). According to Rahnema:

Transitive forms of participation are, by definition, oriented towards a specific goal or target. By contrast, in its intransitive forms, the subject lives the partaking process without any predefined purpose. While one is listening, loving, creating, or fully living one's life, one partakes without necessarily seeking to achieve a particular objective. (p. 116)

The moral aspect refers to the ethically defined nature of goals pursued through participation. For example, Goulet (1989b) advances the thesis that participation is best understood as a "moral incentive" that empowers hitherto excluded non-elites to negotiate new material incentives for themselves (p. 160). According to Goulet (1989a):

That moral incentives work best when joined to a parallel package of material incentives is the main lesson learned from the experience of developing countries pursuing a dominantly material incentive policy, on the one hand, or one emphasizing moral incentives, on the other. Moral incentives such as exhortations or appeals to donate time or resources for others are widely perceived by the target population as potentially coercive. This is why moral incentives alone do not produce satisfactory results. Conversely, the one-sided reliance on material incentives may be efficient but does not produce much equity. A more fruitful approach consists in creating, or negotiating, new mixes of the two types of incentives. And participation is the best means of doing so! (pp. 162-163)

**Participation as Power to People**

From a historical perspective, Voth and Bonner (1978) recognize that in the United States citizen participation
was institutionalized as far back as the 1930s in the form of citizens' direct involvement (a) with the bureaucracy for the delivery of services and implementation of laws and (b) with the decision-makers to determine projects, priorities, or policy. This form of administrative participation was an attempt to eliminate some of the more negative features of the large federal bureaucracies established to deal with the dislocation of the Great Depression. Thus Voth and Bonner define participation as follows: "Citizen participation consists of voluntary activities undertaken by persons in their role as ordinary citizens, or amateurs, to influence public decisions or the actions of public officials" (p. 4). Citizen participation, according to this definition, implies active involvement, or some behavior in which the citizen engages. The action that the citizen takes is intended to convey his or her views to those "in charge." Voth and Bonner thus seem to recognize that participation in the administrative process (exclusive of normal political participation) is the key process of participation. They also recognize that citizen participation in the administrative process involves highly organized programs in which the administrative agency takes the initiative in reaching out to citizens and involving them. This Voth and Bonner consider as one extreme position of citizen participation. At the other extreme, citizen participation involves no more than a formal policy of
opening the administrative process to citizen scrutiny at certain points. Thus an agency may have considerable flexibility in its approach to citizen participation, utilizing one or the other extreme, or operating somewhere between the two.

Rahnema (1992) is of the opinion that scholars as early as 1949 provided the new knowledge of participation based on the concept of empowerment or in other words of information acquisition that would enable the powerless to understand realities of oppression and means of autonomous and self-reliant development. But the author identifies the period from 1970 as the period of blossoming of ideas and practice aimed at defining and implementing social change by, and with, the population concerned, in accordance with people's own aspirations. According to Rahnema, participatory action research (PAR) was born as a new methodology for "dialogical intervention" in the 1970s (p. 130). While the intention of most of the proponents of PAR was to acknowledge an endogenous direction to social change, Rahnema states that participation soon became a favorite "amoeba" or "plastic word" of the development age of the late 1970s and 1980s (p. 130). The author protests that some planners, experts and economists sought to co-opt the participatory discourse with a view to carving out a "human face" for development instead of giving the people an opportunity to make decisions and share power (p. 130).
The many meanings of participation seem to pose a problem to scholars who are engaged in research related to participatory development. Narula and Pearce (1986), for example, state: "There is little agreement on what participation is or what its dimensions are" (p. 36). According to Alvis (1990), who conducted a case study of participatory radio education in Bolivia: "The concept of participation has been shaped from several points of view, and among policy makers, social scientists or popular groups linked to social movements, there is considerable confusion about its substance and implications" (p. 24). Thus it is important that the research related to participation should establish a clear perspective. From a communication perspective, Nair and White (1987a) developed a transactional model of communication in which the authors see participation as a process of integrating the top-down and bottom-up approaches of communication.

**Bottom-Up Versus Top-Down**

Esmann and Uphoff (1984) tend to perceive the bottom-up communication process as participatory and the top-down communication process as non-participatory. The authors summarize some major characteristics of development actions and administrative process under these two modes of development communication. In the context of the top-down approach, the criteria for decisions stem from macro policy. Sanctions for development action derive from state
authority. Decision-making is done by administrators and experts, and the guide for the beneficiary behavior is based on state regulations and experts’ advice. The beneficiaries must be motivated to change. In the context of participatory approach, the criteria for decisions are interests of motivated people at the grassroots. Sanctions for development action derive more from social pressure than from state authority. Voluntary leaders and community members together with experts make decisions. Thus the guide for behavior is agreements.

However, Esman and Uphoff are of the opinion that in practice, no rural development effort could succeed by following only one approach. This means that in reality, both models may exist side-by-side simultaneously. Therefore, the strategies aimed to achieve participation could be perceived as a continuum with two diverging ends; one is self-determination (empowerment), and the other is manipulation. While bottom-up initiatives tend to promote self-determination, top-down initiatives will tend to intervene and manipulate people’s behavior. Therefore, according to Nair and White (1987a), in a practical sense what is crucial is to integrate these two approaches to achieve an optimal level of people’s active participation. Hubchen (1990), whose scholarly research on participation is associated with farming systems research and extension, too perceives participation as a "spectrum" (p. 5). According
to this author, one end of the spectrum is the paternalistic mode in which farmers' decisions are limited to whether or not they should accept a prepackaged technology. On the other is the populist mode in which farmers do their own research with little or no outside help. While in reality a varying mix of both is observed in most development situations, the author emphasizes that farming systems research and extension should help farmers to move toward the populist end of the participation spectrum. This means, as Narula and Pearce (1986) recommend, if the aim of participation is empowerment, then planning and implementation of development projects should be carried out with the people rather than for the people.

Cassara (1988) clarifies the notion of participation in the context of primary health care development, indicating that empowerment does not suggest that help is not needed. According to Cassara, help is needed from all agencies that can give it, but it must be given in a manner that leaves people in charge of setting their own priorities, discovering or researching the cause of their problems, and in the end taking appropriate action. Alvis (1990), in relation to participatory media use, refers to participation basically as self-determination with specific reference to the involvement of the public in decision-making, management, and media policy making.
It seems that increasingly the term participation carries a connotation of self-determination or empowerment. According to the definition provided in the Dictionary of Development: Third World Economy, Environment, Society (Welsh & Butorin, 1990) for example, popular participation is "a concept of development that is broad-based and consultative, involving the establishment of a set of institutions that would give the underprivileged in poor countries an opportunity to participate in the decisions that are most important to their lives and link them to the mainstream of modern society" (p. 792). The Thesaurus of Development Communication (Clearinghouse on Development Communication, 1993b) describes participation as "having a share in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of projects and programs which directly affect the participant" (p. 55).

According to Rahnema (1992), when the concept of popular participation was advanced by its promoters as a key element in creating human-centered development, it was intended to perform at least four functions: (a) a cognitive, (b) a political, (c) an instrumental, and (d) a social one. In cognitive terms, Rahnema states that participation had to regenerate the development discourse and its practices on the basis of a different mode of understanding of reality. The concept expressed the idea that the earlier cognitive bases of conventional development
belonged to an irrelevant knowledge representing an ethnocentric perception of reality specific to Western industrialized countries. That had to be replaced by a different knowledge system, representing a people's own cultural heritage. Popular participation was to carve out a new meaning for and a new image of development based on different forms of interaction and a common search for this newly emerging knowledge. With regard to the political function, Rahnema states, "Participation was to provide development with a new source of legitimation, assigning to it the task of empowering the voiceless and the powerless, and also eventually, of creating a bridge between the Establishment and its target populations" (Rahnema, 1992, p. 122). The author states that the instrumental function of the participatory approach was to provide the actors of development with new answers to the failure of conventional strategies and to propose new alternatives. Finally, in social terms, Rahnema states, "Participation was the slogan which gave the development discourse a new lease of life. All institutions, groups and individuals in development activities rallied around the new construct in the hope that the participatory approach would finally enable development to meet everyone's basic needs and to wipe out poverty in all its manifestations" (p. 122).
Participation in the Production of Knowledge

Over the last ten to fifteen years, along with the idea of participatory empowerment emerged a new perspective of social scientific research called participatory research. Although the concept derives from the experience gained in developing countries, by no means is it limited to developing countries. For example, Gaventa (1988) states, "Within the U.S., and elsewhere in the developed world, similar ideas have been developed, often growing from groups who, within their own context, share characteristics of domination by the knowledge system which are similar to those faced by their counterparts in the developing world" (p. 20).

Jacobson (1991) states that the concept of active participation has led social research toward a direction "in which researchers identify with the goals and struggles of communities engaged in development, rather than remain 'objectively' aloof from them" (p. 1). Thus participatory research attempts to break down the distinction between the researcher and the researched. It involves doing research at least partially by learning from, and working for, communities. In the process, research is seen not only as a process of creating knowledge, but simultaneously, as education and development of consciousness, and of mobilization for action. Jacobson (1991) further states that this approach to the production of knowledge is more
ethical than attempting to describe social reality objectively. According to this author: "because objectivity is impossible, employing it as a concept effectively provides a guise veiling other agendas, whether consciously intended or not" (p. 2). Participatory research, it is claimed, will result in holistic understanding of issues while empowering the people.

Within the North American context Gaventa (1988) identifies three strategies of participatory research: (a) the reappropriation of knowledge, (b) developing the people's knowledge, and (c) popular participation in the social production of the knowledge. The reappropriation of knowledge is the process through which people gain access to information. Gaventa (1988) describes public interest research movements such as "right to know" movements that follow the investigative research tradition in the United States as examples of this strategy of participatory research (p. 21). The author states that in the United States, citizen groups are aided by the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), which provides citizens with an access to an array of government documents which may be thought to affect the public's interest. Although such research may also be identified as an antecedent to action, it may be more appropriate to view it as a means of popular action.
The second approach, developing the people's knowledge, according to Gaventa, is basically "effected through converting common sense into good sense" (p. 23). For example, Gaventa states that the knowledge of folk medicine and other forms of indigenous technology are useful knowledge whose validity has been suppressed by Western science and Western technology. As an example of people's discovery of knowledge that aids survival, Gaventa observes the effect of people's health surveys in parts of the United States which have allowed people to systematize their own experiences with environmental and occupational problems. According to Gaventa, the effect of this approach as a knowledge-production tool has been illustrated in Rocky Flats, Colorado, leading to a campaign against nuclear poisoning, and in Love Canal, leading to a campaign to clean up toxic waste dumps. In both cases the "discovery" of health problems came not from the scientists but from "housewife researchers," who were led by their own experience to document and analyze the health experiences of others in the community (p. 24). This form of people's knowledge development, according to the author, becomes a resource for challenging the hegemony of the dominant ideas.

The third approach (the popular participation in the social production of knowledge) involves scientists conducting research with the people instead of for the people. According to Gaventa, in a situation in which the
people have become active and self-conscious of their own knowledge, they can also participate fully in decisions about the production of new knowledge, for themselves and for society. Gaventa believes that genuine popular participation in the production of knowledge has implications not only for the realization of classical notions of democracy but also for the body of knowledge that will be produced. He states, "The believer in popular participation must hope that the vision and view of the world that is produced by the many in their interests will be more humane, rational and liberating than the dominating knowledge of today" (Gaventa, 1988, p. 26).

Jacobson (1991) believes that participatory research as a general approach has found ready acceptance in the area of communication. The author states that participatory projects have resulted in new modes of communications from media production to artistic theatrical expression of local needs to highly administrative forms of collective planning and management. The author is of the opinion that the focus on dialogue, within the context of participatory research, between and among locals and researchers in many of these modes has led to an interdisciplinary or holistic approach to knowledge development.

**Advantages of Participation**

The critics of top-down approaches to development strongly endorse people's active participation in rural
development. They forward the argument that in many developing countries there is little or no opportunity available to rural people to manage their own affairs, to influence public decisions, and to participate in activities that affect their economic productivity and quality of life (Diaz Bordenave, 1976; Cohen & Uphoff, 1980; Whyte, 1981; Esman & Uphoff, 1984; McAnany, 1980; Cernea, 1985; Chambers, 1986; Goulet, 1989a, 1989b; Black, 1991; Clark, 1991). According to those scholars, genuine participation is rational and humane in a truly democratic sense.

Scholars who are concerned with the ethics of preserving and utilizing indigenous forms of knowledge and problem-solving strongly recommend participation as not merely desirable, but essential to preserve peoples' culture and human dignity. Humanists such as Freire (1973) and Illich (1977) have advocated that participation should be a process of consciousness-raising and empowerment. According to them, a development approach that starts from what people are, what they do, what they want, and what they think and believe is self-fulfilling and empowering. It means that participation enables everyone to take part in all stages of development and in the enjoyment of its benefits.

Tri (1986) perceives participation as a process of social and civic self-education. According to Tri, the effort to participate calls for change of attitudes at every level, which will make participation capable of establishing
productive social and human relations. While empowerment is considered as a principal outcome of participation, grassroots participation is also expected to promote development encompassing equality and freedom (Goulet, 1989b; Servaes & Arnst, 1992).

From a communication perspective participatory empowerment gives greater opportunities for beneficiaries to have an active interaction with benefactors than is the case of manipulated participation (Nair & White, 1987a). Nair and White define participatory development communication as a two-way dynamic interaction between grassroots receivers and the information source, mediated by development communicators, who facilitate participation of the target group in the process of development. Manipulated participation, on the other hand, is a product of primarily a unilinear persuasion process. Such participation can be considered as only a behavioral response to planned messages (Servaes & Arnst, 1992). According to the authors, a process of dialogue and interaction would replace the subject-object relationships between benefactors and the beneficiaries, thereby enabling the oppressed to act as the free subjects of their own destiny.

Servaes and Arnst (1992) state that participation has increased in popularity recently because of the evidence of sustainable social change that has been achieved through participation. The authors suggest that development
planners should recognize the importance of listening to the people, both to understand the people's needs and to mobilize their potential for development. Within the context of participatory development, therefore, the change agent's role would be not to convert people to follow ideas from the top, but to work with the people, learning their needs, getting their suggestions, and blending their ideas with appropriate technologies. According to Rahnema (1992), there had been substantial achievements, even in sheer financial terms, whenever people were locally involved and actively participating in development projects.

Voth and Bonner (1978) are of the opinion that one reason for encouraging citizen participation in the United States was the lowering of public confidence in American institutions. Therefore, increasing the involvement of citizens with government officials and decision-makers is expected to increase public trust and confidence in the government. Furthermore, participation is also likely to enhance people's confidence among themselves. Voth and Bonner cite several examples of what the authors consider as efficient, creative citizen-action solutions to apparently insolvable problems experienced in the United States. These range from simple projects like community beautification to complex accomplishments like neighborhood revitalization. Those experiences suggest that usually citizens conceive new possibilities more easily than do rigidly trained officials.
and professionals. According to Schuttler (1975), community-involved planning in the United States has been used successfully to pass bond issues, plan new facilities and services, prevent urban riots, and give new life to dying communities. While citing three extremely successful instances of citizen participation in planning in Wisconsin, Maryland, and Massachusetts, he states that the techniques have been successfully replicated in more than 50 communities in the United States. Some of the key advantages that the author sees with community-involved planning are the emphasis on psychological needs as much as the physical and financial elements of the project, and the ability of the citizens to conceive new possibilities more easily than professionals can through citizens' comprehensive understanding of the environment.

Schuttler (1975) also sees the ability to manage conflict through participation as a key to achieving development success. While there is a logical tendency for anyone to believe that the active participation of many could increase the possibilities of disputes due to wide range of interests among the actors, Voth and Bonner (1978) stress that citizen participation has the potential of decreasing extreme and destructive conflict by airing conflictual issues regularly and openly. According to the authors, participation will enable the resolving of
conflicts one by one rather than allowing those to accumulate and become explosive.

Another advantage of participation is the development of new leadership among the people. Voth and Bonner consider this aspect as one of citizen participation's most promising. According to the authors, participation provides the opportunity to use the leadership skills of the community members that is often hampered by top-down development administrations. The more recent experiences, particularly in developing countries, also indicate such positive outcomes of participation. For example, reviewing the action research experience in the Asia-Pacific region, Rahman (1990) observes that the use of village committees as a body responsible for planning and implementing income-generating activities has been extremely successful.

In the context of participatory action research, participation has the advantage of providing an opportunity for the researchers to gain skills in a multidisciplinary systems approach while advancing their specialist skills. Maclure and Bassey (1991) see participatory action research (PAR) as an enormous challenge to professional researchers. According to the authors, researchers must be able not only to identify those individuals with whom collaborative work will be most effective but to determine as well the forms of relationships that can simultaneously accommodate prevailing sociocultural norms and the objectives of participatory
involvement in applied research. According to the authors' observations, professional researchers have been able to establish relations with people through participatory research in such a way that both sides have interacted while learning and teaching together on an equal footing. Based on the experience of a participatory action research project in Togo, Maclure and Bassey (1991) state:

By incorporating into the research process the three attributes of shared ownership, community-based learning, and an orientation toward community action, this project has proven to be a useful formative experience for its participants. In a region where PAR is still relatively novel, it has also led to a greater understanding of the conditions that are essential for the successful implementation of PAR in an African context. (p. 191)

A convergence of attitudes of all the development actors toward a common objective is another important outcome expected out of participation (Voth & Bonner, 1978; Servaes & Arnst, 1992). Servaes and Arnst observe that participation creates an opportunity for the developers to acknowledge people's capabilities and skill in equal terms and to lower large egos. This results in the ability to listen and to develop mutual trust and respect.

Assessment of Participation

The theoretical frameworks for assessing participation have acknowledged the complexity of the concept. Thus scholars have presented numerous typologies for assessing it.
In the 1960s, to clarify a concept of nondecision-making (non-participation of citizens in development-decision-making) and to analyze the diverse means of exercise and the impact of power and its correlates to political ideology and institutions in a community undergoing change, Bachrach and Baratz (1970) chose the city of Baltimore to conduct a long-term field research program. Within the context of community action programs, the researchers perceived two broad conceptions of citizen participation and labelled them as interest-oriented participation and cooptative participation. They used these two differing conceptions as a framework to appraise (a) the nature, purpose, and extent of citizen participation in Baltimore’s effort to eliminate poverty, (b) whether the participation of the poor in Baltimore has been a significant factor in changing the distribution of authority and power within the community as a whole, and (c) the appropriate future role for participation in the ongoing anti-poverty effort.

The interest-oriented participation was associated with actions concerning whether the poor have a sense of vested interest in the anti-poverty programs and a growing preparedness to organize and struggle for the introduction, improvement, and enlargement of anti-poverty projects.

The participation was considered as cooptative in nature when the activities of non-elites in decision-making
and policy implementation were channeled toward the pre-conceived goals of higher authorities. Thus the main thrust of the researchers' inquiry was to determine the extent to which the citizen participation aspect of Baltimore's anti-poverty efforts has been interest-oriented or cooptative. However, within their theoretical framework the researchers considered that cooptative participation by the poor can lead to interest-oriented participation and the development of indigenous leadership.

Given the varying nature of citizen participation objectives and the variability of agency initiatives in mobilizing citizen participation, Voth and Bonner in 1978 suggested a typology which derives from the interaction of two variables: participation objective and agency initiative. The researchers assumed two levels (e.g., high and low) for each of those variables, resulting in four categories of participation types: (a) High Agency Initiative with Simple Objective, (b) Low Agency Initiative with Simple Objective, (c) High Agency Initiative with Complex or Ambiguous Objectives, and (d) Low Agency Initiative with Complex or Ambiguous Objectives. This typology is purely concerned with administrative participation, meaning that participation includes only those activities engaged in by citizens that are intended to influence decision-making within agencies or programs in a highly democratic political setup. This typology could be a
basis for the formulation of a number of important questions concerning the degree of participation in a particular project. For example, strategy and techniques of citizen participation will depend upon who takes the initiatives. Similarly, the choice of both strategy and techniques of participation will also depend upon the objectives of participation. Thus questions related to complexity of objectives become important. In a top-down approach, the objectives may be straightforward and clear at the outset. But in a highly participatory situation, many of the objectives will emerge from the process of participation itself as the project evolves, and therefore, objectives will be complex and ambiguous.

Arnstein (1969), who had been a chief advisor on citizen participation in model cities' administration in the United States during the 1960s, has offered a typology of citizen participation using examples from three federal social programs: (a) Urban Renewal, (b) Anti-Poverty, and (b) the Model Cities programs. According to Arnstein, "There is a critical difference between going through the empty ritual of participation and having the real power needed to affect the outcome of the process" (Arnstein, 1969, p. 216). The author developed a typology of eight levels of participation specifically focusing on the Model Cities programs. For illustrative purposes of this typology the author arranged the eight types (levels) of
participation in a ladder pattern with each rung corresponding to the extent of citizens' power in determining the end product. The bottom rungs of the ladder were called (a) manipulation, and (b) therapy. These two rungs describe levels of "non-participation" that have been contrived by some to substitute for genuine participation (p. 217). Referring to "manipulation" and "therapy," the author states, "Their real objective is not to enable people to participate in planning or conducting programs, but to enable powerholders to 'educate' or 'cure' the participants" (p. 217).

The next two rungs, called (c) informing, and (d) consultation, progress to the levels of "tokenism" that allows the poor and the powerless to hear and to have a voice (p. 217). However, under these conditions the beneficiaries lack the power to insure that their views will be heeded by the authorities. In other words, under these conditions there will not be a change of the status quo. The next upper rung of the ladder, called (e) placation, is simply a higher-level tokenism. At this level the author states, "Groundrules allow have-nots to advise, but retain for the powerholders the continued right to decide" (p. 217). Voth and Bonner (1978) believe that although development agency-sponsored participation efforts may not often result in any radical restructuring of power in general, they may very likely increase communities' power
over specific development decision-making leading to improvement in the quality of programs.

Further up on Arnstein’s ladder are the levels of citizen power with increasing degrees of decision-making influence. The beneficiaries can move up to the rung called (f) partnership that enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with powerholders. At the topmost rungs, called (g) delegated power and (h) citizen control, beneficiaries will obtain the majority of decision-making opportunities, or full managerial power. Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation illustrates that there are significant gradations of participation in terms of power sharing.

More recently, Nair and White (1987b) have developed a typology of participation from the perspective of the project beneficiaries as receivers of development messages. The basic tenet of this typology is that participation is essentially a two-way persuasion process where the development communicator (agency personnel) and the target group (beneficiaries) are expected to talk over their differences, giving and taking, and finally arriving at a consensual agreement. Within this typology, therefore, participation is visualized as a continuum varying in kind and degree. For analytical purposes the researchers have simplified these variations into three levels: (a) high participation, (b) quasi participation, and (c) low participation of both the target group (TG) and the
development communicator (DC). Deriving from the interaction of those three levels of participation of the target group and the development communicator, the authors identify the following nine participatory conditions (combinations):

1. **High TG and High DC**: Under this situation the authors expect participatory interaction to be a continuous process in which both TG and DC would work as equal partners. The authors, however, think that this condition is very much "ideal" and practically unlikely due to power relationships and limited resources.

2. **High TG and Quasi DC**: Under this condition the authors believe that the DC would be functioning mainly as a facilitator. The TG will have a control in guiding decisions and implementation of actions, and therefore participation will be considered as "active."

3. **High TG and Low DC**: Under this condition the authors state that the DC will not offer guidance or involvement. The action of the TG would be revolutionary in nature, and therefore participation is considered as "bottom-up."

4. **Quasi TG and High DC**: Under this condition, according to the authors, the TG would tend to take in information as a part of involvement in the development process but might not necessarily act on the information. The DC would dominate the decision-making, and interaction
would be minimal. Thus participation is considered as "passive."

5. **Quasi TG and Quasi DC:** Under this condition the authors state that the interaction would be a process of constant give and take between the TG and the DC. There will be joint decision-making through a process of dialogue. The authors believe that this condition is realistic and possible to achieve. This level of participation is considered as "transactional."

6. **Quasi TG and Low DC:** Under this condition the authors believe that the TG for the most part would choose its own participatory modes. There will be high input of indigenous knowledge. The TG will select the issues it considers critical to its progress. The DC would stand ready to provide guidance, as sought, and facilitate resources on behalf of the TG. This level of participation is considered as "elective."

7. **Low TG and High DC:** Under this condition the authors state that the DC will be directing the TG for all the development actions. A dependency and a sense of powerlessness on the part of the TG would prevail. Development action may be sustained as long as direction is present, and participation is considered as "top-down."

8. **Low TG and Quasi DC:** Under this condition, according to the authors, the DC would dominate the interaction and initiate the dialogue. The DC would be free
to select the issues felt to be important and would control extent and timing of participatory inputs of the TG. Therefore, participation is considered as "selective."

9. **Low TG and Low DC**: Under this condition the authors state that the development efforts would be random, accidental, and perhaps chaotic. The interaction of TG and DC would be not designed but purely coincidental. Therefore, participation is considered as "haphazard" (Nair & White, 1987b, p. 37).

Nair and White are of the opinion that programs should aim for two-way interaction of benefactors and beneficiaries to achieve a "transactional" form of participation. Under such conditions the authors consider participation as most desirable even though a combination of high TG and high DC participation is not quite achievable in reality.

Alvis (1990), for the purpose of assessing participation in a participatory radio education project in Bolivia called River-Radio, developed a three-sided participatory communication model. The three sides or the dimensions were (a) Access, (b) Dialogue, and (c) Participation. The criteria used to classify communication into one of these three dimensions for the purpose of analyzing involvement qualities in the communication experience by the community actors were listed as follows:
1. **Access**
   a. Individual access to communication materials
   b. Access to alternative educational programs
   c. Opportunities to be in contact with the medium

2. **Dialogue**
   a. Interaction between producers and receivers of messages
   b. Direct participation by the audience during the transmission of programs
   c. Public comment and criticism
   d. Means of keeping in touch among administrators and producers within the medium

3. **Participation**
   a. Involvement of the public in the production of programs and in obtaining professional help
   b. Involvement in formulating plans and future programs
   c. Involvement in decision-making, management, and media policy
   d. Contribution of funds or manpower
   e. Involvement in evaluation of plans and results
   f. Ensuring that the process of participation will continue
   g. Sustaining the process by forming local organizations
h. Documenting and making available the experience for other groups

i. Acceptance of plans

Although the above model does not include all the possible characteristics of participatory approaches to communication, Alvis' study supported the theoretical viability of the three-sided model as a useful model to structure and analyze participatory communication.

Sewell and Phillips (1979) have presented four evaluation models of public participation programs:

(a) Vindasius' model; (b) Hampton's model; (c) Farrell, Melin and Stacey's model; and (e) Homenuck's model. All the models were used in North America and in England during the 1960s and the early 1970s. According to Sewell and Phillips, Vindasius' model is one of the earliest formal evaluation models used for the evaluation of public participation programs in Canada. It was originally designed to assess the acceptability and efficiency of a water resource planning project called Okanagan venture in the Qu'Appelle and St. John River Basins. The model relied upon the perceptions of key actors involved in the program, namely agency staff, program personnel, and community leaders, to evaluate the degree to which the following objectives were achieved: (a) the provision of information to the citizenry (Information Out), (b) the receipt of information from the citizenry (Information In), and
(c) incorporation of the inputs into the planning process. Although the model was considered simple and easy to undertake, according to Sewell and Phillips, it is biased toward the view of the agency in terms of the participation objectives.

Hampton's model, according to Sewell and Phillips (1979), was developed in England to evaluate participatory programs in general rather than for a specific case study. This model perceives participation not only as a means of improving the planning process, but also as a means of increasing citizens' power. Furthermore, this model considers citizens' satisfaction as important as that of the agency in assessing the success of participation programs. According to Sewell and Phillips, the purpose of this model is to evaluate the breadth of involvement for specific groups of the public which can be achieved by various techniques.

Similar to Vindasius' model, Hampton's model too considers the main objectives of a program as (a) information dispersal, (b) information gathering, and, (c) attainment of interaction between authorities and the public. Under each objective, techniques are assessed according to the nature of information they generate and the type of public involved. Here the focus is upon the determination of what kind of participation takes place and for whom. For example, under information dispersal there
are three questions on the nature of information followed by three questions on who is informed. Similarly under information gathering there are three questions on the nature of information followed by three questions on who is listened to. Under interaction between planning authority and public there are three questions on the kind of interaction followed by three questions on the type of public involved (e.g., private commercial concerns, local interest groups, groups of general public, and others). One important feature of the Hampton model is that it assumes that different segments of the public seek different goals. Thus their motivations for and satisfaction derived from involvement will vary depending on their goals.

According to Sewell and Phillips, the framework of Farrell, Melin, and Stacey's model too is general in scope and therefore could be applied to almost any geographic area, political unit or participation program. This model, however, evaluates participation primarily from an agency viewpoint. According to this model, participation objectives are:

1. to enhance public acceptance of planning decisions
2. to provide a source of data for planning activities, and
3. to educate the people so that they will acquire skills that can be used to deal with planning problems in their own communities.
In order to achieve these general objectives, the Farrell model identifies seven different types of involvement which may have been undertaken: (a) persuasion, (b) education, (c) information feedback, (d) consultation, (e) joint planning, (f) delegated authority, and (g) self determination. The success of a program is evaluated in relation to the type of involvement employed. Evaluation is based on the outcomes (the extent to which the objectives were achieved), the process (the degree to which program techniques were successfully implemented) and attitudes (the degree to which attitudes of those involved were positively or negatively affected) (Sewell & Phillips, 1979). To foster objectivity this model has set out a series of criteria which may be used for evaluation.

The fourth model of participation evaluation that Sewell and Phillips presented, called Homenuck's model, according to the authors, is more sophisticated than the above three. This model, too, establishes a general approach to the evaluation of participatory programs. As an input into the planning effort, this model perceives a participatory program as performing functions on the one hand, and as contributing to the process of involvement on the other. The five kinds of functions identified in the model are (a) dissemination of information, (b) collection of information, (c) response/evaluation, (d) creation/initiation, and (e) mutual education. The five dimensions
of process subsumed by a program are (a) the recruiting of participants, (b) making decisions, (c) interaction, (d) reduction of data, and (e) establishment of boundaries. Performance in carrying out these functions and processes is evaluated by measures, some quantitative and others qualitative in nature. Functions are appraised in terms of such considerations as the quantity of information generated or dispersed, the number of people who became involved, and the quality of the product (such as the accuracy of information). The process of involvement is evaluated in terms of the ways in which the techniques were used, who was reached, and what impacts they had on various segments of the public. According to Sewell and Phillips, the major limitation to the use of Homenuck's model is the need for an enormous amount of data. Moreover, according to the authors, Homenuck' model relies substantially on subjective judgments.

Because of the complexity and the ambiguity of the concept of participation, Sewell and Phillips believe that systematic evaluation has been a rarity in participation programs. After analyzing 22 case studies (one in the United States and all the others in Canada) involving participation, Sewell and Phillips (1979) observed that agency personnel and representatives of citizen groups differed considerably in their perceptions of the purpose of public involvement. In the eyes of agency personnel
participation was seen as a means to develop programs with a wide public acceptance to enhance the efficient performance of agency responsibilities and to improve the agency’s image. In contrast, citizens viewed participation as a means to reduce the power of planners and the bureaucracy and to ensure that people affected by government policies have influence over their design and implementation.

In an attempt to design participation strategies which will satisfy the needs of politicians, administrators, and citizens alike, Rosener (1975) has formulated a "cafeteria of techniques and critiques" in relation to participation (p. 16). It includes a technique/function matrix. Under the techniques there are 39 situations. According to Rosener, the techniques included in the matrix were derived primarily from experiences of citizen participation in highway planning in the United States. The author states:

The matrix by no means includes all participation techniques, functions, or literature sources. Rather, it is an attempt to encourage viewing participation in a new context. In order to simplify its use, only the functions felt by the author to be "best performed" by a given technique have been checked in the matrix. (p. 16)

The list of techniques presented by Rosener could be generally useful as a basis to assess participation in a given developmental situation.

According to Sewell and Phillips (1979), frequently three basic parameters or objectives are ideally desired in a participatory program: (a) a high degree of citizen
involvement, (b) a high degree of equity among the public, and (c) a high cost-efficiency for the agency. The authors are of the opinion, however, that it is not possible to attain a maximum level on all of those three parameters simultaneously. A certain amount of tradeoff is necessary. The authors consider the failure to accommodate this aspect in many of the models designed for participation evaluation as a major deficiency of such models.

There is an increasing acceptance among scholars that the prime object of participatory development is to meet the needs and satisfy aspirations of peoples, especially those of the less fortunate peoples who have been overlooked in the past. Therefore, approaches that aim to assess participation in programs implemented in developing countries often tend to view participation from the perspective of the beneficiaries. Hubchen (1990), who studied participation in a farming systems research and extension project in the Philippines, used a visual list of participatory activities as an instrument to obtain beneficiaries' rating on the degree of performance and importance of each activity relevant to the project. The purpose of using a visual technique was to overcome a communication barrier that the researcher experienced initially with the use of spoken words from a questionnaire.

The researcher focused on 23 activities relating to project planning, evaluation, and implementation assessed on
a zero-to-four scale. He observed a high correlation between the rank order of perceived performance and that of perceived importance. This implies that project beneficiaries are most active in the activities for which they see the most need.

After an extensive literature search on the subject of rural-development-participation, Cohen and Uphoff (1977) at Cornell University concluded that there is no standard set of indicators of participation that can be applied to all projects or in all cases. As a result, Cohen and Uphoff write that in assessing participation in any situation, there is need for a deliberate selection of participation variables to be studied and measured. They developed a framework to identify a variety of factors that can be included under participatory empowerment by discussing the what, who, how, when, and where of participation. They focus on four areas of participation: (a) in decision-making, (b) in implementation, (c) in benefits, and (d) in evaluation. These four areas of participation comprise the what of participation (pp. 27-58). By the who of participation, they mean the classes of persons involved in project tasks: (a) local residents, (b) local leaders, (c) government personnel, and (d) foreign personnel (pp. 59-83). Their how refers to the mechanics of participation: (a) where does the initiative come from?
(b) what inducements are involved? (c) what is the structure? and (d) what are the channels (pp. 84-111)? Their when and where are mainly contextual factors such as project characteristics and task environment that have effects on participation and its likelihood of contributing positively to the project (pp. 112-156).

All the methods of and frameworks for participation assessment described above require field surveys and direct data collection from subjects. As contrast to such direct approach, Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989) used a set of 52 AID development project evaluation reports to examine how participation contributed to project effectiveness and what conditions encouraged participation in development projects. The researchers referred to participation, for the purpose of their study, as the contribution of beneficiaries to the decision or work involved in the projects. Thus they identified beneficiary participation in (a) project origin, (b) project design, (c) project redesign, (d) project implementation, and in (e) project maintenance. They also examined ten factors which they considered as closely associated with beneficiary participation. Those included: (a) degree of organization of beneficiaries, (b) democracy and equality of organization, (c) whether the organization was created or engineered, (d) use of indigenous knowledge in projects, (e) degree of indigenous knowledge used after project
completion, (f) financial contribution of beneficiaries, (g) beneficiaries' attitudinal support for the project (beneficiary commitment) (h) adequacy of communication from project team to beneficiaries, (i) degree of control/ownership of facilities from locality, and (j) extent of increase in beneficiary capacity.

For the assessment of above variables, the researchers used the 52 evaluation reports as informants. A questionnaire referring to the above variables was used to collect the relevant data from the reports. The reports were written as impact evaluations, and Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin judged them as reasonably good at reporting results, impacts, and secondary consequences. However, the researchers observed that the evaluations were less thorough when discussing participation and participation-related variables.

For this present study the researcher basically adopted the same approach but used a different set of variables. As in the Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin study it was necessary to depend basically on the agency's objectives to determine the overall success of the projects.

Because this study does not attempt to determine the level of participation or the degree of power shift (from traditional powerholders to powerless), the researcher believes that the project evaluation reports prepared for the agency are fairly appropriate to use as the source of
information for the study. The intention is to examine whether the reports have mentioned the variables that the researcher considers relevant and important for communication transactions to take place, and how such situations correlate to the project success determined according to AID's objectives.

**Participation Constraints**

Genuine participation, though widely espoused in the literature, is not in everyone's interest. Because genuine participation results in changes in status quo, those whose position depends upon power over others are likely to be disturbed (Arnstein, 1969; Voth & Bonner, 1978; Servaes & Arnst, 1992). Reaction to such situations could be manifested in terms of resistance to or control or even manipulation of participation. Commenting on constraints to participation, Alamgir (1989) states:

If participation has its undoubted advantages, there are a number of constraints working against it as well. For example, participation cannot be promoted without reference to prevailing political parameters. Internal constraints on voluntary self-help organizations can arise from the inadequacy of local leadership or the limited role allowed the poor in decision-making. External constraints arise from unequal access to productive assets such as land, water, credit, etc., from inadequate government policies or financial support; from the political and ideological orientation of ruling elites and their relationship with both local and international elites; and from the essential isolation and alienation of the poor themselves. (p. 7)

Alamgir further states that it is to overcome such obstacles that a growing number of donors align themselves
with non-governmental organizations (NGOs) for the implementation of development projects in developing countries. Because of NGOs' special access to the poor established by years of work among them, many donor agencies seem to believe that there can be effective and productive interactive communication between beneficiaries and NGOs. NGOs' expertise in grassroots mobilization has become increasingly important in the implementation of participatory development.

In the context of participation in media, because such activism is historically often linked to revolutionary and liberation movements, it is perceived as a de-stabilizing factor by the governments of many developing countries which struggle to achieve development within a volatile state of political instability. Such situations are likely to give rise to government control of media and low budgeting for decentralized media (White & McDonnell, 1983; Zaffiro, 1988).

Participatory media have also suffered due to lack of institutional support. Participatory media projects in developing countries usually have been donor assisted. When a donor terminates assistance at the end of a project, it seldom receives the necessary institutional support to carry on in spite of the immense popularity such a project might have gained during its operation. Closing down of the "Kheda" community radio project in India and the community
radio project in Jamaica are examples of such situations (Heath, 1988; Mody, 1986). According to Alamgir (1989), "even a self-ignited process of participation will die a natural death, however, unless inducements are provided on a sustained basis to make the effort worthwhile" (pp. 7-8).

Democratic political systems, though they encourage active political participation, may not necessarily do so in relation to citizen participation in administration. Voth and Bonner in 1978 observed that citizen participation efforts in the United States had not resulted in any radical restructuring of power as some have hoped. However, authors say that there is considerable evidence to show that citizens' participation has improved the quality of many kinds of programs. In developing countries, even under full-fledged democracies, the access of the poor to public services and programs has been limited, in part because of the standardized nature of these services (Alamgir, 1989). Therefore, the structure and the mentality of bureaucracy seem to pose a major constraint to citizen participation in developing countries. According to Voth and Bonner (1978), administrative bureaucracies are traditionally entrenched with the idea that citizens' involvement in administration could politicize public administration and make it both unfair and ineffective. Quite apart from this phenomenon, Hart (1972) observes that in a modern society experts tend to be taskmasters on the basis of their specialized
knowledge. Therefore, even within a democratic political system, development administration has the capability of minimizing active citizens' participation in the decision-making. Arnstein (1969) identifies this phenomenon as the manipulation of participation by the bureaucracy. Based on experience from federal social programs of the United States in the 1960s, Arnstein states:

In the name of citizen participation, people are placed on rubberstamp advisory committees or advisory boards for the express purpose of "educating" them or engineering their support. At the meetings of the Citizen "Advisory" Committees, it was the officials who educated, persuaded, and advised the citizens, not the reverse. Federal guidelines for the renewal programs legitimized the manipulative agenda by emphasizing the terms "information gatherings," "public relations," and "support" as the explicit functions of the committees. (p. 218)

The observed dominating bureaucratic behavior as a constraint to citizens' participation is now well recognized, and bureaucratic reorientation to achieve effective beneficiary-oriented management in many countries has been attempted in the recent past. Hondale and VanSant (1985) tend to believe that such reorientation is needed in donor bureaucracies just as much as it is needed elsewhere.

Apart from such external constraints to participation, there are also a number of internal constraints. According to Maclure and Bassey (1991), for example, in many rural regions of sub-Saharan Africa, direct questioning and open dialogue among different subgroups are shunned, and, in subsistence economies, experimentation and the possibility
of mistakes are often regarded as conveying unacceptable risk. Therefore, among the beneficiaries the existence of conservatism associated with culture (Domatob, 1987; Maclure & Bassey, 1991) or strong social and political factionalism (Joshi, 1986) could impose major constraints on active participation. Furthermore, seasonal environmental changes that have a strong influence on life styles and activities of the rural poor such as seasonal migrations, long days of field work, and the like (Joshi, 1986) could have adverse effect on participation.

Apart from the kind of constraints that are discussed above, Doerksen and Pierce (1975) observe a theoretical limitation in relation to participation. According to the two authors, all forms of the direct participation models depend extensively on certain assumptions about the characteristics of those participating: (a) that people care about the policy problem, (b) that people have information about the policy area and how it affects them, (c) that people have opinions about issues, and (d) that people have the motivation to participate in the policy decisions on the basis of interest, information, and opinions. The authors are of the opinion that in many instances it is unlikely anything other than a small minority is capable of meeting such requirements for specific applications and issues.

Because of such limitations some scholars strongly endorse endogenous development, meaning that development
should start from the people, and they should be helped with the expertise of outsiders to build upon and extend people's ideas to generate innovations through a process of sharing knowledge and learning from each other (Korten, 1980; Tri, 1986).

According to the above literature review on participation, it is apparent that the concept could be studied from a number of fronts. In the literature, however, the aspects of power shift and grassroots mobilization associated with participation assume prominence. These aspects are very much relevant to academic disciplines such as public administration and political science. On the other hand, participatory action research (PAR) could cover a variety of subject areas from physical sciences to social sciences involving participation. But, from a communication perspective, participation is basically considered as a process in which participants create and share information with one another to reach mutual understanding and agreement. Therefore, in this regard one could study participation through focusing on possible opportunities that are provided in a communication environment for participation to take place. The present study is an example of such an effort. In this study the researcher has examined ten relevant types of situations in which effective participatory communication could take place between beneficiaries and benefactors in a
set of AID-sponsored rural development projects implemented in a number of developing countries.
CHAPTER 3
PARTICIPATION AND PROJECT SUCCESS

Theoretical Foundation

The theoretical framework for the analysis of participation among the development projects in the sample of this study is based on the participatory development communication model of Nair and White (1987a). This model incorporates many of the concepts related to participation being talked about in the development literature, e.g., bottom-up development, grassroots involvement, participatory decision-making, citizen management, indigenous knowledge, self-reliance, egalitarian rights, participatory message development, media integration, team building, and interactivity. This development communication model assumes that participation is transactional and processual. According to Nair and White, the transactional perspective is "the opening of dialogue, source and receiver interacting continuously, thinking constructively about the situation, identifying developmental needs and problems, deciding what is needed to improve the situation and acting upon it" (p. 7).

The receivers in this transaction are not merely recipients of someone else's message but are actively
involved in the process of message development. In other words, by introducing a transactional approach, Nair and White suggest an interface of top-down and bottom-up information flow. The model does not intend to reverse the development models from top-down to bottom-up, but rather attempts to integrate these two polar approaches and unite them through transactional communication. The focus is on altering the communication process and approaches. It is about communication processes which take into account indigenous knowledge and self-reliance gained through increased information access and acquisition. Nair and White refer to indigenous knowledge in a broad sense that encompasses people's understanding not only connected with familiar technologies, but also with other aspects such as the environment in which they make a living and their morals of living.

In the transactional model of Nair and White, the key components of the Berlo (1960) model--source, message, channel, and receiver--are combined with organizational and socio-cultural change concepts, interfaced by processes of communication and participation. Feedback is two-way, reflecting the inherent characteristic of dialogue. As a result the source, message, channel, and receiver components take on new dimensions as they are continuously shaped by the transactional process. This is in accord with the convergence model of communication presented by Rogers and
Kincaid (1981), who define communication as "a process in which the participants create and share information with one another in order to reach a mutual understanding" (p. 63).

Apart from development concepts such as organizational change, socio-cultural change, and common goals, Nair and White also focus on the aspect of conflicting interests as a key concept within the model. Conflicts are bound to occur when interests and experiences of the participants do not match. Servaes and Arnst (1992), who strongly endorse participatory communication for social change, perceive interaction between development agencies and rural people as "cross-cultural" communication (p. 20). They are two groups having different perspectives of reality. Therefore, in the process of active participation, conflicts are likely to arise, although the very process of interaction will help to resolve conflicts if the intention of the participants is to share power and knowledge.

Teamwork, team-building, decision-making, and enabling are concepts operating within the participatory communication process. The transactions between source and receiver lead to innovative message development that is focused on felt needs of the receiver. The process, while acknowledging the indigenous knowledge, shapes and formulates messages, drawing appropriate technical and scientific inputs from the source. In other words, the source does not assume a dominance over the receiver. The
source and the receiver are performing equal roles. The receiver, in this process, shapes his/her own responses consciously and actively rather than in a passive manner such as through persuasion. Therefore, one can view the transactional model as a developmental process as messages are exchanged. Participants in this process (project implementors and the people) grow and change, each influenced by his/her own interpretations of the other's messages, changing attitudes and beliefs as the dialogue progresses. In this model the receiver demands something from the communication transaction and is encouraged to select messages likely to be useful. Not all exchanges are equitable, but the receiver stimulates the kind of message flow to which he/she is likely to be receptive.

This holistic model conceptualizes development communication as a participatory process. Conceptualizing the process from a three-dimensional perspective, the model shows the participatory process within the communication process, "like interlocking spheres within which messages take form" (Nair & White, 1987b, p. 10). The participatory process, according to Nair and White (1987a), "is a two-way, dynamic interaction, between grassroots receivers and the expert information source in a communication transaction" (p. 11). The participatory process aims at power equalization through control of developmental messages by the people rather than by the experts. On the other hand, a
top-down development communication model is characterized by a skewed power distribution between the sender and the receiver, with a concentration of power at the top (e.g., the sender) in which the source (composed of the power elites) and the receiver (the rural poor) would be continuously in conflict due to differences of interests. But in a participatory, transactional communication, the resolution of conflict is aided by the complementarity in goal orientation of the receiver and the source. The goals of the source (development bureaucrats, administrators, and experts) and the receivers (the people) become common to all in such a process through enhanced mutual understanding. The participation process involves human resource development at both the source and the receiver level.

Conflict Resolution

In relation to people's participation in change, Cole and Cole (1983) identify two approaches, namely (a) the functionalist-integrationist approach, and (b) the conflict approach. The authors consider these approaches as representing opposite ends of a continuum. According to Cole and Cole, the functionalist-integrationist approach strives for total acceptance through consensus of the total community with a social system seeking equilibrium, meaning that it strives for stability. At the other extreme is the conflict approach: "The conflict theorist takes the position that authority as a result of stratification is the basis of
conflict and confrontation with authority; the power structure is a means of bringing about social change" (Cole & Cole, 1985, p. 16). A characteristic of the conflict approach is the confrontation with the power structure, for a consensus of the total system is not sought. Some of the potential consequences of the conflict approach include: (a) selective, but rapid social change, (b) alienation of subsystems, (c) change at micro level rather than at macro level, and (d) untrained leadership.

Even when source and receiver are working toward a common goal, no participatory process is expected to be free of conflict because of the structural dimension of power distribution. The conflict occurs because of the differential power relationship between source and receiver. The source, coming from upper strata of society, has vested power interests. The interest of the receiver at the village level is likely to be different from that of the source. Participation could directly threaten those whose position depends upon power over others (Servaes & Arnst, 1992).

Because the functionalist-integrationist approach and the conflict approach represent two opposite ways of initiating change, it appears that Nair and White’s model of participatory communication related to development takes a position in between those two extreme positions. While acknowledging the possibility of conflicts arising through
participation, Nair and White's conceptualization seem to move toward that end of the continuum which represents the functionalist-integrationist approach.

Nair and White (1987a) believe that the process of interrelating source and receiver through a communication transaction is bound to overcome conflict. According to them, when conflict and complementarity (common goals) exist at the same time, the relationship is dialectical (p. 13). The dialectical process is defined as "a systemic relationship between two subsystems (receiver and source) which is characterized by contradiction and complementarity" (p. 12). Within a systems model, where the receiver is linked to the source, a dialectical relationship ensues.

The transactional model encompasses the above concepts and strategies for resolving conflicts through dialectics. The receiver and the source must constantly interact and exchange views based on people's existing knowledge, thereby generating messages and consequently altering attitudes of both source and receiver. This phenomenon is also the theme of Korten's learning process approach (1980) toward participatory development. The learning process involves villagers and program personnel sharing their knowledge and resources to create a fit among needs, actions, and the capacities of the assisting organization. In the learning organization, error (e.g., decisions that are proved wrong)
is treated as a source of information and not as a reason to put blame on someone.

The development communication model of Nair and White addresses certain relevant issues regarding organizational change associated with the transactional process. The focus is on the approaches needed to bring about organizational change, or in other words, a bureaucratic reorientation to institutionalize new infrastructures to facilitate socio-cultural change with a greater concern for the less privileged. The desired outcome is a shift from hierarchical organizational structure to a team-oriented organizational structure, transforming hierarchical thinking into team thinking.

Focusing on social cultural change, Nair and White's model (1987a) addresses the approaches that are needed to bring about conscientization of the receiver (p. 16). Freire (1973) coined the term conscientization. The idea calls for acquisition of information necessary to liberate a people from the inability to shape their own environment and destiny. It also calls for behavioral changes (of the receiver) necessary to become self-reliant, assertive, and a full partner in a communication transaction. In practical terms, for example, the process would involve educating and training participants on participatory development philosophy and methodologies such as collective organization and participatory decision-making. This suggests the person
affected must have access to information and appropriate technology required for exploring alternatives to be an equal in the communication transaction with the source; the receiver must be skilled in carrying out teamwork. In other words, to bring about participation, people must possess skills to define their own needs and set goals which call for interaction with experts who can provide information resources needed to meet goals. The desired outcome is that people make their own decisions and take steps to define their own roles in regard to development efforts.

The Nair and White model analyzes the concepts related to the source, receiver, and the channel, taking into account commonality of goals and conflicting interests in a participatory communication process. The source. The source must have a plan to bring about the teamwork that will accomplish the objectives. Teamwork results when persons significantly relate to each other to accomplish common goals or objectives through either formal or informal team-building processes. Effective, useful dialogue between the source and the receiver, central to Nair and White’s model, is best achieved by teamwork. The people who have the problem discuss with experts and both agree on a course of action. The message is jointly developed through the process of dialogue. Nair and White (1987a) identify role shifting, group learning, and task sharing as necessary elements in this process (p. 18). Role
shifting refers to team members taking over new functions depending on the needs and strategies required for problem solutions. Group learning refers to participatory learning, and task sharing refers to taking responsibility for action by participants.

The various steps in participatory message construction assume simultaneous involvement of the development experts and the rural population. The implication of this perspective is that the source becomes a new (or at least redefined) concept in Nair and White's model. At the source level of the communication process, organizational changes are taking place, changes which in turn modify the channels of communication, impelling the receiver to participate in message construction. The receiver becomes a part of the source for developing and channeling messages.

The receiver. As mentioned earlier, in the transactional model two important processes occur simultaneously: the communication process and the participatory process. Although these two processes are not clearly distinguishable, Nair and White make analytical distinctions for clarifying concepts in the model, particularly those which relate to the receiver. The receiver is expected to do two things:

(1) examine the forces leading to informed decision-making through an enabling process and,
(2) express felt needs and utilize the receiver's own knowledge to shape socio-cultural change.

Informed decision-making would also require access to appropriate information necessary to make decisions. Such information sharing would put the receiver in a position to make a strong statement of what is perceived as appropriate. In turn, the receiver would set his/her own goals, outline alternatives, and evaluate alternative actions.

The channel. While discussing channels, Nair and White simultaneously look at the message. The transactional perspective provides the frame of reference for participation of the receiver in message construction, in concert with the source. Receptivity to messages should increase through active involvement of the receiver in the message construction itself. The expectation is that this involvement will increase self-reliance and capabilities of self-help, leading to empowerment in the context of development. The empowerment will enable people to identify the development potential of the community and ensure participation in development.

In the course of interaction between source and receiver, conflicting interests may surface. Resolution of those conflicts will be facilitated through enhancing the clarity of messages. Message development is viewed as a transactional process between source and receiver in which dialogue and networking are natural, ongoing activities.
The communication forms determine the channel of communication to be used to disseminate development messages. Development agencies may use many existing forms as channels: interpersonal instruction, indigenous organizations, mass media, folk media, and traditional gatherings. When messages flow in several forms and through several channels, they increase in clarity and amount of reception. The channel concept within Nair and White's model embodies the communication transaction between source and receiver as partners in message development and dissemination. The multiplicity of communication channels available for use and the dialogue required for "strategizing their use" make the "channel an intensely dynamic, processual component of the model" (Nair & White, 1987a, p. 25). The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), with more than a decade of experience with participatory development, reports that a multiplicity of channels serving rural needs, whether governmental, semi-private, private or cooperative, is able to aid the participatory framework significantly (Alamgir, 1989).

**Empowerment and Increase in Self-Esteem**

Participatory communication has a liberative content. The goal is to enable the villagers (receivers) to take control of their own lives by providing relevant information. The participation literature identifies this aspect as empowerment (Freire, 1973; Illich, 1977; Gran,
Empowerment is a process through which individuals acquire the knowledge and skills to take control of their lives individually or collectively. Nair and White refer to this aspect as enabling process or enablement (1987a, p. 21). Enablement implies awareness of one's predicament and an ability to deal with the problems that confront one as a member of a deprived group. In Nair and White's model, the acquisition of knowledge and skill enables people to change themselves, their lifestyles, and their relationship to the environment. The resulting increase in awareness leads to greater self-confidence and self-worth, thus decreasing self-alienation. These self-regard changes increase the likelihood that individuals can in fact, through individual or group action, effect changes at all levels of their social world and become self-reliant. The enabling process begins with conscientization and access to resources that can lead to increased knowledge. The intent of participatory communication is enablement. By having access to and learning how to seek out information, the receiver will increase decision-making ability, ultimately leading to an increase in personal power.

**Operationalization of Participation**

Based on the transactional communication model conceptualized by Nair and White, ten characteristics that would facilitate active participation are considered in
assessing participation in the projects that make up the sample:

1. **Linkage to local organizations.** When the project operational design has linkages with existing community institutions, it means that the project sources share the responsibilities for carrying out development operations with the community, possibly creating a transactional communication process between the source (the project implementors) and the receivers (the organizations). The extent of the transactional process could vary depending on the nature of the community institutions and other factors.

2. **Creation of beneficiary groups.** When a project organizes the beneficiaries to cooperate and to take responsibilities for implementing development activities, it is likely that a transactional communication process will occur, enabling the community members to participate actively. In this situation the nature of the group has an influence on the transactional process. For example, if groups have a democratic organization, one could expect a greater level of participation than in a situation in which the group has an autocratic organization.

   According to Hondale and VanSant (1985), created organizations are expected to serve as communication channels during implementation and then to become the inheritors of project functions in the post-project period. Thus, created beneficiary organizations bring two vital
elements into the participatory development model, namely interactivity and sustainability.

3. **Active women’s participation.** According to the theoretical model of the study, an aim in participatory development is egalitarianism. Therefore, it is important for women as well as men to take part actively in project decision-making. It has been observed that in the past the development projects hardly focused on this issue (Tinker, Bramsen, & Buvinic, 1976; Buvinic, Lycette, & McGreevey, 1983; Charlton, 1984). Because male household heads were typically the public representatives of family groups, it was often assumed that information and resources conveyed to males would trickle across to others in the household. Some development scholars have stated that this assumption permitted imbalanced rural development in the past (Boserup, 1970; Feldstein & Poats, 1989). Designing project operations to involve women directly and actively should contribute to participation.

4. **Utilization of indigenous technical knowledge and/or practices.** Use of indigenous knowledge when it is available would seem to imply participation in decision-making. Within the context of the study, the term *indigenous knowledge* takes a narrow focus and refers only to people’s existing knowledge associated with technological practices. In some cases, there may be *indigenous technical knowledge* (ITK) which is based on beliefs and customs and is
internally consistent and logical to those holding them but at odds with or unrecognized by the objectively deduced findings of formal science. In such cases, as emphasized by Nair and White (1987a), it is important for experts to build upon those components of ITK which are not inconsistent with scientific knowledge, seeking to change over time any potentially counterproductive practices associated with local belief systems. Within the theoretical model such a process is identified as the dialectical process, a process that alters attitudes and modifies understanding of both source and receiver.

Utilization of indigenous technical knowledge serves as a means of incorporating beneficiary inputs into the development process and thus accommodating participation. Ferrington and Martin (1988) say that use of ITK is essential to participatory empowerment.

5. Farmer collaboration in research in crop and livestock production. With an emphasis on participatory approaches to development, the traditional concept of technology transfer--which is based on providing technical information passed from experts to the ignorant--is discarded. According to the theoretical model of the study, outside experts (sources) and farmers (receivers) are perceived as working jointly as partners of a research team to identify development priorities and solutions to problems. Thus the farmers will have a strong hand in the
planning and management of field experiments and trials and in the evaluation of results (Hildebrand, 1986; Whyte, 1986; Biggs, 1988; Chambers, Pacey, & Thrupp, 1989). For example, farming-systems research-extension (Hildebrand, 1986), on-farm collaborative research (Biggs, 1988), and adaptive research (Benor, 1984), are systems introduced at different times under different international development programs which basically institutionalize farmer participation in agricultural research.

Collaborative research in agriculture alters the "top-down/researcher-driven/supply-push" research model to a "system-based/farmer-driven/demand-pull" research model, indicating a transactional development communication process (Chapman, Brown, & Castro, 1988, p. 371).

6. **Beneficiary contribution of cash, labor or goods.** Beneficiary contributions take the form of a collective voluntary support toward project activities. Ability of the beneficiaries to contribute to a development project will provide an opportunity for them to take certain responsibilities in implementing the project. The process represents not only collaboration and partnership, but also self-reliance. Decisions to make voluntary contributions such as cash, labor, and material are outcomes of a dialogue between source and receiver identifying developmental needs and problems, as conceptualized in the theoretical model of the study. Decisions to make contributions also imply the
formation of favorable attitudes in the form of commitment among the receivers that would increase prospects for project success.

7. **Beneficiary participation in media message production.** In the context of participation, participatory media are defined in the *Thesaurus of Development Communication* (Clearinghouse on Development Communication, 1993b) as "communication modes which are designed, produced, and maintained by the local population using local resources" (p. 55). If a project provides at least an opportunity for beneficiaries to express their views through media interviews and discussions or in other forms, that could be considered beneficiary participation in the media message production. The choice of development messages in such situations would be based on immediate problems brought up jointly by the receivers and the development communication experts in a transactional communication process. Such joint consideration of problems would tend to promote attitudes that would contribute to a project's success.

8. **Beneficiary training in participation**

According to the participatory model used in the study, empowerment is a process through which receivers acquire the knowledge and skills to take control of their lives. Nair and White refer to this aspect as an *enabling process* or *enablement* (1987a, p. 21). Aspects such as collective
action, need definition, and feedforwarding are also part of the knowledge and skills that receivers need to possess if they are to be effective in a transactional communication process. Therefore, to facilitate participation one should increase beneficiary capacities to assess, choose, plan, create, organize, and take initiatives. These capacities could only be improved through a program of education and training of beneficiaries on participatory aspects of development.

9. **Private commercial-sector participation.** A key purpose of the enabling process identified in the theoretical model of the study is to ensure the sustainability of development through self-reliance. In addition to participants' knowledge and skills about development strategies, there is also the need for assured supply of inputs for the activities to continue. Although the theoretical model does not specifically refer to the private commercial-sector's role in this regard, private commercial-sector participation could help to provide such sustainability through guaranteeing a supply of inputs.

10. **Decentralization of development administration.** With decentralization, the local bodies will have greater local control. Therefore, such a situation exemplifies participatory empowerment. Local control should increase project experts' ability to respond to beneficiary demands promptly without waiting for approval from a central
authority. A project with local control will provide a greater opportunity for beneficiaries to influence project decisions and to achieve a better fit between the objectives of both the development agencies and the beneficiaries.

The Hypotheses

The argument in favor of active beneficiary participation in development has its roots in ethical, anti-bloc, self-reliance ideologies of social development (Mowlana & Wilson, 1990). Goulet (1989a) identifies participation from its ethically defined nature of goals but it also has a political aspect. Leaders in the developing world were calling for international cooperation among developing countries emphasizing self-reliance without aligning with dominant capitalist or communist blocs (Mowlana & Wilson, 1990). The revision of the US policy on international development assistance to encompass participation through the creation of the Inter-American Foundation (IAF) in 1969 and subsequently through The New Directions legislation mandated by the US Congress in 1973 was based on a humane rationale (Korten, 1980). In the mid-seventies the World Bank, too, started to reorient its development approach based on the basic human needs doctrine (Hellinger, Hellinger, & O'Regan, 1988; Black, 1991).

While there have been increased arguments favoring bottom-up and participatory development, some scholars have criticized the lack of application of the concepts either in
research or implementation (Mansel, 1981/1982; Cernea, 1985; UNESCO, 1986; Hellinger, Hellinger, & O'Regan, 1988; Fair, 1989; United Nations Development Program, 1990; Black, 1991). As far as research is concerned, although scholars often endorsed active participation, they often failed to show empirical evidence in support of the concept (Finsterbusch & Van Wicklin, 1897; Hewavitharana, 1993).

Because much emphasis on people's participation in rural development occurred during the latter part of the 1970s and the early 1980s, ample time now has passed for its application to be reflected in recent development projects assisted by major international donors. Therefore, an aim of this study is to analyze a sample of recent development projects funded by AID to assess how much AID recently has been responsive, in practice, to the concept of participation for development. Given the significant shift in writings toward favoring a development paradigm providing self-management and active beneficiary participation, the researcher expects a greater percentage of AID-funded rural development projects in the sample to show a greater percentage of operational actions of participation. Because there is no basis to compare these findings, the assessment of extent of participation in projects in the sample will be an exploratory aspect of the study.

Experience in diverse settings confirms the general thrust of participatory theory. Scholars who have been
active in studying recent rural development efforts in parts of the developing world (Korten, 1980; Tandon & Brown, 1981; Esman & Uphoff, 1984; Cernea, 1985) report confidently that involving villagers and local organizations in the design and execution of their own development projects can activate an enormous reservoir of local human resources. Studies in development strategies relying upon local decision-making and organizations generally confirm the premise that participation can be a critical factor in project success (Useem, Setti, & Kanchanabucha, 1988). Efforts to experiment with such procedures have been made more urgent by failures of development efforts conceived within the frameworks of earlier theories (e.g., modernization, Marxist and neo-Marxist theories). However, the concept of participation is not a derivative of any older theory of development. It is rather an outcome of the criticism of such theories. Servaes (1986) characterizes this new ideology of development as need-oriented, endogenous, self-reliance-oriented, and egalitarian. The operational aspects of these concepts are listed below in terms of their contribution to success of developmental efforts:

Implementation of development actions through existing local organizations. Esman and Uphoff (1984) perceive local organizations as intermediaries in rural development. After an extensive study of local organizations in developing countries, they conclude:
Development assistance agencies and, increasingly, officials in developing countries can profit from strategies that benefit the rural majority through local membership organizations not only because they may be normatively desirable but because they are economically rational and politically wise.

According to Clark (1991), non-radical, non-governmental organizations are increasingly seen as preferred partners by many major official aid agencies and governments of developing countries. Esman and Uphoff (1984) have empirically demonstrated, using 16 countries' experience, that local organization is a necessary if not sufficient condition for accelerated rural development, especially development which emphasizes improvement in the productivity and welfare of the majority of rural people.

Implementation of development actions through created beneficiary groups. Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989) found in their study of 52 AID projects that organized beneficiaries have more influence on government agencies and accomplish more than unorganized beneficiaries. The researchers also observed that participation variables contribute significantly to project success in projects with organized beneficiaries.

From the implementor's perspective, organized beneficiaries are easier to reach, and organization facilitates the solicitation and incorporation of beneficiary inputs into the project. Hondale and VanSant (1985) perceive group creation as a widespread practice in
integrated rural development that helps both learning and implementation. The two researchers recognize organized beneficiaries as valuable channels of information about needs for specific services. Moreover, they say that because such groups are also primary users of services, the groups have an important role in planning and implementing service delivery.

**Enabling women to be actively engaged in development actions.** Esther Boserup (1965) broke the ground for women in development with her challenge of the prevailing notion that economic development would automatically improve women’s status by replacing traditional values and economic backwardness with new opportunities and an egalitarian ethos. Since then gender issues in development have been an aspect of concern. Almost all the leading international development organizations, including AID, have policies or programs that consider gender issues in the projects or activities they support (Feldstein & Poats, 1989).

In many developing countries rural women account for 40 to 70 percent of the agricultural output and are actively involved in certain operations and management of agricultural and food production activities. Studies done by Poats, Galt, Andrew, Walecka, Hildebrand, and McDermott (1986) have indicated that exclusion of women in an information-exchange-participatory model of development will result in loss of vital information exchange in rural
agricultural development, leading to an inefficient dialogue
and less project success.

Utilization of indigenous technical knowledge and
practices. The participation literature often acknowledges
the importance of indigenous technical knowledge (ITK) as an
input for rural development. It has been argued that the
relevance and prospects for success of innovations brought
in from outside will be enhanced if they build upon
indigenous knowledge (Farrington & Martin, 1988; Biggs,
1988; Chambers et al., 1989; Mundy & Compton, 1991). Use of
ITK systems through a dialectical process is likely to make
beneficiaries more willing to adopt new practices because
the project will seem related to beliefs the beneficiaries
already accept. Attitudes toward the project will be more
likely to be favorable if a portion of the content is
already accepted.

Conduct of collaborative on-farm research. After
evaluating eight AID-sponsored agricultural research and
development projects, Murphy (1982) reported that the
project in Guatemala in which on-farm trials were conducted
in close collaboration with farmers showed greater success
than the projects in other countries where experiments were
controlled by experts. The farmers in the latter situation
were passive; experts had the total control of trials. On
the other hand, in the Guatemalan situation farmers were
equal partners of the trials. The trials were conducted to
develop practices that suited the farmers' needs. The field trial results were evaluated on the basis of farmers' opinions. In situations of such collaborative research, the technology development process begins with active farmer participation. It is different from a situation in which farmers only adopt a new technology which is developed elsewhere.

It is expected that when farmers are given an opportunity to manage and evaluate field trials in connection with technology development, they get a chance to influence project decisions to make projects more appropriate to their needs.

Voluntary, collective beneficiary contribution toward development actions. Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989), who analyzed 52 AID-sponsored projects, observed beneficiary contribution as a variable that is highly correlated with overall project effectiveness. It is expected that when beneficiaries make decisions to contribute collectively toward development, it will be a sign of commitment. According to both cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957) and attribution theories (Shaver, 1983), such commitment often leads to favorable attitudes which should contribute to participation and eventually to project success.

Beneficiary participation in media production. Participation literature cites several examples of active
beneficiary involvement in media production concerned with development actions. For example, Oepen (1990), who had long years of experience in Southeast Asia with development media research, describes a community television project in India, a People in Communication project in the Philippines, and a video-program production project by the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) in India as success stories of active beneficiary participation in media production for development. O'Sullivan-Ryan & Kaplun (1981), Joshi (1986), Mody (1986), Kivikuru (1989), and Malik (1989) describe similar successful development communication projects in a number of countries in which people were involved in the media production.

It is expected that when beneficiaries have an opportunity to make decisions on media messages, those messages are more likely to be relevant to the felt needs of the people and therefore effective in initiating development actions. Beneficiary-involved media production is also conceived as an effective mechanism of feedforwarding to influence decisions of policy makers at the top (Mody, 1986; Hornik, 1988; Uche, 1989).

Training in participation. Participatory training could be considered a precursor to effective information exchange between benefactors and beneficiaries. In relation to development organizations, such training is expected to improve the communication skills of the members and thus the
functioning of the organizations. Training in participation is expected to increase beneficiaries' capacity to collaborate as equal partners and participate in project design, implementation, redesign, and maintenance (Freire, 1973; Esman & Uphoff, 1984; Srinivasan, 1990; Black, 1991; Chambers et al., 1989; Clark, 1991).

**Private commercial-sector participation.** AID's policy emphasis recently has been to encourage and facilitate involvement of the private commercial-sector in development. According to Binnendijk (1989), AID's experience has confirmed that activities with the potential for generating a profit are best left to private entrepreneurs. This was particularly the case with activities that involved the distribution of agricultural inputs and services to farmers and the purchase and marketing of farmers' agricultural surplus. Because public agencies were ill-equipped to do these tasks, mainly because of their bureaucratic rigidity, inefficiencies and unreliability resulted. The private commercial-sector is expected to be more flexible in decision-making than the public sector when it comes to dealing with the people; therefore, people will find it easier to deal with the private commercial-sector to obtain needed services and inputs.

The advantages of the private commercial-sector include business management skills and the entrepreneurial spirit of private firms, which lead to reliable, efficient, and cost-
effective operations. Private management's natural interest in pleasing clients and its independence from bureaucratic procedures make it particularly responsive to local community needs and perceptions and to changing circumstances in the rural environment. Furthermore, private (commercial-sector) activities are sustainable without continued donor or public sector assistance when there is long-term potential for generating sufficient revenue to cover expenses as well as to yield a profit.

Decentralization of development administration. Hondale and VanSant (1985), who emphasize local action for rural development, provide the following argument in support of decentralization to enhance local action:

Government bureaucracies are poorly attuned to the needs and aspirations of the poor, principally because most development agencies came into being before participation became part of the dominant development paradigm. These agencies were designed for more centralized, service-oriented programs, and their bureaucratic structures, systems, and norms pose important barriers to effective local action. (p. 59)

AID (Binnendijk, 1989) observed that centralization concentrates experience in the national capital and contributes little to developing local leadership and initiative.

The significant contribution that decentralization offers to participation is the enhancement of beneficiary capacity to make decisions regarding development actions. With decentralization people are likely to gain real control
over resources and processes under which development is expected to occur. Because decentralization will redistribute power at local and national levels, it may be the most important single means of achieving effective participation.

The World Bank experience indicates that in some countries decentralization has resulted in greater participation in development activities and more effective and efficient administration of local and rural development programs (Rondinelli et al., 1985).

Considering the potential power of participatory actions described above for mobilizing rural development, the researcher hypothesizes that:

(H1) In separate analyses of each participation variable, a project containing a participatory variable will be more likely to show overall success than a project without that variable.

Because the theoretical model of the study incorporates many of the concepts about participatory development, it is logical to expect that the more of these participatory variables are incorporated into a development project, the more complete and thus more effective participation will be. Therefore, the researcher hypothesizes that:

(H2) The greater the number of participatory variables a project contains, the more likely the project is to show overall success.

The impact of a participatory activity on overall project success will depend on how successful that
particular activity is in a project. Depending on various factors, implementation of a participatory activity could be successful (completely or partly) or unsuccessful. This means it is more important to consider a participation variable’s implementation success than its mere presence in a project. The communication model of the study recognizes that cooperation and team spirit are important prerequisites for effective receiver participation in development communication. Certain factors may impair or disrupt cooperation and team spirit among the participants. If circumstances are unfavorable for cooperation and team spirit, then the participatory activity is not likely to be successful in a project, and vice versa. Therefore, the researcher hypothesizes that:

\( (H_3) \) In any project containing a participatory variable, the project will be more likely to be evaluated as successful overall if the participatory variable it contains is also evaluated as successful rather than if the variable is not evaluated as successful, and

\( (H_4) \) the greater the number of successful participatory variables a project contains, the greater the likelihood that the project will show overall success.

The theoretical models used by Cohen and Uphoff (1977) and Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989) to study participation identify beneficiary decision-making as central to participation. When beneficiaries have a greater share of development decision-making, Bachrach and Baratz
(1970), who studied community action programs for poverty elimination in Baltimore, considered it as people-oriented participation. Arnstein (1969), who describes people's participation using a typology of eight levels, identifies the topmost level of participation as citizens' control in which beneficiaries obtain the majority of decision-making opportunities. Therefore, when a participatory activity clearly indicates opportunity available for beneficiary decision-making, such an activity could be more effective in impelling the development efforts toward beneficiary needs, resulting in overall success of the development project, than when a participatory activity does not explicitly indicate such an opportunity. Therefore, the researcher hypothesizes that:

\[(H_5) \text{ In separate analyses of each participation variable, projects containing the participatory variables with a clear indication of beneficiary decision-making will be more likely to show overall success than projects with the same variable without such clear indication of beneficiary decision-making.}\]

According to Rondinelli et al. (1985), nearly all countries in which governments have attempted to decentralize administration have faced serious problems of implementation. The researchers observe that some problems arose from insufficient central political and bureaucratic support, and others from ingrained centrist attitudes and behavior on the part of political and administrative
leaders. Accordingly, the researchers state that small-scale decentralizations such as project implementation through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) were the most successful ones. As a rule, due to the small size of such organizations they find integration of decision-making with the community for rural development is easier than for larger bureaucracies such as government agencies. For example, Tongsawate and Tips (1988), based on their experience with non-governmental organizations in Thailand, state, "Very few of those operating in Thailand would be large enough to display typical characteristics of bureaucracies" (p. 411). Therefore, the researcher hypothesizes:

\[
(H_6) \text{ Projects that are implemented through a non-governmental organization (NGO) will be evaluated as showing more successful decentralization than those projects that are not implemented through an NGO.}
\]

The power of participation may not be a uniformly available engine for mobilizing rural development. Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989), after studying 52 AID-funded development projects, observed that participation had less favorable influence on project effectiveness when projects were located in extremely impoverished settings. The researchers used host-country Gross National Product (GNP) per capita level as the criterion to determine the poverty or in general the development level of those settings. Based on the
experience of Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin, the researcher hypothesizes that:

\[(H_7)\] Each participatory variable is more likely to be judged as successful when a project with that participatory variable is implemented in a country with a moderate to high level of Gross National Product (GNP) per capita than in a country with a low level of GNP per capita.

The United Nations Development Program in 1990 published for the first time in its Human Development Report an index of development called the Human Development Index (HDI). According to the report, HDI is a more meaningful index of a country’s development than GNP, because HDI encompasses three salient characteristics that influence citizens’ development, namely life expectancy, literacy, and income (United Nations Development Program, 1990). Those components are indicative of both the process of widening people’s choices and the level of their achieved well-being. The HDI, as a composite index of those characteristics, is considered useful in distinguishing clearly between two sides of human development. One is the formation of human capabilities, such as improved health or knowledge. The other is the use that people make of their acquired capabilities for work or leisure.

Therefore, the researcher believes that the ability of a country’s population to be actively involved in development participation is greater if the country has a
higher level of HDI than a lower level of HDI. Thus, the researcher hypothesizes that:

\( H_g \) Each participatory variable is more likely to be judged as successful when a project with that participatory variable is implemented in a country with a moderate to high level of HDI than in a country with a low level of HDI.
CHAPTER 4
METHOD

The study involved content analysis of 102 project evaluation reports published by the United States Agency for International Development (AID). These reports were examined for the presence of ten participation variables chosen for the study. Information related to each of the participation variables, when present in an evaluation report, was examined to determine the success of the activity concerning the variable as well as for its indications of beneficiary decision-making. The overall success of each project was determined on the basis of information presented in the project output section and in the conclusion of the report.

A purpose of the study was also to focus on fairly recent projects because of an intention to examine the extent to which AID recently has been responsive, in practice, to the concept of participation for development. It was observed in 1992, when projects for the study were selected, that AID projects initiated after 1990 did not have evaluation reports published. However, interim evaluation reports of some projects that have been started as late as 1988 and continued into 1990 were available and
were used. The analysis of participation made by Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989) used evaluation reports of AID projects published by mid-1984. Their study mainly included projects initiated during the later part of the 1970s and the early part of the 1980s. Therefore, it was considered that the selection of projects funded by AID since the early 1980s through 1988 would lead to a continuation of the study of AID projects in relation to participation. Thus the study used a selection of evaluation reports of AID projects funded beginning in 1980. The most recent evaluation report in the selection was published in 1992.

Selection of the Sample

The sample for the study was chosen from AID’s Development Information System (DIS). The DIS is a bibliographic data base. It identifies 7,000 projects initiated since 1974 and 65,000 associated project and technical reports (Center for Development Information, 1992).

Rural development in the AID context has no distinct definition (Binnendijk, 1989). Nonetheless, many projects that involve agriculture and health improvement are targeted to rural communities. For example, one of AID’s five major topics of development is agriculture and rural development (Binnendijk, 1989). Also, AID has used communication strategies and technologies, particularly involving mass
media, for more than 20 years especially in health, population, and education. Among development communication projects which AID identifies as successful, more than 50 percent are specifically aimed at agriculture, nutrition and health improvement, and population control. The others involve integrated development projects, education, and human resource development (Clearinghouse on Development Communication, 1993a).

Because of the above, it was decided to use the key words, agriculture, health, communication, and mass media, to obtain an appropriate sample for the study. AID Research and Reference Service used these key words at the researcher's request to retrieve reports on such projects from its electronic database (DIS).

At the first stage of selection, sets of project reports had been retrieved with the use of two principal descriptors, agriculture or health. Those sets had been then crossed with the additional descriptors, communication or mass media, at the second stage of selection. Thus a collection of reports on health or agriculture development (some projects dealt with both aspects) with reference to communication or mass media (several projects used a number of media) was obtained (AID Research and Reference Services, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

According to the procedure of selection, the sample of the study can be regarded as a purposive sample. Truly
random sampling in development research seems to be rare, and therefore, often in practice one observes the use of purposive samples in development research (Hursh-César & Roy, 1976). This study is an example of a situation in which the researcher is unable to select a large random sample but able to gather a set of projects that are likely to have a fair degree of internal consistency in terms of the research focus. According to Neurath (1976), internal consistency of the data in a study is a powerful argument for selecting a purposive sample.

The study was designed to use project evaluation reports as the source of data for the analysis. Therefore, among the projects retrieved only those with either interim or end-of-project evaluation reports were finally chosen for the study. This selection consisted a total of 102 projects (see Appendix A) of which 96 had been implemented in 40 developing countries (see Appendix B) and six others implemented regionally. The selection included 25 end-of-project evaluation reports and 77 interim evaluation reports.

Usually AID projects are evaluated both during implementation and following completion of projects. The evaluations conducted during project implementation are known as either mid-term or interim project evaluations. Each project is evaluated by a team of evaluators who visit the project site. Very often such a team is
interdisciplinary and includes, depending on the subject area covered by a project, agriculturalists, economists, social scientists, health officials, and development generalists. Each team includes one or more AID officers. Outside consultants join the teams where the necessary expertise is not available within AID at the time of evaluation (Murphy, 1982).

The evaluation reports chosen for the intended study appear to have followed a basic format according to AID guidelines. Each report included a summary, introduction, and sections on project inputs, project process and outputs, conclusions, and recommendations. The amount of description and the nature of description within each section, however, appeared to be variable among the reports. A few projects (six in number) were more focused on staff, policy, and institution development than on aspects concerning dealing with people at the grassroots (project beneficiaries). Their evaluation reports were characterized by very little or no reference to specific activities with people at the grassroots. The remaining 96 project evaluation reports were used in the analyses of correlation between participation and project success. However, all 102 projects were examined for the presence of each of the participation variables of the study.
Data Collection

A coding manual (see Appendix C) addressing ten participation variables that could contribute to active benefactor-beneficiary partnership was used as the principal instrument to collect relevant data from the sample. The coding manual was formatted like a questionnaire. While reading each report, the researcher recorded the information, as cited in the report, relevant to the questions included in the manual.

Definition of Terms

Case number. Each evaluation report in the sample was identified by a consecutive integer starting from one in an ascending order.

Project type. Because the principal aim of study was to analyze how the opportunities for active partnership between benefactors (project implementors) and beneficiaries (people at the grassroots) contribute to project success, project reports in the sample were identified as one of two types. Those projects whose activities were not directly aimed at the grassroots were basically identified as management and infrastructural development projects. This type had the least focus on community participation and was characterized by the following:

1. The project titles included the words--management or staff training such as nurses training, or fund or finance or sector assessment.
2. None of these projects had reference to linking with existing community organizations or creation of beneficiary groups.

3. Project reports did not address any of the participation actions other than staff training and commercial sector participation. The former was present in management development projects, and the latter was present in infrastructural development projects in which the construction work had been performed by private contractors.

**Host-country.** This term refers to the country in which the project is implemented. The name mentioned in the report was used as the country’s name. If a project was implemented simultaneously in several countries, the project was classified as regional. The country’s name was used to identify the Gross National Product (GNP) per capita and the Human Development Index (HDI) relevant to the country. For projects marked as regional, GNP and HDI values were considered inapplicable.

The study used ten participation variables as well as some others. At times the variables were used dichotomously; for other parts of the analysis the variables were classified into as many as three levels.

**Participation Variables**

The following information regarding each participation variable of the study was recorded on the coding sheets by
the principal investigator as direct quotations from reports.

**Linkage to existing organizations.** When a report mentioned that a project arranged specific development activities to take place with the collaboration of certain existing local organizations, the project was considered as having linked to existing local organizations. The following were observed as linkages to existing local organizations: (a) schools having the staff and the children engaged in project activities, (b) churches and religious missions that were engaged as supporting institutions, (c) cooperatives involved in project activities, and (d) local non-governmental organizations engaged in project activities. This category does not include private commercial organizations and small private businesses (other than cooperatives) that are linked to development projects.

**Creation of beneficiary groups.** According to the evaluation reports, the following were observed to have been created or selected by the project implementors to solicit participation as groups: (a) youth groups, (b) community groups (e.g., fish pond managing groups, community woodlot groups, and safe water groups), (c) instances in which developers encouraged villagers to select leaders for project activities, (d) farmer groups, (e) contact farmers, (f) village water and sanitation committees, (g) water use associations, (h) maintenance
committees, (i) standpipe committees, (j) community-selected health workers, (k) village health committees, (l) health clubs or health councils, (m) local action committees, (n) local management committees, (o) village committees, (p) area development committees, (q) agricultural committees, (r) collective management units, (s) focus groups, (t) solidarity groups called "groupements," (u) village representatives as extension workers, (v) credit groups, (w) community banks, and (x) promoters, collaborators, or distributors (e.g., in family planning projects). However, if a created group is identified entirely as a women’s group, then such a group was classified under women’s active participation rather than under the variable creation of groups. Classifying women’s groups as others would have minimized the consideration given to women. Because such an activity is directed toward mobilizing women specifically, its categorization under women’s active participation is considered appropriate. There were only two such occasions encountered.

Women’s active participation. In the process of identifying women’s active participation in a project, two levels of women’s participation were identified within the selected sample of projects. At the lower level women were classified as passive service recipients. When a project was primarily aimed at women, but its evaluation did not refer to specific activities of the women related to the
project activities, other than as recipients of services, then such situation was regarded as passive women's participation and was not listed in this study. If an evaluation report referred to women as individuals or groups actively engaged in development activities, then such a situation was regarded as an indication of women's active participation. For the purpose of this study the following were regarded as situations of women's active participation in development projects: (a) women who were trained as trainers, (b) women who underwent training on subject matter related to the project activities, (c) women who were engaged as project staff (e.g., as full-time outreach workers, extension workers, animators, service point officers, educators, distributors, contraceptive sales agents, field workers, community nurses or auxiliary nurses), (d) women who were helped to start business on their own (e.g., home-craft groups, animal raising by women, starting other small businesses by women), (e) women volunteer action groups called "groupements" and other women's interest groups such as housewife groups, (f) women who were appointed to committees such as water and sanitation committees, health committees, development committees, and (g) women who were involved as local representatives of national women's NGOs or other women's organizations. The activity described above under (d) was regarded as more appropriate to consider under women's
active participation rather than under private commercial sector participation, because for the purpose of the study, private commercial sector participation involved supply of inputs or services to beneficiaries by the private sector on a profit basis. Two projects referred to exclusive women’s involvement in project-supported small enterprises.

**Utilization of indigenous knowledge/practices.**

Indigenous technical knowledge was considered as referring to traditional practices and technologies. For the purpose of the study the following were identified as situations of utilizing indigenous technology in development projects: (a) project approach through indigenous knowledge systems or the use of indigenous technology or practice in conjunction with improved technology or practices, (b) engaging of traditional birth attendants or local midwives in health projects, (c) use of traditional medicine or medical treatments (e.g., certain reports referring to the term "Ayurvedic" meaning the use of traditional medicine and treatment), (d) use of traditional diarrhea control practices, (e) promotion of known familiar technologies such as building on existing expertise of peasant farmers or the use of soil conservation techniques which are historically familiar in the location or the use of homemade ground-leveling devices and hand tools for the construction of soil conservation structures, (f) use of farm family storage of grains, (g) selection of traditional woodlot protection
methods (Use of native species of trees and plants, however, was not regarded as utilization of indigenous practices.), and (h) folklore when used for health education. Even when some of the above activities were mentioned in projects which used on-farm collaborative research/trials, the activities were grouped under the variable utilization of indigenous technology/practices. There were four such instances observed. In those four instances there could have been a certain amount of overlapping of the two variables, utilization of indigenous technology/practices and on-farm collaborative research/trials but on the whole particularly when projects dealt with health development, such overlapping was not possible.

Collaborative on-farm research/trials. This process involves conducting research on farmers' fields with farmers directly involved in the development and dissemination of technologies. The terms used in the evaluation reports to describe collaborative research were: (a) farming-systems research and extension, (b) adaptive research, (c) on-farm applied research, (d) farming-systems oriented technical assistance, (e) use of peasant farm systems and agro-sylvo-pastoral elements for project trials, and (f) collaborative farmer or cooperative-managed experiments.

Voluntary beneficiary contribution. This category considered only beneficiary voluntary contributions to projects that involved pooling of cash, labor, and materials
for the common use. Collaborative on-farm research also represents a contributory partnership but not exactly a situation of voluntary contribution for the common good as the term is used here. The following activities were observed as voluntary beneficiary contributions to projects: (a) contribution of manual labor, cash, or local materials for project activities, (b) initiation of self-help activities, (c) participants (villagers) helping to train others as a part of the project activity, and (d) contribution of land space for pipe laying.

**Beneficiary-involved media production.** A wide range of activities ranging from mass media to theater, posters, leaflets, and slides was considered as media. When reports mentioned certain forms of media production in which there is a great likelihood for the beneficiaries to participate either directly or indirectly, such situations were classified as beneficiary-involved media production. The following were observed as beneficiary-involved media production: (a) radio/television message development with pre/post testing with audience, (b) use of visuals for farmer-training showing local farmers' activities, (c) use of local radio stations for development communication, (d) use of investigative journalists who present beneficiary views on media, (e) incorporation of inputs from anthropological studies into media production,
(f) media material design by the staff using its experience with the community through informal contacts, (g) use of information gained from knowledge, attitude, and practices (KAP) surveys for the preparation of media messages, (h) use of community theater, and (i) incorporation of beneficiary views and voices directly into programs (e.g., radio programming with regular interviews with farmers, identification of needs and projection of people’s perceptions via media, engaging of specific groups such as students for program production, and the use of community-managed programs for broadcasting).

**Beneficiary training for active participation.** The following were considered as activities identified in evaluation reports concerning beneficiary training that could enhance participatory capacities of project beneficiaries: (a) training in community development activities such as community organization, community self-development, and community participation (b) training in management such as organizational and financial management or scheme management, (c) training in participatory methods (e.g., training based on participatory problem-oriented experiential approach), (d) training in group administration such as working in groups, collaboration, and team building, (e) orientation training in social forestry, (f) adult education or informal education described in the reports as
training used to build an indigenous organizational movement, community leadership, or local leadership, (g) critical consciousness-raising described as *conscientization* in the reports, (h) local planning of development programs, (i) promoter programs (Evaluation reports identify such training programs as enabling beneficiaries to convey the opinions and desires of the community concerning development program direction and strategies to project implementors.), (j) focus group techniques for development committees, (k) training in animation (outreach) for development committees, and (l) orientation to "Posyandu" Service in Indonesia (community health service with people’s collaboration).

**Private commercial-sector participation.** When an evaluation report specifically mentioned the active involvement of the private, commercial-sector as project service and/or goods suppliers, then such situations were identified as private commercial-sector participation. The following activities were observed as private commercial-sector participation in projects within the sample: (a) private extension service, (b) supply of contraceptives through private firms, (c) provision of private clinical services for family planning, (d) repair and maintenance or rehabilitation of water supply systems by private commercial-sector, (e) media production by private firms, (f) conducting of market research by private firms,
(g) marketing of farm produce such as processing and trading activities, fish drying, and non-traditional agricultural export (agricultural produce that was not traditionally exported by the private commercial sector), (h) involvement of commercial banks for lending money as a part of project inputs, (i) construction of structures by private companies as parts of project inputs, (j) management of forestry plantations by private firms, (k) supply of agricultural inputs (e.g., seed/seedling production and distribution) through private nurseries, and (l) involvement of private commercial firms to provide family planning services to their workers.

Decentralization of development administration. This research followed the definition of Rondinelli et al. (1985), who classified decentralized administration as the transfer of responsibility for planning, management, and decision making from a central authority to (a) semi-autonomous public authorities or corporations, (b) area-wide, regional, or functional authorities, or (c) non-governmental private or voluntary organizations. Therefore, a project was classified as showing decentralization even when it involved only transfer of authority from the national to the provincial level. Decentralization was not defined as requiring lack of contact with a central agency. When a project was implemented through a non-governmental organization, it was identified as showing decentralization.
The following instances in evaluation reports were considered as indications of decentralization through NGOs: international private voluntary organizations, religious missions, community organizations, development committees, or regional bodies of people’s representatives, such as "Panchayats" in India, that were responsible for the entire management of a development project.

All the following project administrations were considered as indications of some form of decentralization, but not through NGOs: (a) project reflecting government policy of decentralized planning and management, (b) structuring the implementation with a regional focus, (c) making efforts to decentralize management, (d) provincial subcommittees setting up policies related to management, (e) project designed to be outside of line operation of the government agency, but not through an NGO, (f) use of decentralized development-based model, (g) project with semi-autonomous status, (h) delegation of authority to regions or provinces, (i) academic and administrative supervision of the project relying on self-contained efforts of each village cluster (which is much smaller organization than what is referred to as "Panchayat" in India) and (j) decentralized training (in the case of a management training project).

The frequency of projects in the sample having each of the participation variables identified in the study is the
basis for assessing the extent of participatory action incorporated in AID projects.

Assessment of Participation Variable Success

The principal investigator recorded information presented in the reports that was relevant to the success of individual participation variables. Furthermore, whenever they were given, he recorded the reasons for their failures or partial success. He also noted down any recommendations given by the evaluating team regarding the participation variables concerned. All the relevant information was noted on the coding sheets as direct quotations.

In a few projects dealing with several geographic areas, when an activity concerning a particular participation variable in one of those geographic areas was affected by political instability (e.g., civil violence), then the level of success of that particular variable was judged on the basis of its performance in the other geographic areas of that project where the activity was not affected by the disturbances.

When an activity concerning a participation variable was reported as stopped by authorities, then the level of success was considered as impossible to assess. When all or almost all the remarks about a particular participation variable indicated success (e.g., when many aspects were overwhelmingly successful and no more than one aspect was
listed as unsuccessful), then such a condition was judged to be completely successful.

When remarks about a particular participation variable noted some strengths of that particular activity while focusing on weakness also, then such a variable was considered as partly successful. When recommendations qualify the success, the variable was also considered as partly successful.

When all or almost all the remarks about a particular participation variable indicated the weakness of that particular instance, then the level of its success was judged to be poor. Also, when remarks indicated that a particular activity was part of the project but dropped (e.g., media use was planned but not implemented), then it was considered as poor.

Assessment of Decision-Making by Beneficiaries

The participation variables observed to be present in projects were also evaluated on the basis of whether they gave clear evidence that the activity had marked opportunity for beneficiary decision-making. Even though the above activities (i.e., participation variables 1-10) identified within the sample of study are called participation variables or participatory actions, one cannot be certain that beneficiaries had opportunities to make decisions about the project in each instance. Therefore, when assessing success of each participation variable, the presence of the
following in the evaluation reports, along with the remarks about participation variable success, were considered to decide whether the variable indicated beneficiary-decision making: (a) planning (designing) and/or evaluation of project activities by beneficiaries, (b) use of such terms as creative participation in association with remarks about certain participation variables, (c) group leaders' selection by committee members, (d) community selection of workers and/or agents for the project, (e) situations of farmer participation described using the terms listed under the variable on farm collaborative research/trials, (f) voluntary contribution of cash, labor, or material to project activities, (g) direct participation of beneficiaries in media production such as radio programming with regular interviews with farmers, community-managed radio program production, or community theater production (h) indirect participation of beneficiaries in media production such as pre-testing of media and post evaluation of media, and (i) use of such terms as collective management in the descriptions of participation variables.

Assessment of Overall Project Success

A project's overall success assessment was made considering the summary remarks about project outputs and the conclusions that had been recorded for each project by the evaluation team. Overall project success was classified as excellent, moderately successful, or poor. (In a few
instances the overall success was impossible to determine.)

When an evaluating team in its evaluation reported favorably about almost all project aspects, then the overall success of such a project was judged to be excellent.

When remarks about project output were generally mixed and the conclusion included both positive and negative aspects, then the overall success was considered as moderate. In instances in which the conclusions were favorable but remarks about individual aspects were mostly negative, the overall project success was considered as moderate. The latitude of the moderate category was considered to be wider than that of the excellent and the poor categories.

When almost all the project aspects were rated negatively along with a negative conclusion, then the overall project success was judged to be poor.

Host-Country Development Level

This variable was assessed in two forms: (a) Gross National Product (GNP) per capita and (b) Human Development Index (HDI). The GNP is the per capita dollar value of the gross national product of a particular country. The year 1990 is the end of the period considered for the study, and therefore, GNPs published for the year 1990 (United Nations Development Program, 1993) were used for the study. For a stratified analysis of cases according to the GNP, the amounts were considered under the following three levels:
* $0-499 = Low
* $500-999 = Medium
* $1,000 and above = High

Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989), in their study of 52 AID-sponsored projects, identified the same levels of GNP for the stratified analysis of project success in association with participation. Therefore, the use of the same levels of GNP can be considered as useful for the purpose of comparison of findings.

Since 1990, the Human Development Report of the United Nations Development Program has published annually the HDIs of the member countries of the United Nations system. For the purpose of this study the data on HDI published in the Human Development Report 1993 (United Nations Development Program, 1993) was used to rank the countries in the study sample in three levels such as low, medium, and high. The data relevant to HDI published in the 1993 report were formulated from 1990 statistical data and therefore considered appropriate.

The HDI can assume a value ranging from 0.001 to 1.000. The Human Development Report categorizes the HDI in three different levels, and accordingly the HDIs of the countries in the sample will be grouped under the same three levels:

* 0.000-0.499 = Low
* 0.500-0.799 = Medium
* 0.800-1.000 = High
The above value ranges of HDI are used in the *Human Development Report (1993)* (UNDP, 1993) to rank countries on HDI as low, medium, and high.

**Validity Assessment**

If the participation variables identified in the study are valid operationalizations of the participation construct, then such participation variables should be present in greater proportions among community participation-oriented projects than in top-down communication-oriented projects.

In the context of this study, the validity assessment was made comparing projects which identify themselves as community and/or integrated development projects with those projects designed to promote and sell contraceptives or oral rehydration salt (ORS) through the commercial private sector.

When a project identifies itself as an integrated-development or as a community-development project, one could expect it to be more participatory in nature than a private commercial-sector-involved contraceptive or ORS promotional project. Those projects which aim to sell contraceptives for family planning and ORS for diarrhea control through the commercial private sector are expected to be relying on persuasive strategies and, therefore, can be considered as top-down communication-oriented projects although they also
attempt to promote a certain amount of active beneficiary participation.

Therefore the researcher expected integrated or community-development projects to have a greater proportion of each of the participation variables of the study than would contraceptive and ORS promotional projects involving the private commercial sector. As further evidence in support of the validity of the participation variables, the researcher expected to observe more indications of beneficiary decision-making associated with participation variables present in integrated or community development projects than in contraceptive/ORS promotional projects.

Procedure

For the purpose of validity assessment, a sub-sample of projects with titles referring to community involvement or integrated action was identified. For the purpose of analysis this category was named group A. The two key words, community and/or integrated in the title were used to select projects for group A. The projects in group A were considered as implying participation-oriented development because they contained the words community or integrated in their project titles.

Those projects that are designed to sell either contraceptives or oral rehydration salt (ORS) through the commercial private sector were identified as the other group (e.g., group B) for the purpose of comparison. The projects
in group B were considered as implying more top-down communication than the projects in group A because the projects selected for group B used a private commercial-sector involved marketing model to sell contraceptives and ORS. The frequency of each participation variable of the study across the two groups was ascertained, and the significance of the difference was determined through a proportion test comparing the two samples. The results are reported in Table 4-1. The presence of commercial-sector participation was not analyzed as a variable, because the projects for group B were selected on the basis of the presence of that particular variable. The variable on-farm collaborative research was also not considered for the analysis because all the projects in group B were concerned with family planning or oral rehydration therapy and therefore had no relevance to this participatory variable.

**Results**

Only the variables, linking with existing organizations and beneficiary voluntary contribution were observed to be significantly higher in group A projects than in group B projects. Other variables did not show a significant difference. The results are reported in Table 4-1. Therefore, the validity of the variables related to the construct (participation) was not strongly supported by the observations. However, further analysis of the participation variables observed in both groups revealed
Table 4-1

The Frequency of Participation Variables Observed in the Two Groups of Development Projects Chosen for Construct Validity Testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Variable</th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>Z-Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linking With Existing Organizations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Beneficiary Groups</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary Contribution</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary-involved media Use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Training in participation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** * Significant at p < .05  
N = The observed number of participation variables.

N1 = The expected number of participation variables in group A. N2 = The expected number of participation variables in group B.

Group A = Community-participation-oriented projects.
Group B = Contraceptive and ORS promotional projects (through private commercial-sector)
that the participation variables in group A have a higher frequency of beneficiary decision-making indications than those in group B (Z-score = 3.10 p < .01). This observed significant difference is evidence in support of the validity of the variables used in this study as operationalizations of active beneficiary participation.

**Major Limitations Related to Data**

Several limitations may have decreased the validity of the study to some extent. Because the data concerning the ten participation variables of the study had to be collected from evaluation reports instead of directly from project beneficiaries and associated personnel, often the information available regarding each variable was scanty. Although it might have been possible to gather further information through contacting the evaluation team members, the time required to obtain such information could have been a major constraint to the study. Furthermore, one cannot be certain about the accuracy of feedback in such attempts.

An important aspect associated with participation is the opportunity for the beneficiaries to have control over the project decisions. The evaluation reports often appeared not to have addressed this aspect greatly although some remarks indicated the existence of such considerations. A greater understanding of this aspect among the projects in the sample could have substantially improved the quality of this study.
The information available to assess the success of each participation variable was often insufficient. This situation led to a high incidence of impossible-to-assess situations in relation to participation success among the projects studied.

Although the opinions and judgments stated in the evaluation reports are not those of AID, there is a possibility that an evaluation team would be reluctant to rate a project as extremely unsuccessful because such a rating could cause undesirable repercussions under certain circumstances. As a result one could expect to find an overly high incidence of moderately successful projects among the evaluations.

Having evaluation reports of both interim and end-of-project types in the sample may have contributed to variability in the quality of information about the projects. If the sample had been restricted to one type of evaluation, then the number of cases available for analysis would have been substantially reduced. Of the total evaluation reports that were obtained for the study, 75 percent consisted of interim evaluations.

The reasons for poor performance of participatory activities were not always easy to determine in the reports. As Hornik (1988) states, several factors such as literacy, condition of roads, marketing facilities, pest and disease outbreaks, and shortage of extension agents could hamper
participatory efforts. The information related to such problems observed in reports was highly diverse in nature, and therefore categorization of such data in a meaningful manner was difficult.

Reliability Assessment

The coding of participation variables in relation to their presence in projects, individual success level, indication of beneficiary decision-making, and the coding of overall project success were made by a three-person panel of judges consisting of the following personnel:

1. Prof. Mickie N. Edwardson. Chairperson of the supervisory committee.

The person who had read all the evaluation reports of the sample and quoted relevant information in the coding sheet was the source of verification whenever the other two judges in the panel had questions about certain remarks quoted. In a few instances when the quoted information seemed incomplete, the judges referred to the original report for clarification. Each assessment (coding) was made involving an active participatory process among the judges through which a convergence of decisions was achieved. The criteria for coding were specified by the panel of judges (see Appendix D). To assess the reliability of the
procedures, a subsample was created by choosing every sixth case number from numbers 1 to 102 of the coding sheets. The responses marked on the coding sheet of this sub-sample were coded by a fourth judge independently on the basis of evaluation criteria previously determined by the three-judge panel. Scott’s index of reliability (Scott’s pi) was calculated to determine the inter-coder agreement (agreement between the panel and the independent coder) in relation to the coding of participation variable success, their indications of beneficiary decision-making, and the coding of overall project success.

An inter-coder agreement index (Scott’s pi) of .81 was achieved in the coding of participation variable success level. An inter-coder agreement index of .78 was achieved in the coding of indications of beneficiary decision-making. An inter-coder agreement index of .82 was achieved in the coding of overall project success.

Scott’s pi is the ratio of actual difference between obtained and chance agreement to the maximum difference between obtained and chance agreement. According to Scott (1955), "It can be roughly interpreted as the extent to which the coding reliability exceeds chance" (p. 323). Therefore, the above values suggest acceptable levels of coding reliability in the coding of variable success, overall project success, and indications of beneficiary decision-making.
Data Analysis

The data analysis has five major objectives:

1. To determine the extent to which AID has incorporated participatory opportunities in rural development projects in the developing world from 1980 to 1990.

2. To examine the correlation between participation and overall project success (hypotheses 1-5).

3. To compare the decentralization success when a project is implemented through an NGO and when not so implemented (hypothesis 6).

4. To examine the relationship of the host country’s development level, in terms of GNP per capita and HDI, with success of each participation variable observed in AID projects (hypothesis 7 & 8).

5. To identify and list reasons for participation failures.

Those projects in the sample which are identified as dealing with management or infrastructural development were excluded as inapplicable for the examination of correlation between participation and project success because those projects do not directly refer to actions aimed at grassroots participation. These projects in the sample were observed to be less than six percent (six in number) of the total number of projects in the study sample.
The existence of a relationship between participation variables and project success was examined through a series of crosstabulations involving each participation variable. Participation variables are considered as the predictor variables, and project success is regarded as the dependent variable. Because the data for this study are ordinal level, the most appropriate measure of correlation is judged to be Kendall's Tau-b coefficient. Siegel (1956), in his book *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences*, states, "The Kendall's tau has the advantages of being generalizable to a partial correlation coefficient and of having a sampling distribution which is practically indistinguishable from a normal distribution for sample sizes as small as 9" (p. 239).

Each of the participation variables was rank ordered in such a way that the absence of the variable has a lower value than the presence of the variable. The level of overall project success was rank ordered in such a way that the category poor has the lowest value and the category excellent has the highest value. Moderate success category has a value in between poor and excellent categories.

**Hypothesis 1**: It was expected that each participation variable would be associated more with moderately successful projects or excellent projects than with poor projects. The strength of the correlations was determined through the computation of Kendall's tau-b for each analysis.
Each of the participation variables of the study was missing from a substantial number of the projects. Therefore, it was important to ascertain that missing variables do not contribute positively toward moderate and excellent levels of overall project success. The following parametric analytical steps were necessary before making crosstabulations to interpret the results meaningfully:

1. The significance of total variance attributable to participation was determined through a multiple regression procedure. The regression technique is considered as "robust" in relation to possible violation of (a) random selection, (b) interval levels of values, (c) independence of predictor variables, (d) normal distribution, and (e) linear association between predictor and dependent variables (Rowland, Arkkelin, & Crisler, 1991, p. 126). The variables of this study are assumed to have a low level of independence, particularly because projects that are participation-oriented are likely to include several of the variables of the study. In other words, certain variables are likely to be present with one or more of the other variables.

In the multiple regression model, the presence of each predictor variable (e.g., the participation variables) was coded with 2 and entered as a binary variable (i.e., the missing cases were coded with 1). It was expected that the amount of regression variance accounted for by the
predictors in the multiple regression equation would be significant (e.g., \( p < .05 \)).

2. For further clarification, a histogram of standardized residuals and a scatterplot of the standardized residuals against the predicted values were examined for evidence of deficiencies in the regression model.

**Hypothesis 2:** According to the hypothesis, the greater the number of participatory variables observed within a project, the higher the level of overall project success would be. The hypothesis was tested through a crosstabulation of overall project success with the number of participation variables observed within each project. It was expected that the overall project success would be directly correlated with the number of participation variables present in a project. The strength of the association was determined through the computation of Kendall’s tau-b.

**Hypothesis 3:** Each participation variable in terms of its individual success was expected to be directly correlated with the overall project success. Therefore, it was expected that when overall project success (ranked as poor, moderate, or excellent) is crosstabulated with each individual participation variable success (ranked as poor, partly successful, or completely successful), the participation variables which are observed to be higher in success level would be associated with projects higher in
overall success. The strength of these associations was determined through the computation of Kendall's tau-b value for each analysis.

In this situation too, for meaningful interpretation of the crosstabulation results, a multiple regression analysis, similar to the one performed prior to making crosstabulations for testing of Hypothesis 1 was done. In this case, each successful predictor variable (i.e., participation variables judged to be partially or completely successful) was coded with 2 and entered into regression analysis as a binary variable. (The missing situations such as inapplicable situations and participation variables which are judged as poor or difficult to assess were coded with 1.) It was expected that the amount of regression variance accounted for by the predictors in the multiple regression equation would be significant (e.g., \( p < .05 \)). The histogram of standardized residuals and the scatterplot of the standardized residuals against the predicted values were expected to show evidence of positive contribution of participation variable success.

**Hypothesis 4:** According to the hypothesis, the greater the number of successful participatory variables observed within a project, the higher the level of overall project success. The hypothesis was tested through a crosstabulation of overall project success with the number of partly and completely successful participation variables
observed within each project. It was expected that the number of excellent projects would be greater and poor projects would be fewer when the number of successful participation variables is greater in those projects. The strength of the association was determined through the computation of Kendall’s tau-b.

**Hypothesis 5:** According to Hypothesis 5, projects having a higher level of overall success are more likely to be associated with those participation variables which indicate obvious beneficiary decision-making than those participation variables which do not seem to indicate obvious beneficiary decision-making.

For the purpose of testing the hypothesis, overall project success was crosstabulated with each participation variable. Each participation variable was coded into two levels, namely with obvious beneficiary decision-making and without obvious beneficiary-decision-making. The strength of expected associations was determined through the computed values of Kendall’s tau-b.

**Hypothesis 6:** According to the hypothesis of the study, decentralization, as a participation variable in a project, is expected to be more successful when the project is implemented through a non-governmental organization (NGO) than when it is not so implemented. To test this hypothesis, decentralization success levels (ranked as poor, partly successful, and completely successful) were
crosstabulated with decentralization type (whether project is implemented through an NGO or not). It was expected that in projects where decentralization is observed, successful decentralization would be associated more with projects implemented through NGOs. Because the analysis consists of nominal categories (e.g., decentralization with an NGO and decentralization without an NGO) the differences of the proportions under each category were determined through the computation of Chi-square.

**Hypothesis 7:** According to the hypothesis of the study, each of the participation variables was more likely to be successful if the project was implemented in a country which has a moderate-to-high Gross National Product (GNP) per capita than if implemented in a country with a low GNP per capita. To test this hypothesis, each participation variable success (ranked as poor, partly successful, and completely successful) was crosstabulated with the host country GNP per capita level. It was expected that a higher level of participation variable success would be associated with higher level of GNP per capita. The strength of these correlations was determined through the computation of Kendall’s tau-b for each analysis.

**Hypothesis 8:** According to the hypothesis, each of the participation variables was more likely to be successful if the project was implemented in a country which has a moderate Human Development Index (HDI) than when implemented
in a country with a low HDI. Only the two levels of HDI, low and moderate, were considered for the analysis because within the sample only a single project had been implemented in a country with a high HDI.

To test the hypothesis, each participation variable success (poor, partly successful, and completely successful) was crosstabulated with the host country HDI level. It was expected that partly or completely successful participation variables would be associated more with moderate HDI than with low HDI. The strength of these correlations was determined through the computation of Kendall's tau-b for each analysis.

With regard to situations of participatory activity failures observed in projects, the relevant information that explained failures was recorded under each participation variable to be used as background information regarding the discussion of the findings.
CHAPTER 5
RESULTS

This study was designed to examine the presence of ten participation variables in AID projects and the relationships of each of those variables to overall project success. The hypotheses were intended to determine (a) correlation between presence of each participation variable and overall project success, (b) correlation between the number of participation variables in a project and overall project success, (c) correlation between success level of each participation variable and overall project success, (d) correlation between the number of successful participation variables in a project and overall project success, (e) success of decentralized project administration when it is effected through non-governmental organizations and through governmental organizations, (f) correlation between beneficiary decision-making in participation variables and overall project success, (g) correlation between participation variable success and gross national product per capita of host-countries, and (h) correlation between participation variable success and host-country Human Development Index (HDI).
Distribution of the Participation Variables Among the Projects

The frequency of the ten participation variables observed within the study sample is listed in Table 5-1. The decentralization of project administration is the most commonly observed participatory variable in AID-sponsored projects. In 43 projects out of the 71 projects which indicated decentralized project administration, it had been effected through non-governmental organizations.

Table 5-1
The Number and Percent of Projects in the Sample With the Participation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Variable</th>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project Administration</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking With Existing Organizations</td>
<td>65'</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary-involved media Use</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private commercial-sector Participation</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary Contributions</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Collaborative Research</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Training in Participation</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * This figure includes seven cases in which linkage to existing organizations is limited to schools.
Apart from decentralized project administration, implementing project activities through existing local organizations and creating beneficiary groups are the most commonly adopted strategies to encourage participation in AID projects.

Approximately half the projects (44 percent) in the study sample had women actively involved in project activities other than as service recipients. Activities such as beneficiary voluntary contribution, beneficiary training in participation, and private commercial-sector participation was reported in less than half the number of projects in the sample. Of the ten participation variables in the study, the use of indigenous practices were found in the fewest projects.

Among the agricultural development projects (which consisted of only 35 projects out of the total 102 projects in the study sample), less than half the projects (only 31 percent) reported the use of on-farm collaborative research or trials.

Little over half the projects which used media (54 projects used mass media or combination of several media) reported some involvement of beneficiaries in media production. However, direct beneficiary participation in media production such as program production by beneficiary groups was observed in only ten projects.
Multiple Regression

Prior to testing of the study hypotheses, the total variance attributable to participation variables was determined through a multiple regression procedure. The purpose of following this procedure was to rule out the possible significant contribution of missing observations since individual participation variables were missing from many of the projects. The multiple regression model is used to make general statement about the response, and whether the response tends to increase or decrease as a predictor increases or decreases irrespective of the missing observations. The missing observations are assumed to be missing at random, and they would not have any characteristics drastically different from the observations with complete data.

The coefficient of multiple determination or the $R^2$, which is a measure of the proportion of variance in the dependent variable resulting from the predictor variables acting together, was observed to be .33. The multiple regression equation was observed to be highly significant, $F(10, 78) = 3.86, p = .003$. While the percent variance explained by the combination of predictor variables is not large, it could be considered relatively substantial in the context of social science research (Rowland et al., 1991).

A histogram of standardized residuals is presented in Figure 1, and a standardized scatterplot of the residuals
against the predicted values is presented in Figure 2. Analysis of residuals (the difference between the fit and the observed) is considered as a simple and effective method for detecting model deficiencies in regression analysis (Chatterjee & Price, 1977). The standardized residuals have zero mean and unit standard deviation. In the histogram, the standardized residuals of all the cases fall between +1.67 and -2.00 and more cases are distributed around zero. Thus it indicates that the error terms are approximately normally distributed, with no apparent violation of normality.

In a standardized scatterplot of residuals against predicted values (Figure 2), one expects a maximum number of cases to spread right across the middle. The scatterplot shows that the greater number of cases tend to be close to a straight line across the middle, thus supporting the correctness of the model. However, the plot indicates three lines. These resulted from having a discrete (categorical) response, with residuals in some categories forced to be negative (or positive). Since there were only three levels for the observed value (poor, moderate, and excellent), the lines result.
**FIGURE 1**

Histogram of Standardized Residuals to Determine the Correctness of the Regression Model to Explain the Proportion of Variation in Project Success Associated With the Presence of the Participation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Exp N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* = One Case, .: = Normal Curve)
FIGURE 2

Standardized Scatterplot of Residuals Against Predicted Values to Determine the Correctness of the Regression Model to Explain the Proportion of Variation in Project Success Associated With the Presence of the Participation Variables
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Standardized partial regression plots examined indicated some clustering of cases across the middle, but with wide variations. This means that individually, many variables of the study are likely to have a weak correlation with the outcome variable.

Even when participation variables were clearly present in a project, it was often difficult from the reports to determine the degree of success of an individual variable. Therefore, prior to the testing of the hypotheses concerning
individual participation variable success and overall project success, a multiple regression procedure was followed. The purpose of using a multiple regression procedure, in this situation too, was to rule out a possible significant contribution of missing observations to overall project success. Particularly in the crosstabulations of participation variable success and overall project success, the number of missing observations appeared to be high. For example, in certain crosstabulations the number of missing observations was as high as 91. In spite of this, 51 percent of the variance in the dependent variable was attributed to a combination of predictor variables. The regression equation was observed to be highly significant, $F(10, 78) = 8.31, p < .001$.

As explained above, in this situation too, the histogram of standardized residuals and the standardized scatterplot of residuals against predicted values support the correctness of the regression model (see Figures 3 & 4).

The standardized partial regression plots examined indicated clustering of cases close to a line across the middle, but again showed wide variations from variable to variable.

According to these findings it is possible to interpret the results observed through crosstabulations of data as indicating that the missing observations do not appear to have a marked influence on project success.
FIGURE 3

Histogram of Standardized Residuals to Determine the Correctness of the Regression Model to Explain the Proportion of Variation in Project Success Associated With the Participation Variable Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exp N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>154</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.33 :*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67 * .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.33 ****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.00 ***<em><strong><strong>:</strong></strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.67 *******<em>:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.33 ***********:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>.00 **********<em><strong>:</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.33 ***********:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.67 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-1.00 ********: **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1.33 ****: **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.67 **:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2.00 *:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.79</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.33 .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.07</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* = One Case, . : = Normal Curve)
FIGURE 4

Standardized Scatterplot of Residuals Against Predicted Values to Determine the Correctness of the Regression Model to Explain the Proportion of Variation in Project Success Associated With the Participation Variable Success
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Strength of Correlations

With regard to the correlations observed between rank-ordered dependent variables and independent variables concerning each of the hypotheses of the study, Kendall's Tau-b estimates will be considered in three levels. An estimate ranging from .10 to .19 will be considered as showing a relatively slight correlation. An estimate ranging from .20 to .29 will be considered as showing a relatively moderate correlation. An estimate of .30 or
above will be considered as showing a relatively strong correlation.

Studies which have used Kendall’s Tau to estimate correlation between ordinal variables often describe the estimates in relative terms. For example, Kent and Rush (1976), who studied the relationship between mass and interpersonal communication variables in a study of communication behavior of older persons, describe a correlation estimate of .17 (based on Kendall’s Tau) as a relatively strong correlation in comparison to other correlations observed in the same study. In their study, the estimated correlation values between mass and interpersonal communication variables varied from -.10 to .17. A study made by Kaiser and Lilly (1975) on political attitudes of youth describes a correlation of .15, based on Kendall’s Tau at a significance level of p < .001, as not particularly strong even though the correlation of .15 was the highest observed in their study. Wagenaar (1974), who studied teachers’ militancy and their participation in organized strikes, describes a correlation between age and activism estimated at .20, based on Kendall’s Tau, as a weak correlation in absolute terms. In a study related to marijuana use among college students, however, Ellis and Stone (1979) describe a correlation of .19, according to Kendall’s Tau, as moderately strong while describing a correlation of .57 as strong. It is apparent that
researchers interpret estimates of correlations based on Kendall's Tau in different ways, perhaps taking into consideration various factors related to their particular studies.

Because the main objective of the current study is to examine the strength of correlations between the variables concerned in a set of projects sponsored by AID, the consideration of statistical significance to interpret the strength of correlations has less relevance in this context than in research that involves a random sample. The objective of considering the level of significance in sociological studies is to evaluate the validity of generalizing findings to the population from the sample. Selvin (1957), who is critical of the way that social scientists often depend on statistical significance to interpret research findings, states, "The conditions under which tests of significance may validly be used are almost impossible of fulfillment in sociological research" (p. 520). The author further states, "Many users of tests confuse statistical significance with substantive importance or with the size of association" (p. 527).

In this study, the researcher describes a set of AID-sponsored projects based on the relative strength of correlations observed between the variables of concern. Thus, the relative strength of a particular correlation, irrespective of the level of statistical significance,
becomes the main criterion of interpretation of the results. Kendall’s Tau correlations that are observed in this study vary from -.37 to +.62. Several coefficients including the -.37 did not show statistical significance at \( p < .05 \) level.

**Hypotheses Testing**

**Hypothesis 1**

It was expected that each participation variable would be associated more with moderately successful projects or excellent projects than with poor projects. The pattern of positive Kendall’s Tau correlations observed between overall project success and presence of each of the participatory variables (except with private commercial-sector participation which shows almost no correlation) show some support for the hypothesis. Findings are reported in Table 5-2.

The presence of decentralized project administration and on-farm collaborative research are strongly correlated with overall project success. Other participation variables such as beneficiary voluntary contribution, use of indigenous practices, active involvement of women, and linking to existing local organizations show moderate correlations. Three participation variables--beneficiary
Table 5-2

Overall Project Success by Presence or Absence of Individual Participation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Degree of Overall Project Success</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>Ρ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent           Moderate       Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n      %          n      %          n      %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project W</td>
<td>27     39.1       34     49.3       8      11.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration W/O</td>
<td>2      8.3        13     54.2       9      37.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Collaborative Research W</td>
<td>5      50.0       5      50.0       0      0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/O</td>
<td>6      27.3       8      36.4       8      36.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices W</td>
<td>10     47.6       11     52.4       0      0.0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/O</td>
<td>19     26.4       36     50.0       17     23.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary Contribution W/O</td>
<td>15     46.9       14     43.8       3      9.4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women W</td>
<td>18     40.9       22     50.0       4      9.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/O</td>
<td>11     22.4       25     51.0       13     26.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to Organizations W</td>
<td>21     34.4       32     52.5       8      13.1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/O</td>
<td>6      21.4       13     46.4       9      32.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation W/O</td>
<td>22     36.7       28     46.7       10     16.7</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Participation W</td>
<td>13     40.6       14     43.8       5      15.6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/O</td>
<td>16     26.2       33     54.1       12     19.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Involved Media Use W</td>
<td>11     37.9       15     51.7       3      10.3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W/O</td>
<td>6      27.3       13     59.1       3      13.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Commercial Sector W</td>
<td>8      22.2       24     66.7       4      11.1</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation W/O</td>
<td>21     36.8       23     40.4       13     22.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: W = With the Participation Variable, W/O = Without the participation variable
group creation, training in participation, and beneficiary-involved media use—show relatively slight correlations.

**Hypothesis 2**

According to the hypothesis, projects with greater number of participatory variables were expected to achieve a higher level of overall project success. The findings support the hypothesis indicating a strong positive correlation between the number of participatory variables a project contains (without regard to the success of the individual variable) and the overall project success. The findings are reported in Table 5-3. The projects which did not have a single participation variable (Only two such projects were present.) were poor in overall project performance. Those projects observed to have a maximum number of participation variables (The maximum number of variables present in any single project was eight.) showed excellent overall project success. Apart from those extreme observations (such as projects with no participation variables or with the maximum number of participation variables), the proportion of projects that achieved a moderate level of success remained more or less the same irrespective of the numbers of participation variables present. This might be expected from the fact that the majority of projects were classified as moderately successful rather than poor or excellent.
Table 5-3
Overall Project Success by the Number of Participation Variables Observed in a Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Success</th>
<th>The Number of Participation Variables Observed in a Project</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Projects: 2  5  6  13  24  14  8  14  3  89

Note: Kendall's Tau-b = .42  p < .01
Hypothesis 3

According to the hypothesis, each participation variable in terms of its individual success was expected to be directly correlated with the overall project success. The correlations between individual participatory variable success (evaluated as partly successful or completely successful in contrast to poor) and overall project success support the hypothesis (see Table 5-4). Except for beneficiary voluntary contribution and private commercial-sector participation, individual success of all the other participation variables shows a relatively strong correlation with overall project success. Success of beneficiary voluntary contribution and private commercial-sector participation within projects show a relatively moderate correlation with overall project success.
Table 5-4

Overall Success of Projects Containing Individual Variables by Whether Each Variable was Ranked Completely Successful, Partly Successful, or Unsuccessful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Degree of Overall Project Success</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Involved</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media Use</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Participation</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to Organizations</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is continued on next page. C/S = Completely Successful, P/S = Partly Successful, and N/S = Not Successful (Unsuccessful)
Table 5-4 (Continued.)

Overall Success of Projects Containing Individual Variables by Whether Each Variable was Ranked Completely Successful, Partly Successful, or Unsuccessful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Degree of Overall Project Success</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent %</td>
<td>Moderate %</td>
<td>Poor %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Collaborative Research</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Commercial Sector</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: C/S = Completely Successful, P/S = Partly Successful, N/S = Not Successful
Hypothesis 4

According to the hypothesis, the greater the number of successful participatory variables observed within a project, the higher the level of overall project success should be. The findings support the hypothesis showing a strong and a positive correlation between the number of successful participatory variables a project contains and the overall project success. The findings are reported in Table 5-5. The participation variables that were evaluated either as partly successful or completely successful were considered as successful participation variables for testing this hypothesis using Kendall's Tau. The proportion of projects with an overall ranking of success gradually increases as the proportion of participation variables also ranked as partly or completely successful increases.
Table 5-5

Overall Project Success by the Number of Participation Variables (in a Project) Ranked as Successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Success</th>
<th>The Number of Participation Variables Ranked as Successful in a Project</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Projects 18 17 19 12 9 10 2 2 89

Note: Kendall’s Tau-b = .62  p < .01

Participation variables that are ranked either as partly successful or completely successful are considered as successful participation variables.
Hypothesis 5

According to the hypothesis, projects having a higher level of overall success are more likely to be associated with those participation variables which indicate obvious beneficiary decision-making than those participation variables which do not indicate obvious beneficiary decision-making. Most findings show only slight or moderate positive correlations (see Table 5-6). Beneficiary decision-making associated with training in participation is, however, observed to be strongly and positively correlated with overall project success. Beneficiary decision-making associated with decentralized project administration and voluntary contributions are positively and moderately correlated with overall project success. Beneficiary decision-making associated with the use of indigenous practices, on the other hand, shows a moderate but a negative correlation. Beneficiary decision-making associated with group creation and active involvement of women is only slightly correlated with project success, while beneficiary decision-making associated with linking to existing organizations and beneficiary-involved media are not correlated with overall project success.

Because all situations of on-farm collaborative research are considered as a means of farmer decision-making, that particular variable was not included in this analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Degree of Overall Project Success</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Participation</td>
<td>W 10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project Administration</td>
<td>W 8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 21</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Contribution</td>
<td>W 14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation</td>
<td>W 10</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 12</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>W 4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to Organizations</td>
<td>W 2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 19</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Involved Media Use</td>
<td>W 8</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>W 1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W/O 9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** W = With indications of beneficiary decision-making, W/O = Without indications of beneficiary decision-making
Similarly, private sector participation is also not included in the analysis. The private commercial-sector is also a part of the public (whether consisting of the specific target group or not) that consistently makes its own decisions related to activities connected to development projects. Therefore, no comparison of different amounts of decision-making seemed possible.

**Hypothesis 6**

According to the hypothesis, decentralized project administration as a participation variable in a project, is expected to be more successful when the project is implemented through a non-governmental organization (NGO) than when it is not so implemented. The findings presented in Table 5-7 support the hypothesis. They show that when the project decentralized administration is through non-governmental organizations, decentralization has a greater success rate than when decentralization is through other means. The proportion of successful AID projects (either completely or partly successful) having decentralization effected through NGOs is greater than the proportion of projects having decentralization that is not effected through NGOs. In contrast, the proportion of projects with poor decentralization success is higher when decentralization is not effected through NGOs than when it is effected through NGOs ($X^2 = 6.64, p < .05$).
Table 5-7

Success of Decentralized Project Administration by Whether Project is Implemented Through Non-Governmental Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decentralization Success</th>
<th>Decentralization Method</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completely Successful</td>
<td>% 43.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly Successful</td>
<td>% 32.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>% 24.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n 9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Projects 37 27 64

Note: $X^2 (2, 64) = 6.64, \ p < .05$

NGO = Non-Governmental Organization

Hypothesis 7

The correlations, based on Kendall’s Tau, observed between individual participation variable success and the Gross National Product (GNP) per capita of the host country generally do not support the hypothesis. The findings are reported in Table 5-8. According to the hypothesis, participation variables in AID projects implemented in relatively rich countries should be more successful than in projects implemented in relatively poor countries. The success with linkage with existing local organizations, use of indigenous practices, beneficiary involved-media use,
Table 5-8

Success of Participation Variables by Host-Country per Capita Gross National Product Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Host Country per Capita GNP Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to Organizations</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Involved Media</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is continued on next page. C/S = Completely successful, P/S = Partly successful, N/S = Not successful
Table 5-8 (Continued.)

Success of Participation Variables by Host-Country per Capita Gross National Product Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Host Country per Capita GNP Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Commercial Sector</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Participation</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Collaborative Research</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: C/S = Completely Successful, P/S = Partly Successful, N/S = Not Successful
and decentralized project administration is not correlated with host-country GNP per capita. Except for the participation variable of beneficiary voluntary contribution, all the other participatory variables are negatively or negligibly correlated with GNP per capita level of the host country. Success with beneficiary-group creation, active involvement of women, and private commercial-sector participation is moderately but negatively correlated to host-country GNP per capita. Success with on-farm collaborative research and beneficiary training in participation is strongly and again negatively correlated to host country GNP per capita. Only with regard to beneficiary voluntary contributions do the findings show a strong positive correlation with GNP per capita. 

**Hypothesis 8**

With regard to the correlations between the success of individual participation variables and the host-country human development level, the findings in general do not show evidence in support of the hypothesis. The results are reported in Table 5-9. According to the hypothesis, participation variables in AID projects implemented in countries with a high Human Development Index (HDI) should be more successful than those implemented in countries with a low HDI. For the testing of this hypothesis, the host-country human development level in terms of the Human Development Index (HDI) was considered only in two ordinal
Table 5-9
Participation Variable Success by Host-Country Human Development Index Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Host Country HDI Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>85.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Involved Media Use</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table is continued on next page. C/S = Completely successful, P/S = Partly successful, N/S = Not successful
Table 5-9 (Continued.)

Participation Variable Success by Host-Country Human Development Index Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Host Country HDI Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tau-b</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to Organizations</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Commercial Sector</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>88.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Collaborative Research</td>
<td>C/S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P/S</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N/S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: C/S = Completely Successful, P/S = Partly Successful, N/S = Not Successful*
levels.

Success with active involvement of women, use of indigenous practices, beneficiary-involved media use, and decentralized project administration is not correlated with HDI. Success with linking to existing local organizations and beneficiary group creation is slightly but negatively correlated with HDI. Success with private commercial-sector participation is moderately and negatively correlated with HDI. Success with on-farm collaborative research and beneficiary training in participation is strongly and negatively correlated with HDI. Therefore, these findings indicate that in the set of AID-sponsored projects studied, more of the participation variables are found to be successful when they are implemented in countries with low HDIs than in countries with medium HDIs. However, success with beneficiary voluntary contribution is positively and strongly correlated with HDI. Only this last finding supports the hypothesis.

In several instances the researcher observed that the evaluation reports describe certain problems that impaired the success of participatory activities in projects. These problems encountered in implementation were difficult to categorize into distinct groups, but they are incorporated into the discussion about the findings of this study in the following chapter. When each of the participation variables is found to be successful, its correlation with overall
Project success markedly improved (except for the variable beneficiary voluntary contribution) compared to what was observed with the mere presence of each of the participation variables (see Table 5-10) in projects.

Table 5-10

Comparison of Participation Variables' Correlations With Overall Project Success When Each Variable is Present (Disregarding Whether Successful) and When Each Variable is Judged as Successful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correlation Strength (Tau-b)</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decentralized Project Administration</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Collaborative Research</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Indigenous Practices</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Voluntary Contribution</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Involvement of Women</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to Local Organizations</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Group Creation</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training in Participation</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Involved Media Use</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Commercial Participation</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary of Findings

Participation and Project Success

Participation, as defined in this study, is likely to be found with overall project success in the projects reviewed in this study. More opportunity for participation, irrespective of the type, was correlated with greater success in achieving project objectives. However, the mere presence of an individual participation variable in a project did not show an impressive correlation with the overall project success. Only when such a variable was judged to be successful did it show a significant correlation. The number of such successful participation variables present in a project had a strong correlation with overall project success.

These findings are perhaps more noteworthy because of the limitations encountered in the data collection. The data had to be collected from evaluation reports prepared with objectives entirely different from those of this study. The information available to assess the success of each participation variable was often insufficient. This
situation led to a number of instances in which it was impossible to determine participation success.

**Success With Decentralization**

Decentralized project administration is the most frequently found aspect of participation in AID projects of the study. The analysis of decentralization success in AID projects indicates that decentralized administration is more likely to be combined with success when projects are implemented through non-governmental organizations (NGOs) than through governmental agencies. This supports the Rondinelli et al. (1985) observation that often decentralization attempts through non-governmental organizations are more efficient than through governmental ones. Irrespective of the host-country's development level, decentralization seems found in projects that obtain their purposes.

**Participation Success and Host-Country Development**

Cash, labor, and material contribution toward projects by beneficiaries was more successful in relatively rich countries than in poor countries. Similarly, such contributions were more successful in countries with relatively high literacy, health, and income levels (those with a medium HDI in the study) than in countries in which those aspects are relatively low (those with a low HDI in the study).
The level of a country's wealth (whether rich or poor) is apparently not related to the individual success of the following activities: use of indigenous practices, beneficiary-involved media use, and decentralized project administration. But on-farm collaborative research and beneficiary training in participation are observed to be more successful when such activities are implemented in relatively poor countries than in richer countries. To a smaller degree poor countries also showed more success when using private commercial-sector participation, beneficiary group formation, and active involvement of women in projects. The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), which was formed with an objective of participatory development, also concluded that the rural poor, when given the chance, were eager to participate in projects designed to benefit them (Alamgir, 1989). Esman and Uphoff (1984), in their study of local organizations' role as intermediaries in rural development, also observed that increasing GNP has been to some extent associated with the erosion of the participatory tradition.

On-farm collaborative research and beneficiary training in participation are more successful when implemented in countries having relatively lower levels of literacy, health, and income (e.g., countries low on the Human Development Index) than in countries with higher levels of those basic human development aspects. A similar
correlation with success was observed in links to local organizations, beneficiary group formation, and particularly private commercial-sector participation, but in a lower magnitude. It seems that participation really works in places where it is needed most. The success with active involvement of women in projects, use of indigenous practices, beneficiary-involved media use, and decentralized project administration shows no marked relationship to HDI level. Esman and Uphoff (1984) observed that literacy is unrelated to the effectiveness of local organization participation.

Beneficiary Decision-Making and Project Success

As far as could be determined, beneficiary decision-making in participatory activities showed some degree of positive correlation but failed to contribute to overall project success to the degree that proponents of participation would lead us to believe. This aspect, however, needs to be explored with more data relevant to beneficiary decision-making in AID projects. The evaluation reports used in the study had so little information describing obvious instances of decision-making that the analysis was based on very limited data.

Implications

Theoretical Implications

The collective impact of participation variables in the study on overall project success provides evidence in
support of the study's theoretical framework. Effective and useful dialogue between the source and the receiver is central to Nair and White's model (1987a) that forms the basic theoretical framework of the study. The various steps in participatory message construction assume simultaneous involvement of the development experts and the rural population. A greater interaction leads to a greater suitability of the development messages to beneficiary needs, eventually contributing to a greater success in achieving development objectives.

In the participation literature, the concept of active participation is often defined to include beneficiary decision-making. Nair and White (1987a) state that teamwork, team-building, decision-making, and enabling operate as parts of the participatory communication process. The steps in participatory message construction assume simultaneous involvement of the development experts and the rural population. However, very little information about this was available in the evaluation reports. Nonetheless, activities identified as participation variables in the study are likely to create opportunities for communication interaction between beneficiaries and benefactors that may eventually lead to greater mutual understanding and collaborative decision-making. According to the theoretical framework developed by Bachrach and Baratz (1970) for participation assessment, even cooptative participation
(beneficiary participation that is engineered for the manipulative purposes of development agencies) can lead to beneficiary-oriented participation and the development of indigenous leadership.

Applied Implications

It is evident that simply designing opportunities for participation is not meaningful unless development agencies make such participatory opportunities work well within projects. For example, a project plan may include a decentralized management structure, but the development agency may not provide the support to operate such a system efficiently. The locally recruited staff may not have been sufficiently trained or the local management may not have enough funds to operationalize decisions made at the grassroots. Under such circumstances, that particular project is unlikely to achieve much success in spite of having a decentralized management. Therefore, it is important for the development agencies to look into the needs required for the efficient functioning of participatory activities to ensure their success.

In the study, for example, the presence of variables beneficiary group creation, beneficiary involved media use, and training in participation, all of which showed a relatively slight correlation with overall project success, showed a remarkable increase in correlation strength when each of those variables was judged to be successful within
projects. The presence of the variable private commercial sector participation, which hardly showed a correlation with overall project success, showed a moderate level of correlation strength when that particular variable was judged to be successful within projects. The presence of the variables linkage to local organizations, active involvement of women, and use of indigenous practices, which showed only moderate levels of correlation with overall project success, showed strong correlations when each of those variables was judged to be successful within projects. These findings indicate the value of ensuring the success of each participatory activity in a development project.

The presence of decentralized administration in projects and its implementation success show the strongest correlation with overall project success in these studies. Decentralization also appears more effective when implemented through NGOs than through governmental agencies. This should encourage AID and other development agencies to give more and more non-governmental organizations the opportunity to administer development projects.

In spite of the limited data, the analysis of decision-making situations indicates some correlation between decision-making and overall project success. The indications of beneficiary decision-making were explicit in situations of beneficiary training in participation in several projects. Those projects show a relatively strong
correlation between beneficiary decision-making (presumed to exist in beneficiary training) and overall project success. This observation has a particular significance because educating and training beneficiaries in participatory development philosophy and methods such as collective organization and decision-making are integral to participatory development. Such projects can be regarded as truly participation-oriented due to their focus on the training aspect related to active beneficiary participation.

Beneficiary decision-making, however, in the use of indigenous practices showed a relatively moderate but a negative correlation. Moreover, beneficiary decision-making in use of existing local organizations and beneficiary-involved media use did not show a correlation with overall project success. There were only slight correlations between project success and decision-making in situations of beneficiary group formation and women’s active involvement.

Because of such observations an observer might doubt the value of beneficiary participation in AID-sponsored development projects. However, the analyses showing obvious beneficiary decision-making and overall project success included a relatively small proportion of the projects studied. Thus, further research on this aspect is warranted.

The host-country economic status (GNP per capita) and the general development level in terms of literacy, health,
and income (HDI) show differing correlations with success of participation activities. Beneficiary voluntary contribution to projects was found to be evaluated as successful when implemented in richer countries as well as in countries that have achieved reasonable status in literacy, health, and per capita income. On the other hand, several of the other participatory activities were declared successful in countries in which people are relatively poor and deprived of basic living necessities. One can speculate that in more developed countries the elaborate bureaucracy may stifle eagerness to participate or that in poorer countries people are more eager to improve their status. Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989), however, observed a tendency for the correlations of five participation variables with project effectiveness to increase with host-country development level. Because of the limitations that were encountered in gathering data for Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin’s study and for this study, it is necessary to conduct further research to explore the impact of host-country development level on participation success.

The positive and strong correlation of beneficiary contribution success with relatively high host-country development level is understandable. Many voluntary contributions observed in the projects were cash, labor, or materials. Such resource commitment by beneficiaries is
more possible in countries where people are relatively less poor and have their basic living necessities met.

The amount of participation in AID projects. Because much of the emphasis on people’s participation in rural development came into focus during the latter part of the 1970s and early 1980s, the researcher expected that approval of the concept is now widespread and therefore should be reflected in a substantial proportion of the AID projects in the study.

A majority of these projects used established linkages to local organizations, but a few such linkages were limited to schools. Perhaps when development projects encourage local organizations to take responsibility for implementing development activities, a two-way communication between the beneficiaries and benefactors takes place in the development process. When linkage is limited to schools, however, there may be less two-way communication than when other local organizations are used. Other existing local organizations that are linked with development agencies might seem to have more time for project work than would schools which are created for other purposes.

Apparently AID has been active in creating beneficiary groups with some autonomy in their management and functioning. Among such beneficiary groups are sanitation committees, water use associations, maintenance committees, development committees, health committees, and agricultural
committees. Such groups are expected to facilitate information flow both horizontally and vertically.

The evident emphasis on decentralization, linkages to local organizations, and beneficiary group formation in AID projects indicates AID's concern for active local participation. This observation is in line with Esman and Uphoff's (1984) claim that AID recently had focused more on activities that are likely to benefit the rural poor.

On the other hand, analysis of the projects also shows a lack of emphasis on participation training in AID projects. By awakening community consciousness, participation training may contribute to the protection of individual rights and strengthen the self-confidence of vulnerable groups such as poor women and landless villagers. This aspect is one of the least emphasized in the AID projects studied. Actions such as decentralized project administration, linking with local organizations, and beneficiary group formation could be more meaningful when accompanied by beneficiary training that is geared to improve self-management and collective action.

Although much has been written urging women's active participation in development in the past decade, the emphasis on active involvement of women in AID projects remains rather low (45 out of 102 projects). AID should have had ample opportunities to design projects that emphasize and encourage women's active involvement in
development. Existing cultural values in certain societies and localities, however, may have been a constraint in this regard.

Another aspect of beneficiary participation with a small emphasis is the use of indigenous knowledge and practices for development (22 out of 102 projects). A few projects emphasized the gathering and assessing of indigenous knowledge systems pertaining to the development aims of the projects. Some of the health projects have attempted to use local healers and traditional birth attendants with varying success. It may be that when such projects do encourage use of indigenous knowledge, the objective is more for public relations or manipulative success than true collaboration. Among projects aiming toward agricultural development, only 11 out of 35 such projects have adopted an on-farm collaborative research approach. Apparently AID is not perceiving collaborative research as a general approach to agricultural development in many countries. In the few projects that did include on-farm collaborative research, a relatively strong correlation between the successful implementation of this activity and overall project success is observed. In evaluating these projects the teams often recommended strengthening the linkages with farmers through more and more farmer-managed validation trials. The teams emphasized that project personnel should take a more active role in location-
specific adaptive research. One team recommended that project personnel should recruit local agronomists with the requisite skills for participatory research. In a few projects with unsuccessful collaborative on-farm research, the failures were attributed to lack of support from the development agencies. Byrnes (1988), who reviewed AID-supported farming-systems research and extension (FSRE) projects implemented from 1975 to 1987, noted that AID management understands little about how to implement them. This means that in spite of designing projects to embark on collaborative research, development agencies still may be attempting to follow a top-down approach.

The low emphasis on beneficiary voluntary contributions may be attributed to the low economic development level of many of the host-countries. Only about 20 percent of those countries hosting the development projects in the study indicated a high Gross National Product (e.g. over $1000) per capita. Assessment of correlation between success with beneficiary contributions and host-country GNP per capita level shows a strong, positive correlation.

A little over half the projects (32 out of 54) which used some form of media indicated some concern with active beneficiary involvement in media production. Active beneficiary involvement in media production usually was limited to pre or post evaluations of media materials. Only a few evaluation reports (10 out of the 54 projects that
used media) referred to the direct involvement of beneficiary groups in the actual production of media. These observations seem to indicate that the concept of active participation has only a minor relevance to media use in AID-sponsored rural development. In a few other situations too, the project evaluation teams recommended active and direct participation of beneficiary groups in media production. The evaluation teams expressed the belief that target audiences should participate in planning and executing communication activities to reflect the circumstances people face, their constraints, and appropriate behavior. Many media-involved projects used a combination rather than one medium alone.

A surprising finding is the lack of emphasis on private commercial-sector participation in AID projects (37 out of 102 projects). A major theme of AID's development efforts has been to emphasize privatization (Hellinger et al., 1988). Many of the rural development projects may not be providing a sufficiently profitable role to the private commercial sector to encourage involvement as active service providers. For example, with regard to a family planning project, the evaluation team reported that the private sector was unable to compete (for selling contraceptives) with government's free supply of contraceptives. In an agricultural project, the team reported that the private extension services were non-sustainable because profits from
such services were not immediately available to the service providers. The mere presence of the private commercial sector in the projects studied did not correlate positively with overall project success. However, when the private commercial sector’s participation was successful, there was a moderate, positive correlation with overall project success. Private sector and public sector institutions, therefore, need to learn to work together rather than to carve out separate roles. They should work out new partnerships for both communication and service delivery purposes.

**Some factors reported as constraints to participation.** The project evaluations noted shortcomings in the implementation of the ten participation variables of the study. Some of those are attributed to weaknesses of development agencies while some others are attributed to the deficiencies of the communities themselves.

Some linkages with local organizations failed due to weak local capacity to make decisions. Some of the reasons: absence of real community leaders in such organizations, selection of leaders by the project officials rather than by the community, lack of beneficiary familiarity with the project’s development activities, and lack of project support and coordination of organizations. One evaluation team observed that local organizations linked to the project were not used for planning, managing, and evaluating project
activities. Another team reported that the project managers had not been very innovative in establishing linkages with organizations. As a result several potential local organizations were not used. In another project, the cooperative movements linked to the project were described as highly politicized, and they tended to implement only limited numbers of proposals.

According to the evaluations, the created beneficiary groups suffered from several forms of mishandling. One evaluation team observed that the development ideas of the project were deriving mainly from the staff instead of from beneficiaries, and this led to a lack of motivation among the group members. Certain projects suffered from conflicts between the staff and the created groups regarding roles and functions. In another case the formed beneficiary groups were unable to identify the development needs because group members were not given sufficient training for group action. In some situations, although there had been training at the inception, such training had not been followed up. In another instance the evaluation team observed that the members of a created group were unable to participate actively because of their extreme poverty; apparently they could not afford to spend time undergoing training and doing activities associated with group functioning.

Involvement of women also suffered from planning difficulties. Several evaluation teams noted a lack of
well-defined plans to include women in participatory activities. Some teams observed that women were not given an opportunity to participate. For example, one evaluation report indicated that sanitation committees formed by the project recruited very few women as members. Another evaluation team reported limited training opportunities given to women's groups. Certain family-planning project-officials did not train voluntary female promoters in leadership. Moreover, no mechanism was provided for female promoters to be responsive to the community's needs. In several other instances evaluation teams reported a lack of women front-line staff in the field.

The problems concerning use of indigenous practices were mainly associated with population control and oral rehydration therapy promotional projects. Several evaluation teams observed conflicts between the use of indigenous practices and modern medical practices.

Not many constraints were reported regarding beneficiary contributions to projects. However, one evaluation team reported a situation in which a host-country government made the initial decision about the contribution to be made by the beneficiaries. This led to small contributions from the beneficiaries.

The production of beneficiary-involved media suffered mainly from lack of concern of authorities about participatory-media use. An evaluation team also mentioned
lack of trained staff and equipment needed for participatory media production.

Although some projects had arrangements to conduct beneficiary training in participation, several evaluation teams observed lack of clear plans to transfer responsibilities of management to the community. In one project the evaluation team mentioned a ministry's halting of training in collective community action for political reasons.

One factor hindering private commercial-sector participation was the fact, noted by several evaluation teams, that government organizations were working with donor-assisted NGOs (non-profit organizations) instead of following a private-sector market model. This seemed to discourage private commercial-sector participation. In one project, the evaluation team mentioned that existing government policies did not encourage private commercial-sector participation in activities such as agricultural extension.

Several decentralized project managements failed because of lack of management capability at all levels of the decentralized system. Another reason often associated with poor decentralized management was the lack of support available to peripheral units from the center. Such units could not obtain necessary funds, staff, and authority to function autonomously. In several cases of decentralized
administrations, there were no references to the involvement of beneficiaries in management. In several other instances, evaluation teams complained that government agencies lacked understanding of the decentralization concept. In one instance decentralized administration was adversely affected by a tug of war between those who were seeking greater centralization and those seeking greater decentralization.

Almost all the participatory activities appeared to have been adversely affected by political violence wherever such disturbances occurred. A common constraint has been the lack of empathy by the developers toward active community participation. If a project was concerned with active beneficiary participation and if authorities supported it, then participatory activities often flourished and were followed by overall project success.

Suggestions for Future Research

Perhaps because of the nature of the evaluation reports used in the study, indications of beneficiary decision-making were few and scanty. To determine this aspect of participation in a project, one has to examine the development agenda to assess the degree to which the agenda accommodates and promotes a local point of view. Future studies in this regard should collect the relevant data directly from projects because such data will not likely be present in sufficient quantity and quality in any secondary source. Effective participation research has to be based on
operational research in the field. Such work will make it possible to test hypotheses accurately.

Another important topic that needs to be addressed is constraints to participation. The present study observed that some of the participatory activities were not actively pursued due to various factors. But it was not possible to determine whether the beneficiaries or the benefactors were mainly responsible for the failures. Although evaluation reports, in some instances, described the constraints in some detail, the information available in most instances was not enough to determine the accountability accurately. A future field study should focus on this aspect. Such information could be of immense value to reform development policies and reorient bureaucracies to accommodate and sustain participation for development.

The findings regarding influence of host-country development level on participation success indicated a disparity between the current study and Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin’s study. While it is possible, in this regard, to find arguments in favor of the findings of both studies, one has to investigate this aspect further, examining projects that have been identified as participatory. One reason that may have contributed to the differences could be the difference in the nature of projects that were used in the two studies. One approach that could improve the degree of uniformity in this respect would be to select a set of
projects that are identified as self-help projects or integrated community development projects. Because it is possible to obtain the necessary data from case study reports or evaluation reports on such projects in a number of countries, the investigation could be undertaken using a methodology similar to that of the present study.

**Recommendations**

Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin (1987, 1989), after examining participation-associated variables and project success in 52 AID projects, concluded that participation is beneficial and should be encouraged in development projects as a general rule. Except for the findings on host-country development level and participation success, all the other findings of the current study are consistent with the findings of their study.

The AID projects used in the current study are more recent than those of Finsterbusch and Van Wicklin’s study. Furthermore, in their sample, a majority of projects emphasized construction of facilities as projects’ primary output, while in this study a majority of projects emphasized behavioral changes as the primary output. These differences do not seem to matter in relation to the contribution of participation to development.

Despite the dependence of both studies on data sources that were not optimal for this sort of hypothesis testing, the consistency of results observed is heartening. The
findings may have filled some crucial gaps of empirical analysis of participation in development.

The findings suggest that development efforts sponsored by AID in the future should include as many participatory activities as possible. Particularly important is a greater focus on beneficiary training in participation, women’s active involvement, integration of indigenous knowledge, and use of beneficiary-involved media. Participation should be especially encouraged in development efforts of relatively poor countries because of its greater success observed in poor countries. Resource commitments may be generated in such a way that they do not incur a burden on the poor. When planning participatory activities, it is important for developers to consider and eliminate constraints to participatory activities.

AID-supported development evaluations in the future need to address beneficiary decision-making in AID projects. This aspect, however, needs to be evaluated to guarantee that projects meet beneficiary desires. Decision-making should not be simply an aspect of manipulation to secure consent for the developers’ wishes. One practical approach in this regard would be to develop evaluation methodologies which are capable of assessing beneficiaries’ participation satisfaction. Another approach would be to assess the degree of convergence achieved regarding development aims of
both beneficiaries and benefactors in the process of participation.

An appropriate way to evaluate AID-sponsored rural development in the future would be to adopt participatory action research procedures rather than using hitherto adopted standard evaluation procedures. Some of the more recent evaluation reports (interim evaluations) of the study have used participatory approaches. Through collaborative investigations, accompanied by productive dialogue, participating groups could learn to analyze their own problems and devise solutions. At the same time participatory action research would enable professional researchers to gain insights that allow for reformulation of research questions and more realistic interpretations of data.

Although the findings of the present study mostly reinforce the claims of participation proponents, findings also may have added something new to AID’s experience with rural development in the past 10 to 15 years. The success of non-governmental organizations should encourage them to embark on participatory development efforts. Such efforts may be specifically focused on the variables identified in the study. Income disparities and lack of access to resources still plague the poor in most parts of the world. Improvement of the lives of the rural poor is yet far from being achieved. According to the findings, AID’s emphasis,
as a leading international development assistance donor, in the direction of active people's participation has not been strong enough. Whether AID could take the role of a grand creator of participatory development is questionable. Political commitment of host countries toward power sharing and reform would play a crucial role in this context.
APPENDIX A
THE AID PROJECTS IN THE STUDY SAMPLE

Following are the project evaluation reports selected for the study. They are listed in the order of case identification numbers (ID No.) used in the study. Each report also has a five-letter, three-digit number which is called Document Order Number given by the AID Development Information Services Clearinghouse. A PD prefix designates an internal AID project document. A PN prefix designates an AID-supported study. The year refers to the year of publishing.

When ordering documents, it is necessary to indicate both the title of the evaluation report and the document order number. Requests for copies on paper or microfiche should be forwarded to:
Development Information Services Clearinghouse
1500 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 1010
Arlington, Virginia 22209-2404
Phone: (703) 351-4006
Fax: (703) 351-4039

An abstract of each document could be viewed using the AID’s Development Information System on CD-ROM called CD-DIS. The CD-DIS could also be ordered from the same address.

The List of Evaluation Reports


ID No. 4: The Evaluation of Senegal Reforestation Project in Senegal, 1991. (PD-ABC-420)


ID No. 7: The Evaluation of Village Reforestation Project (in more than one country of Central and West Africa Region), 1984. (PD-AAP-414)


ID No. 10: The Evaluation of Southeast Regional Reforestation Project in Burkina Faso, 1989. (PD-AAZ-775)


ID No. 16: The Evaluation of Increased Productivity Through Better Health Project in Belize, 1989. (PD-AAZ-958)


ID No. 21: The Evaluation of Rural Development Linkages Program in Malawi, 1989. (PD-AAZ-716)


ID Nos. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30: Evaluation of PVO Projects in Health and Nutrition (in more than one country), 1985. (PD-AAV-060)

ID No. 31: The Evaluation of Environmental Component of the Community-Based AID-Supported Study in Guatemala, 1989. (PN-ABC-184)


ID No. 35: The Evaluation of Non-Traditional Agricultural Export Project in Ecuador, 1988. (PD-AAX-824)

ID No. 36: The Evaluation of OPG Rural Community Health Project in Ecuador, 1983. (PD-AAN-813)


ID No. 39: The Evaluation of Managed Fish Production Project in Panama, 1986. (PD-AAT-440)


ID No. 44: The Evaluation of Small Towns Shelter and Community Development Project in Kenya, 1989. (PD-AAZ-072)

ID No. 46: The Evaluation of Health Sector I Project in Honduras, 1986. (PD-AAU-066)


ID No. 53: The Evaluation of Forestry Protection and Continuous Land Use in Peru, 1989. (PD-ABA-869)

ID No. 54: The Evaluation of AID Project in Mali, 1983. (PD-AAP-706)


ID No. 56: The Evaluation of Small Scale Irrigation Management in Indonesia, 1990. (PD-ABB-363)


ID No. 58: The Evaluation of Irrigation Development Project in Honduras, 1989. (PD-ABA-162)

ID No. 59: The Evaluation of Advanced Family Planning Training for Nurses: Family Planning Services Project (in more than one country), 1985. (PD-AAQ-824)

ID No. 60: The Evaluation of CARE Community Water Project in Haiti, 1989. (PD-AAZ-816)


ID No. 63: The Evaluation of USAID/Bangladesh Social Marketing Project in Bangladesh, 1987. (PD-ABA-792)

ID No. 64: The Evaluation of National Social Forestry Project in India, 1989. (PD-AAZ-020)


ID No. 66: The Evaluation of Social Marketing of Contraceptives Project in Pakistan, 1989. (PD-AAV-963)

ID No. 67: The Evaluation of Breast is Best League in Belize, 1987. (PD-AAW-135)


ID No. 71: The Evaluation of Training Programs for District Health Management (in more than one country), 1988. (PD-AAY-567)

ID Nos. 72 & 73: The Evaluation of Rural Water Supply Programs in Guatemala, 1986. (in two localities implemented by two NGOs funded by AID) (PD-AAZ-234)


ID Nos. 75 & 76: The Evaluation of Communication for Technology Transfer in Agriculture Project in Honduras and in Peru, 1989. (PD-ABB-104)

ID No. 78: The Evaluation of Extending Family Planning Services Through Third World Women Managers (in more than one country), 1989. (PD-ABA-314)


ID No. 84: The Evaluation of Expansion of Family Planning Services Project in Guatemala, 1990. (PD-ABB-541)

ID No. 85: The Evaluation of Nutrition Education and Social Marketing Project (in more than one country), 1990. (PD-ABC-081)


ID No. 88: The Evaluation of Family Planning and Health Services Project in Bangladesh, 1991. (PD-ABC-913)

ID No. 89: The Evaluation of the Kasserine Regional Health Education Project in Tunisia, 1991. (PD-ABC-974)


ID No. 91: The Evaluation of Community and Child Health Project in Bolivia, 1992. (PD-ABD-773)

ID No. 92: The Evaluation of Agroforestry Outreach Project in Haiti, 1986. (PD-KAI-175)

ID No. 93: The Evaluation of Agrarian Reform Credit Project in El Salvador, 1985. (PN-AAV-311)
ID No. 94: The Evaluation of Family Planning Development and
Services II Project in Indonesia, 1989. (PD-AAZ-540)

(PD-ABD-550)

ID No. 96: The Evaluation of AIDS Communications and
Technical Services Project (in West Indies and Eastern
Caribbean Region), 1991. (PD-ABD-659)

ID No. 97: The Evaluation of National Family Welfare Center
Program of In Service in Kenya, 1985. (PD-AAR-031)

ID No. 98: The Evaluation of Basic Needs Trust Fund (in West
Indies and Eastern Caribbean Region), 1987. (PD-KAL-993)

ID No. 99: The Evaluation of Agriculture Sector Development
Grant in Niger, 1990. (PD-ABA-759)

ID No. 100: The Evaluation of Malaria Control Project in
Ecuador, 1987. (PD-AAX-151)

ID No. 101: The Evaluation of Family Planning Management
Training in Senegal, 1987. (PN-AAY-369)

ID No. 102: The Evaluation of Oral Rehydration Therapy and
Growth Monitoring (in more than one country), 1987.
(PD-AAX-640)
APPENDIX B
HOST-COUNTRY LIST

Bangladesh
Belize
Benin
Bolivia
Burkina Faso
Costa Rica
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
El Salvador
Ghana
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
India
Indonesia
Jamaica
Jordan
Kenya
Liberia

Malawi
Mali
Nepal
Niger
Nigeria
Pakistan
Panama
Peru
Philippines
Senegal
Somalia
Sri Lanka
Tanzania
Thailand
Togo
Tunisia
Yemen
Zaire
Zimbabwe
Zanzibar
APPENDIX C
CODING MANUAL/ CODE SHEET

ID #

Project Name:

Country:

Commencement: Evaluation:

Report type: Interim/Mid-term or End-of-the-Project/Final

1. Linking with existing local community organizations or NGOs:

   (1.a) Do the project activities include linking with existing local community organizations (including local schools)?

   No/Not mentioned
   Not relevant
   No, but recommended
   Yes

   (1.b) If yes:
   What type of organization/s:

   (1.c) How successful?
   Completely successful
   Partially successful Why?
   Poor Why?
   Impossible to assess

   (1.d) What are the evaluation team recommendations:
   None
   Other:
2. Creation of beneficiary groups:

(2.a) Has the project initiated beneficiary groups or individuals to work as active participants? (If the created group is entirely for women include it only under # 3)

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

(2.b) If yes, what kind of groups or individuals:

(2.c) How successful?
Completely successful
Partially successful    Why?
Poor                   Why?
Impossible to assess

(2.d) What are the evaluation team recommendations?
None
Other:

3. Women’s active participation in project activities:

(3.a) How are women engaged in project activities?

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

How successful?
Completely successful
Partially successful    Why?
Poor                   Why?
Impossible to assess

(3.c) What are the evaluation team recommendations?

None
Other:
4. Utilization of indigenous technical knowledge:

(4.a) Is there any reference to the use of technology or practice that is indigenous (including those projects which refer to the use of collaborative on-farm research)?

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

(4.b) If yes, what kind of technology/practice?

(4.c) How successful?
Completely successful
Partially successful  Why?
Poor  Why?
Impossible to assess

(4.d) What are the evaluation team recommendations?

None
Other:

5. Collaborative on-farm research:

(5.a) Does the project refer to on-farm crop/animal production research or trials which involve farmer collaboration?

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

(5.b) If yes, what kind of collaboration?

(5.c) How successful?
Completely successful
Partially successful  Why?
Poor  Why?
Impossible to assess
(5.d) What are the evaluation team recommendations?
None
Other:

6. Beneficiary contribution to project:

(6.a) Is the project designed to utilize collective beneficiary contributions i.e., cash for a common fund or labor/material contribution for common construction?

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

(6.b) If yes, what kind of contribution?

(6.c) Has the project been successful in getting contributions?

Completely successful
Partially successful Why?
Poor Why?
Impossible to assess

(6.d) What are the evaluation recommendations?
None
Other

7. Beneficiary involvement with media:

(7.a) Has the project used media?

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

(7.b) If yes, what type of media?

Small media (leaflets, brochures, slides, folk media, and alike)
Mass media (radio, television, cinema, and newspapers)
Combined media (combination of both small and mass media)
(7.c) How do beneficiaries involve with media?

Only as information recipients

Indirect involvement (pre and post testing of media materials, use of surveys, ethnographic studies, and investigative journalists)

Direct involvement (production of programs by the beneficiaries, and direct interviews with beneficiaries)

(7.d) Has the media use been successful?

Completely successful

Partially successful Why?

Poor Why?

Impossible to assess

(7.e) What are the evaluation team recommendations?

None

Other:

(8) Beneficiary training in participation:

(8.a) Are the beneficiaries given a training pertaining to management or collective action?

No/Not mentioned

Not relevant

No, but recommended

Yes

(8.b) If yes, what type of training?

(8.c) How successful?

Completely successful

Partially successful Why?

Poor Why?

Impossible to assess

(8.d) What are the evaluation team recommendations?

None

Other
9. Private commercial-sector participation:

(9.a) Is private commercial-sector involved in activities of the project to provide services or goods needed by the beneficiaries?

Not relevant
No/Not mentioned
No, but recommended
Yes

(9.b) How is the private commercial-sector involved?

(9.c) How successful?

Completely successful
Partially successful Why?
Poor Why?
Impossible to assess

(9.d) What are the evaluation team recommendations?

None:
Other:

10. Decentralization of development administration:

(10.a) Are there indications of decentralized project administration?

No/Not mentioned
Not relevant
No, but recommended
Yes

(10.b) If yes, what are the indications?

(10.c) How successful?

Completely successful
Partially successful Why?
Poor Why?
Impossible to assess
(10.d) What are the evaluation team recommendation?
None
Other

(11) Overall project success:

(11.a) List the project outputs that have been specifically identified for evaluation. Indicate their success or failure as stated in the evaluation report.

(11.b) Copy the conclusion made in the report regarding success or failure of the project.
APPENDIX D
CRITERIA USED FOR ASSESSING PARTICIPATION VARIABLE SUCCESS, BENEFICIARY DECISION-MAKING, AND OVERALL PROJECT SUCCESS

Assessment of Participation Variable Success

A participation variable is judged to be completely successful when:

all or almost all the remarks are indicative of the strengths of the particular activity (e.g., when many aspects are overwhelmingly successful and only one aspect is weak), or

remarks only use the term favorable to explain the performance of an activity, but there are not any negative remarks.

A participation variable is judged to be partly successful when:

remarks indicate the strengths of the particular activity while focusing on some weaknesses also, or

recommendations of the evaluation team qualify the success of the activities concerning the variable or when the evaluation team makes no comments other than recommending the particular activity to continue.

A participation variable is judged to be poor when:

all or almost all the remarks are indicative of the weaknesses of the particular activity, or

remarks indicate that activity did not promote participation, or

remarks indicate that the particular activity was part of the project, but dropped. (e.g., when media are planned, but not implemented).

Note 1: When the given information about a particular activity seemed not quite adequate, it will be necessary to refer to the information provided under the project success in the code sheet for further information. If this section
has information about that particular variable, then the
variable should be evaluated according the above criteria.
Also under some circumstances, to gain more information
about the variable, it may be necessary to refer to the
details on other variables mentioned in the project report
and recorded on the code sheet that has relevance to the
activity concerned.

When information available on any section of the code
sheet does not provide adequate information to make a
judgment about the success about any particular variable,
then it should be coded as impossible to assess. Guerilla
activity or civil unrest also makes it a impossible to assess.
When an activity is stopped by authorities, it is
also considered as an impossible-to-assess situation. In
projects dealing with several geographic areas when an
activity concerning a particular participation variable in
one of those geographic areas is reported as affected by
political instability (e.g., civil violence), then the level
of success of that particular variable needs to be judged on
the basis of its performance in the other geographic areas
of that project where the activity was not affected by the
disturbances.

Assessment Of Beneficiary Decision-Making

When details on a participation variable on the code
sheet indicate any one of the following, then it could be
judged as a situation indicating beneficiary decision-
making:

planning/evaluating project activities by the
beneficiaries, or

the use of the term creative participation, or

selection of group leaders, community workers, health
workers by beneficiaries, or

the use of terms farming-systems research and
extension, or adaptive research, or on-farm applied
research, or farming-systems oriented technical
assistance, or use of peasant farm systems and agro-
sylvo-pastoral elements for project trials, or
collaborative farmer or cooperative-managed
experiments, or

Contribution of funds, labor or material to the project
voluntarily by beneficiaries, or

Media in which there is pretesting or post evaluation
by beneficiaries, or media production through direct
involvement of beneficiaries or beneficiary groups such as radio programming with regular interviews with farmers or community-managed radio program production (also if the indications are that there is a possibility in the future to work with people for media production), or

Use of community theater, or

beneficiary training in collective management or collective action, or use of terms such as conscientization (critical consciousness raising), or priority need identification in relation to beneficiary training, or development of skills among beneficiaries on preparation of solicitations to government officials.

Assessment Of Overall Project Success

A project’s overall success assessment needs to be made considering the summary remarks about project outputs and the conclusions that had been recorded on the code sheet. Overall project success is classified as excellent, moderately successful or poor.

Excellent:

When an evaluating team’s remarks on all or almost all of the project outputs and the conclusions about the project are favorable, then the overall success of such a project could be judged as excellent.

Moderate:

When remarks about project output are generally mixed and the conclusion includes both positive and negative aspects, then the overall success could be considered as moderate. In an instance in which the conclusion is favorable but remarks about individual aspects are mostly negative, then too, the overall project success could be considered as moderate. The latitude of the moderate category is considered to be wider than that of the excellent and the poor.

Poor:

When almost all the project outputs are rated negatively along with a negative conclusion, then the overall project success could be judged as poor.

Note 2: There could be a few instances in which the overall success may not be possible to determine due to insufficient
information. Such a situation needs to be considered as impossible to assess.
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