



141
793
THS

THREE

1. 17
17. 17
17. 17

PLACE IN RETURN BOX

to remove this checkout from your record.

TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

MAY BE RECALLED with earlier due date if requested.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE

/Participation and Client Accountability in Development :

The Philippine Upland Development Program/

by

Kenneth K. Ames

//

A Plan B Paper

**Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of**

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Resource Development

1995

LIBRARY
Michigan State
University

Table of Contents

	page
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
Organization of Thesis	3
Hypothesis	4
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Participation.....	6
Client Accountability.....	11
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY	16
Selection of Case	16
Data Collection	17
interviewees	18
questions.....	20
compilation of responses	22
operationalization of definitions.....	23
Client Accountability.....	23
Participation.....	24
Quality	26
CHAPTER 4 DESCRIPTION OF CASE	28
Upland Development Working Group	31
CHAPTER 5 RESULTS	34
Participation.....	35
Client Accountability.....	42
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	46
Conclusions	46
Recommendations.....	47
Limitations of the Study	48
Recommendation for Further Research.....	49
CHAPTER 7 BIBLIOGRAPHY	52
APPENDICES	56

Acknowledgments

Numerous people need to be thanked for making it possible for me to complete this thesis. Family, friends and colleagues have made it possible for me to be here undertaking this effort.

First, I would like to thank Dr. George H. Axinn who allowed me to enter the program and served as my advisor throughout the process. He was supportive of ideas and encouraged me to "get on with it" when that was necessary. He and Nancy also made it possible for me to concentrate on the writing by providing a great working space during their sabbatical. Nancy also provided encouragement and expert editing skills during the final push to the defense, for that I will always be thankful.

Dr. Jeff Riedinger and Dr. Bill Derman also served on my committee for which I am grateful. They both provided needed focus which, I hope, makes this final document more meaningful to the reader.

The Department of Resource Development has been an exciting place to be for the past few years. I have gotten personal and professional support from numerous faculty and staff members for the work undertaken. I also got tremendous emotional and financial support from the members of this community during a difficult time. Their willingness to reach out to me will never be forgotten.

The friends I have made at MSU are some of the best people it has ever been my privilege to associate with. They have made the difficult times easier and the fun times memorable. I look forward to continuing the friendships begun here and working with these individuals in the future. I feel that with people like these there is hope for development efforts and hope for the world as a whole.

Finally I would like to thank my family. Their support has made everything possible. Even though I am not sure they understand what I am trying to accomplish my family has been and will continue to be my first priority.

Abstract

For the last four decades “developed” countries have tried to assist “lesser developed” nations provide for themselves. This assistance has taken on many differing forms with mixed results. These differing approaches have facilitated multiple topics of discussion for scholar and practitioners examining development efforts. This document looks at two of those topics: participation and client accountability. A review of the literature related to the topics is undertaken with reference to a case study conducted. The Philippine Upland Development Program, a program with the expressed goal of improving participatory approaches to upland management, is the case studied. An examination is made of opinions of stakeholders concerning the success the program has had in meeting it's goal. Those interviewed also discussed their impressions concerning the accountability of those implementing the program to the client. These results are used to make some generalizations concerning development and how incorporation of these topics into the development cycle would improve efforts undertaken.

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION:

Throughout the history of international development there have been many attempts by those of "developed" countries to provide assistance to people in "lesser developed" countries. This assistance has taken differing shapes and forms. During the 1960s the trend was geared toward the transfer of technology. The assumption was that if people of developing countries had access to the technology of the "developed" world they could pull themselves out of poverty.

The 1970s ushered in capital intensive development projects which were designed to improve the infrastructure of developing nations. The assumption was that improved infrastructure would allow free markets to flourish and development, similar to what developed countries had experienced during preceding decades, would occur. During the 1980s many development activities continued along this path emphasizing the concept of trickle-down economic development. This period saw expansion of large scale capital intensive projects with the assumption that benefits would trickle down to all members of society.

The current trend within large donor/development agencies is the reexamination of past projects with an eye to the future. This reexamination has been prompted by several factors, chiefly the perceived failures of past efforts. These are perceptions of people within

agencies, those responsible for implementation of projects, contracted evaluators, and of academicians.

This reevaluation has produced a vocabulary words and which is frequently cited in literature addressing development in the 90s, representing issues at the forefront of current thinking in the field of development. Many of these ideas are just beginning to emerge in the field. However, periodically the ideas are phenomena which are being revisited.

During the 90s there has been a shift of policy within many organizations to include the population the program serves, that is the client, in all phases of the development process. This inclusion has fostered changes in practices which have generated terms such as *participation* and *client accountability*. These changes are toward inclusion of people in the development process or even "putting people first" (Chambers 1983, Korten 1984, Cernea 1991).

Participation and *client accountability* are both issues with many facets. There are questions regarding who participates; how to ensure this participation represents the entire community; what mechanisms are available to hold the practitioner accountable; and how is each concept defined. These issues are explored in this thesis with discussion presented from a case study of the Upland Development Program in the Philippines.

Development thinking in the 90s has increasingly included people in the development process. The ideas of development 'for people', 'including people', and 'centered on people' is addressed in numerous writings (Chambers 1991, Knippers-Black 1991, Paul 1991, etc.). The idea of participation has fostered such concepts as 'bottom-up planning', 'restructuring' and

'people-not-project centered development'. These concepts are influencing the direction of development strategies currently, and for the foreseeable future.

To ensure that practitioners are incorporating the concepts in all phases of the process there needs to be a method for holding them accountable. Accountability has emerged or is defined as an approach for holding practitioners responsible for actions taken. Frequently, those responsible for the implementation of programs are not from the communities the project serves. Thus, they do not have to live with the consequences of their actions after the program ends. Accountability to the client encourages practitioners to make decisions, and take actions which hold the interest of the client above that of others.

ORGANIZATION OF THESIS:

This thesis examines the concepts of participation and client accountability. It is built on examination of the literature and use of a case study for examples. The case material was gathered during a study of stakeholder perceptions of the Upland Development Program (UDP), in the Philippines, conducted by the researcher.

The thesis is organized as follows: First, current literature related to the key concepts is examined. Methodology used is then discussed followed by an in-depth description of the Upland Development Program. The Results section, which follows, discusses key concepts with reference to the case. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are made regarding the study.

HYPOTHESIS:

This study explores the following hypothesis: **The level of accountability the practitioner feels toward the client (client accountability) and the level of participation the client has in all phases of the program are directly related to the quality of program developed.** To test this hypothesis the literature and information gathered regarding the Upland Development Program is brought to bear on the issue of development.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The new professionalism reverses the values, roles and power relations of normal professionalism. It puts people first and poor people first of all. The 'last-first' paradigm includes learning from the poor, decentralization, empowerment, local initiatives, and diversity. Development is not by blueprint but by a flexible and adaptive learning process. To achieve reversals on a massive scale is now perhaps the greatest challenge facing the development professions. (Chambers, 1993:1)

The call for a new professionalism in development which Chambers addresses encompasses many aspects including the participation of stakeholders in all stages of the development process and the accountability of people implementing programs. Participation and client accountability are the two concepts which are the focus of this thesis. The "extent and effectiveness of participation" (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977:85) can be measured by the extent to which leaders are accountable to the client (Uphoff, 1986:104).

In this section current literature on each concept is addressed to provide a basis for operationalizing definitions which are applied to the case studied. The analysis of the case, with reference to these operationalized definitions, appears in the results section of this document.

PARTICIPATION:

One of the concepts which is addressed in this document is participation. Community participation theory emerged as a coherent approach to social development through the United Nations Popular Participation Programme. Participation is viewed as a means to include a variety of stakeholders in the development process. A World Bank paper stated, “participatory rural development should not be viewed as a set of techniques but as a state of mind reflecting a deep-rooted respect for the values and creativity of others” (Bhatnagar and Williams, 1992:41).

Discussion concerning the participation of clients in development is not new. As indicated by Korten, during the 1970s people-oriented perspectives on development were gaining ground. Korten goes on to state at the time there were policy commitments to participation and equity in development efforts. However, he continues, the bureaucracies upon which the implementation depended were unequal to the task (Korten, 1986:234).

At the time it was understood there was a need to allow client communities to build capacity to care for themselves and manage their natural resources. This was viewed as a way to mobilize rural communities, allowing them to participate more meaningfully in their own development (Alfonso, 1986:60). Chambers also discusses the need to include the rural poor in the development process because of the knowledge they possess. In **Rural Development: Putting the Last First**, he points out the rural poor possess knowledge which is not accessible to outsiders (Chambers, 1983:82). Once again, this can be viewed as a call for implementors of international development projects to include people in the entire process.

The notions of people-centered development and participation are closely linked. How can development be truly participatory if the people are not involved? And, if development is participatory is it people-centered? As stated by Kothari, "unless man is the maker of his own destiny, there is no scope for real freedom and self-realization" (Kothari, 1988:84).

This notion of participatory, people-centered development gained popularity due to the perceived weaknesses of the older production-centered approaches. This was true, in part, because the older method was seen as unresponsive to local variations and made little use of the creative energies of community members served (Korten & Klauss, 1984:169). People can be expected to participate in development only when they believe they are part of it and can benefit from it (Owens & Shaw, 1972:14).

It was understood that to make progress lesser developed countries have to rely on their peoples. Arkoff makes this quite clear when he states "a government cannot develop a country, it can only help its country develop itself" (Arkoff, 1984:195). The implication is that it is up to the people, who elect the government, to take responsibility for the development of the nation. The South Commission makes a similar statement in a 1990 report. This report makes it clear that for development to take place, in lesser developed countries, it is the responsibility of the peoples of those countries (South, 1990). A UN document makes a similar inference when stating, "individuals in any society should not be free or joy-riders ... but be an active participant in the development process" (UN, 1991:2).

Even though, as discussed above, participation is not a new idea it is still being grappled with in development circles. This is true because even though participation appears

to be a simple process there are many barriers to its implementation. Jan Knippers-Black argues that the lack of participation in the development process has a historic basis. She states "the programmed influence of colonial and neocolonial states has brought to bear on containing rather than promoting participation in the Third World" (Knippers-Black, 1991:37). This supports the theory of participation as a concept not easily implemented.

Another barrier pointed out by Korten is the pressure placed on financing agencies to move too much money too quickly (Korten, 1984:176). A reorientation on the part of these agencies is in order to develop people-centered participatory programs and projects. There needs to be greater emphasis placed on projects which benefit the communities and less placed on moving the money. A World Bank study indicates there are certain types of programs which are more conducive to the participatory approach. These include those which focused on infrastructure, (particularly irrigation and water systems), or local infrastructure, (particularly forests) (World Bank, 1994:14). The Bank study suggests participation works best when there is a shared asset or other material incentive for people to spend their time in group activities.

Even though participation has been addressed since the 1970s it is still an issue which is debated. As Frances Korten observed, "programs directed to the poor must support rather than supplant people's own efforts at development (Korten, 1989:61). In much of development this supplanting is still the norm. To help eradicate this co-opting of people in the development process a new state of mind has to be created by those implementing programs and projects. This new state of mind is based on participation of all people in every stage of the development process.

This 'new' state of mind has caused much debate within the international development community. The debate has included what is meant by participation, who is to participate and how to ensure all stakeholders are included in the participatory process. The on-going debate allows for a continued reevaluation of programs and, presumably, improvement in the development process. This section discusses the various definitions and develops an operational definition which the author applies to the case studied.

The term participation is a much debated concept and agreeing on a definition has proven difficult. The American Heritage Dictionary defines participation as "the act of taking part or sharing in something" (1992:1319). This definition is the basis for most other attempts to define the concept. It is the starting point from which individuals and organizations define the term in such a way to allow implementation.

The World Bank defines participation as "a process by which people, especially disadvantaged people, influence decisions which affect them" (Bhatnagar and Williams, 1992:177). This definition gives focus to who participation is designed to benefit. It indicates there is a specific audience for the focus of participation. If development projects are designed to benefit the poor then the poor need to be included in the entire development process.

Midgley states that for participation to be effective it must be direct and give ultimate control to local communities so they themselves decide their own affairs (Midgley, 1986:9). Midgley goes on to state not only does input of community members allow a greater say in the development process but it also contributes to a heightened sense of community and strengthening of community bonds.

The UN resolution also states that participation requires the voluntary and democratic involvement of people in (a) contributing to the development effort, (b) sharing equitably in the benefits derived therefrom and (c) decision-making in respect of setting goals, formulating policies and planning and implementing economic and social development programmes (Midgley, 1986:25). The goal of this participation is to ensure the participation of all members of the community in programs and projects which affect them.

With participation, people in a community are able to express their desires to a greater degree. As stated in a World Bank Discussion paper, "participation implies that people sharing common problems should voice their demands and work together toward solutions" (Bhatnagar & Williams, 1992:41). The collective expression of desires allows communities a better position when dealing with those from outside the community.

For participation to be most effective there has to be flexibility in program implementation at the local level. Even when programs are national initiatives there needs to be local control. This allows variations in project implementation to suit local conditions and take local customs and practices into account. This flexibility allows for greater success of individual projects.

By allowing local control of projects it is possible to tap into what Lineberry refers to as the innate wisdom and knowledge of the rural poor concerning the environment with which they are intimately familiar (Lineberry, 1989:5). The knowledge the local population possess can be the starting place for any project which is to be initiated.

CLIENT ACCOUNTABILITY:

“...people working in the field of development are wholly disqualified from claiming professional status. Unlike other, genuine, professionals, they are accountable to no one (except in the ordinary hierarchical way). If they make a mess of a development project, they will not be there to see it and they can walk away from their victims, towards the next disaster.” (George, 1992:168)

The criticism of those working in the field of development made by George is a strong one. If practitioners working in development are to create a means of improving their professionalism then being held accountable to clients served has to be addressed. Accountability is an issue being addressed by such divergent groups as the Congress of the United States and those working in education. The goal is to make those working in various fields more responsible for action taken.

In the field of international development this is particularly needed because those taking action are usually from outside the community being served. As George states, at the end of the project, or individual contracts, the outsiders leave and return to their normal lives. This ability for abandoning, or moving on, is often because the practitioner does not have a feeling of commitment or accountability to any group or individual within the community. Uphoff discussed this lack of connection to the community when he argued for a sense of accountability to the community (Uphoff, 1986:104). He suggested that with a stronger tie to the community the “paraprofessional” would have a stronger commitment, or accountability, to the individuals.

Bryant and White also discuss the benefits of the inclusion of the client to achieve a greater level of accountability. In a discussion dealing with the inclusion of those at the local

level of project development and implementation they state that the reorientation of the process to include those at the internal and external level is most likely to be successful (Bryant & White, 1984:51). By reorienting the development process to include those at all levels the program is most likely to have a greater success. This is also a call for accountability to the client, or to include the client in the development process.

As with participation there are many questions to be answered when dealing with the concept of client accountability. These include: What definition is to be used? To whom are individual practitioners accountable? What means are there to hold these individuals accountable? and How does this help ensure that appropriate development takes place? These are some of the aspects of accountability addressed in this section. Because the term accountability means different things to different people this section is devoted to looking at how accountability is used in development and what some of the definitions of the term are.

Often times people assume accountability means financial accounting. In his book *Crisis Accountability and Development in the Third World*, Gharthey discusses the accountability of development in Africa from the financial viewpoint. He demonstrates how large amounts of money spent on development are often wasted or misappropriated.

Frequently, projects benefit those already well off in a community, not the poor or disadvantaged. Other times money spent creates more problems than it solves. The money makes those who are already well off better off and the poor poorer. This inadequate accounting manifests itself in many ways including, inappropriate policies, abuse of power, fraud, and corruption (Gharthey 1986:1).

One of the most used definitions of accountability is the one found in a World Bank document which refers to accountability as “holding individuals and organizations responsible for performance measured as objectively as possible” (Paul, 1991:2). As simple as this definition appears at first reading it contains many complex aspects.

First, accountability and responsibility are used interchangeably. This implies that an individual who acts in a responsible manner is accountable. It also implies that the concept of responsibility transcends cultures. But it does not answer the question -- Accountable to whom?

In fact, many differences exist between cultures as to what it means to act responsibly. If practitioners working in development are to be held to standards, which standards are to be used? This is an important and complex question. For the purposes of this study, it will be assumed the standards to which the practitioner are held are those of Western society.

For this paper accountability is defined as a type of responsibility. It is the feeling of responsibility the practitioner feels, either to clients or to some other source. As can be gleaned from the title of this section, this study focuses on accountability to the client.

Accountability can be divided in terms of direction. This division is important in determining to whom the practitioner is accountable. There is accountability to beneficiaries and accountability to outside sources. This division is also referred to as external and internal accountability. Axinn refers to this accountability in agricultural research in India (Axinn, 1990:9). He states measures of control and reasons for decentralization are both demonstrated by the phenomena of accountability. To understand who benefits from

programs and why programs are designed a particular way it is important to understand where the practitioner is accountable, either internally or externally.

Clark refers to the multiple directions of accountability in his book *Democratizing Development* (Clark, 1991). He acknowledges that there are multiple sources of accountability even for NGOs. He states the ideal would be for organizations to be accountable to all the constituencies (Clark, 1991:62). The difficulty in being held accountable to multiple sources is then discussed. An organization will find it difficult to accomplish any work if they are trying to answer to all the constituents.

Client accountability refers to the degree of responsibility the practitioner feels toward the client served. External accountability refers to the degree of responsibility the practitioner feels to one or more external sources. Frequently the external sources are donors or the practitioner's contracting organization. There is always a need for practitioners to be accountable to the organization which is paying for the project. However, the degree to which this responsibility affects decisions regarding development is the issue to be examined. In this paper accountability is examined at the internal or client level.

The means for holding practitioners accountable are varied. Some assume that if a community is involved in the development process then it is able to hold the practitioner accountable to them. This may be true if the level and degree of participation of the community is high. When the community is involved in the entire process, then they may have a say in who becomes involved from outside the community.

By developing some form of professional standards by which to hold the individual practitioner it might be possible create a higher level of client accountability. In the field of

medicine those practicing are held to the Hippocratic Oath which is used to hold them accountable. If a physician makes a decision which is not compatible with professional standards, s/he can be held accountable in a court of law. There are penalties for not doing the right thing and means to discipline those who do not live up to this standard.

This is not true in development. There are no means for holding development practitioners accountable. As stated by George at the beginning of this section, they are able to walk toward the next disaster. There is a need to create standards by which to hold development 'professionals', thus creating standards for accountability.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

SELECTION OF CASE:

The case being used for this analysis is a study conducted during the summer of 1994. The researcher had the opportunity to travel to the Philippines and work on an internship coordinated by the Midwest University Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), sponsored by Winrock International*. While in the Philippines the researcher was assigned to work with Dr. Romulo del Castillo of the University of the Philippines at Los Baños. Dr. del Castillo is a long term consultant with Winrock and has been involved with the Upland Development Program* since its inception.

In coordination with Dr. del Castillo, and assisted by Dr. Mary Racelis of the Ford Foundation, the strategy for the study was formulated. It was decided that an examination of differing perceptions of stakeholders in this ongoing Ford-funded project would be appropriate. The study was designed to provide an interim accounting of the program's progress. The Ford Foundation funding cycle for the program comes up for reevaluation in 1995. This study will be used as one of the tools to help make decisions concerning future funding. The study will also be used by Dr. del Castillo to be shared with other members of the Upland Development Working Group.

* additional information concerning Winrock International is contained in Appendix A.
* A full description of the Upland Development Program is found in Chapter 4.

DATA COLLECTION:

Data were collected in two ways. These included an examination of documentation on the case and interviews with people involved in the project. To prepare for the interviews, the review of documentation was undertaken first. The documentation was from a variety of sources, including the Ford Foundation, the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), the University of the Philippines at Los Baños (UPLB) and various other support institutions.[▼]

After the initial document review a roster of possible interview candidates was created. The roster was compiled from a list of all members of the Upland Development Working Group (UDWG) provided by DENR.[♦] Selection of those to be interviewed was based on several factors. These include (1) length of time of individual involvement, (2) position held in the program, (3) current position and (4) accessibility. Additional information concerning selection of interviewees is included in the following section.

Next a list of possible question areas was created. The questions included areas of interest to the Ford Foundation, Dr. del Castillo, and information to be used for this thesis. The questions were designed to create a dialogue with the interviewee and were open-ended in nature. Additional information concerning the type of questions used is contained in the following section.

After interviews were completed a written summary of the findings was prepared. This written document was presented to the Ford Foundation, Winrock International, MUCIA, the Asia Regional Office of Winrock, Dr. del Castillo and the Department of

[▼] A full list of support institutions is found in Appendix B.

[♦] The complete list appears in Appendix C.

Environment and Natural Resources. An oral presentation was also made to members of the Upland Development Working Group at a seminar at DENR.

INTERVIEWEES:

The fifteen interviews were conducted on a one-on-one basis and took place in ten different locations. Some were conducted in the offices of the interviewee, others in more informal settings. Twelve of the interviews were with project professionals and three were with farmers.

Interviewees were selected from a list provided by DENR consisting of members of the Upland Development Working Group (UDWG). The list included individuals currently involved in UDWG and previous members. Most individuals were selected from this list. However, others, not included on the list, were selected based on accessibility. Many in the latter category were present at the Regional Review and Planning Workshop, held at Aclan State College of Agriculture (ASCA). This conference was one of three conferences being held during the summer of 1994. It served as an opportunity for a representative group to gather and share ideas and plan for the next year of individual projects.

An attempt was also made to interview individuals from the various support institutions and members of DENR staff. DENR personnel were selected based on positions they represented. Efforts were made to contact personnel from a variety of levels within the bureaucracy. This included individuals from Central Office, Regional Offices and those working in the field. This was done to obtain a wide representation of DENR personnel.

During the Workshop at ACLAN the researcher also talked with farmers involved in UDP. These individuals were interviewed to allow the opinions of farmers to be included in the report. It was felt farmers' views would provide another dimension to the evaluation. When looking at participation and accountability it is important to obtain the opinions of those the program was designed to benefit.

QUESTIONS:

Interviewees were asked a variety of questions. The questions were qualitative in nature and designed to obtain information concerning personal perceptions of UDP. Questions also focused on what the individuals felt should be included in an overall evaluation of the DENR-UDP.

Interviewees were first asked to describe their involvement with UDP. This included the organization they represent and how, if it were a support institution, it became involved with DENR-UDP. They were asked the number of years they have been involved in the program and in what capacity. During this portion of the interview they described the type of committees, sub-committees and technical groups in which they participate.

Following this, interviewees were asked (1) what they felt was the purpose of UDP, (2) who they felt the program was designed to benefit (3) and how successful the program was in meeting those goals. If individuals felt the program was designed for more than one audience, they were asked to describe the differences. This series of questions was designed to determine the success of the program in meeting the expressed goals. These questions also looked at the issues of client accountability and participation of UDP. Was UDP meeting the goals it was designed to meet? And, was it serving the clients it was designed to serve?

Next the interviewees were asked to describe the strengths of UDP. This included all levels of the program. They were asked what factors make this program successful and why they feel these factors are important. First they were asked to describe what they meant by successful, and successful in comparison to what. The goal of this series of questions was to

determine factors which make UDP successful and understand the reasoning associated with each factor.

Individuals were then asked to describe weaknesses of the program including areas they felt needed improvement and why they felt these factors were weaknesses. Again, this began by the individual interviewees describing what they meant by weakness, and what they were comparing this program with to determine whether a weakness existed. The question also probed for areas the individual felt were beyond the control of the program and how these factors affected the program. Interviewees were encouraged to make recommendations for improvements and how to implement these improvements.

For the purpose of a comprehensive evaluation individuals were asked to list factors they felt should be included in an overall evaluation of the program. The purpose of these questions was to assist in preparations for the evaluation. Different factors and types of evaluation were discussed with individuals, giving them a chance to explain why these factors should or should not be part of an overall evaluation.

The above categories of questions were put to the majority of interviewees. The only difference was the type of questions asked of the farmers. The questions asked of these individuals were more specific concerning personal involvement with UDP and how the program affects their farms. Farmers were asked to describe what they felt UDP was all about, how they felt UDP affected them and to describe some of the positive and negative aspects of the program.

Again, all questions were asked on an open-ended basis, encouraging interviewees to interpret the question as they saw fit. This allowed for interpretations by interviewees and a

more in-depth discussion than if closed-ended questions had been used. Notes were kept during each interview, with a through summary of notations made immediately after each concluded. Each of the interviews lasted approximately two hours, however, no predetermined time frame was scheduled.

COMPILATION OF RESPONSES:

The responses provided were compiled for the final report and are used in this document. The identities of individuals making specific comments were concealed. This was done in the spirit of intellectual integrity, and is a requirement of Michigan State University's Committee for Research Involving Human Subjects. Comments made by individuals are grouped into categories with especially relevant comments included.

In this study responses to individual questions were examined with regard to accountability and participation. Each item was assigned a numerical value, or score, on a scale of one to ten. Each interviewee's cumulative answers were given a ranking and assigned a high or low status. This was done for the concept of accountability and separately for the concept of participation.

The scores are then transferred to a four-square comparison table. This table consists of categories for high and low participation, and high and low accountability. Each interviewee's responses was transferred to the table, by assigning a value for the combination of accountability and participation. Each of values falls into one of the boxes for each respondent.

Comparisons are then made regarding the level of accountability and the level of participation. These comparisons are used to make comments on the effectiveness of UDP and overall comments regarding development. These comments and comparisons are presented in the Results chapter of this thesis.

OPERATIONALIZATION OF DEFINITIONS USED:

For this study the issues of *client accountability* and *participation* have been chosen. After the selection was made it was necessary to define the concepts and to make those definitions operational. This was necessary because both terms are qualitative in nature and definitions had to be measurable. The following is a brief discussion of the definitions chosen and the operationalization of those definitions.

CLIENT ACCOUNTABILITY

As the literature review chapter indicates, the definition of accountability can vary greatly from person to person. For this study *client accountability* refers to responsibility the **practitioner** feels toward the client, or beneficiary of the program. In this study **practitioner** is used to refer to a person who is working at the grassroots level of development. This includes the person who has day-to-day contact with the clients and people working in the office where the program is administered.

In this study, client accountability is measured at the feeling and perception level of the practitioner with regards to the client. For this study it is assumed that a practitioner with a stronger feeling of accountability is more likely to make decisions which take the welfare of

the client into a greater account. It is also assumed that these decisions are more in line with what the client feels is of a higher priority in the implementation of projects.

For this study the definition of *client accountability* is the responsibility the practitioner feels toward the client, or beneficiary, and how this affects decisions made regarding the project. This is a difficult feeling or perception to measure for many reasons. First, this is not a term which is familiar to many of those working in development. During discussions with those working in UDP this became evident. Questions were designed to take this ambiguity into consideration, allowing interviewees to determine and discuss how they defined this concept. Other questions focused on where the design of the project originated; how implementation was carried out by each individual project; and the level of flexibility allowed at the national level. Questions were also asked regarding who the practitioner felt the project was designed to benefit and to what degree they felt this had been achieved. Not only were these types of questions asked but also observations of activities were made and project documentation was evaluated for evidence of accountability to client.

PARTICIPATION:

The other major key concept which is addressed in this study is *participation*. This phenomena appears in a wide variety of literature and is debated by many of those working in the field. It is also an issue many of the large donor agencies, such as the World Bank and USAID as well as many small NGOs, are trying to address in project implementation. Again participation is an issue many feel has many facets. There is the question of who will participate, how to ensure those participating represent the community as a whole and how to

build the concept into projects. There are also matters of extent and depth of participation on the part of each of the actors involved in the project.

For this study the definition of participation is the level of involvement individuals feel s/he had in the project. This general definition allows for the analysis of participation at various levels of a program. It is possible to examine the level the client feels s/he is part of in the program and how those working at the national level feel involved. For this study there is a comparison made of the intensity of participation at the various levels. Comparisons of differences at various levels and the overall perceptions of how the various levels participate is made.

To operationalize this definition, questions were designed to ascertain the level of participation various actors in the program felt. The interviews included individuals at various levels who were asked to describe the amount of participation they had in the program and also the level of others at varying levels. Questions focused on the input individuals felt they had in the overall program, what areas of the program they felt they had the most control over, and how they felt their input was received and acted upon by others in the program. These questions were designed to measure the individual participation and consider how individuals felt their input contributed to the overall program. The compilation of the responses is reported in the Results section of this document, Chapter 5.

QUALITY

The other variable which appears in the hypothesis is **quality**. Quality is defined as having a perceived positive outcome, or being viewed as a success. Programs which are viewed to be successful meet the goals and objectives which they set out to meet. In order to measure if a program is successful it is vital to look at the stated goals and measure the outcomes of the program against these goals.

To measure quality in this program the interviewees were asked if they perceived the program as a success. Frequently the answer to this question was a yes or no. However, there then was a discussion as to the reasoning for this answer. Interviewees discussed why they felt the program was successful and what they were comparing the program to when making their judgments. They discussed this program in comparison to others they had been affiliated with and how it compared. Questions were then posed to determine the areas of the program the interviewee felt were the most successful and areas where they felt there were weaknesses. Questions focused on different aspects of the program and how these aspects compared to the overall program quality. This allowed for determining if the areas mentioned were related to participation and accountability without using those terms during the questioning.

Interviewees were also asked to discuss, in general terms, who the intended beneficiaries of the program were and how the program meets the needs of those individuals. During this segment of the questioning the interviewer paid particular attention to the responses given, trying to determine if the interviewee was collaborating what was stated earlier regarding success. The goal of this segment of questioning was to better understand

the level of success the interviewee felt regarding the program. The researcher understands few individuals are willing to admit a program is unsuccessful, especially when directly involved. However, by asking questions in different ways the researcher feels answers provided were honest and an accurate measure of how the interviewees felt.

Interviewees were willing to discuss the success of the program on an open basis. At the beginning of each of the interviews the researcher told the interviewees their answers would be held in confidence. One of the respondents stated she “did not care if others found out about her comments because these comments are normally discussed in meetings, between members of the program, on a continuing basis.” This led the researcher to believe the answers given were actually the answers the individuals felt and less of what the interviewee thought the researcher wanted to hear.

Answers to the questions regarding quality, as well as participation and accountability, are reported in Chapter 5 of this document. The questions also are used to test the hypothesis stated: **The level of accountability the practitioner feels toward the client (client accountability) and the level of participation the client has in all phases of the program is directly related to the quality of programs developed.**

Chapter 4

DESCRIPTION OF CASE

The Upland Development Program (UDP) is a multi-year project of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)[♦]. The program originated in 1981 and is scheduled to end in 1994. The purpose of the program is to *develop participatory approaches to upland management and strengthen institutional capabilities of the DENR for effectively mobilizing farmer participation in social forestry projects* (Briefing Kit 1994:1). Although this is the stated goal of UDP there are many secondary goals. These include the creation of differing agroforestry techniques, the development of process documentation and methodologies for community organizing. These secondary goals are often as important as the primary goal. As was evident during a conference held in the summer of 1994, the goal of assisting the upland farmer is the goal which motivates many of those involved in the program. The primary and secondary goals are discussed in greater depth in Chapter 5.

UDP has proceeded in three stages, each partially funded by the Ford Foundation. The initial stage, Exploratory/Diagnostic Research, began in January 1981 and was completed in February 1983. During this stage other community-based social forestry projects were examined. These included governmental and non-governmental programs both within and outside the Philippines. The purpose of this examination was to determine factors to serve as

[♦] DENR was originally known as the Bureau of Forest Development, then Forest Management Bureau.

inputs for UDP. During this phase a review and analysis of policies and laws affecting social forestry was undertaken. Other major accomplishments during phase I include the organization of a working group to facilitate the background research and visitation to some of the other program areas by representatives of, what would become, the Upland Development Working Group.

Stage II, action research, was conducted from March 1983 until December 1988. This stage consisted of refinement of lessons gathered during stage I. Stage II particularly focused on methodologies, including those related to agroforestry technologies, community appraisal, community organization, process documentation, and project management. During this stage three pilot "learning" sites were established in the provinces of Oriental Mindoro, Cebu and Zamboanga. These sites were used as learning grounds for DENR. The lessons the sites provided were used for creation of policies for the department.

They also resulted in the creation of the preliminary version of the Implementation Manual for Participatory ISF Projects[♥]. This manual is used by not only the department but by many other governmental and non-governmental groups. The original three sites continue to be learning grounds for UDP, with some of the most important lessons coming from these areas. As one of those interviewed stated "the original three sites are providing information of what is to come for the newer sites."

Stage III, Limited Expansion Phase, began in January 1989 and is ongoing. This stage focuses on field testing of the participatory framework developed during the two previous

[♥] ISF - Integrated Social Forestry.

stages. This stage also included expansion to thirteen new sites, one for each of the regions. These sites were designed according to the Implementation Manual.

The expansion phase was undertaken in response to differing conditions within the country. Not only are there physical differences (i.e. soil types and precipitation), but also cultural differences which affect implementation of ISF projects. As one of the farmers interviewed stated, “we might be all Filipinos, but we come from different backgrounds.” Being able to respond to the differences in demands is one aspect of implementation the program strives to attain. Lessons learned during this expansion include many relating to implementation and those concerning expansion itself.

Other key components of phase III include the field testing of the participatory framework for ISF including the field strategies and methodologies based on the Implementation Manual for Participatory ISF Projects (Briefing Kit 1994:1). The limited expansion phase also focused on technical activities of the support institutions. These activities included; agroforestry technical assistance from the University of the Philippines at Los Baños, social science research provided by De La Salle University, process monitoring support by the Institute of Philippine Culture, and training and support for community organizing activities by the Philippine Business for Social Progress.

The program supports community organizers, who live in the project site, and report to the regional DENR office. These individuals are not only responsible for reporting to the regional offices but also provide technical support to the communities. This support includes the introduction of agroforestry practices, farm-planning activities and formulation of marketing strategies for groups of local farmers. The regional offices are responsible for

supporting the site and reporting to the national level. At the national level the central office is responsible for all the sites throughout the country.

The objectives of the Upland Development Program focus on strengthening the capabilities of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. To accomplish this, lessons from the sites and from the review of other programs' policies and laws have shaped policies for the agency. These policies were created by the Upland Development Working Group, frequently in consultation with communities involved in implementation of differing projects. The policy recommendations of UDWG have resulted in changes in legislation regarding the management of the uplands. These recommendations have also be instrumental in shaping the social forestry focus of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources.

Upland Development Working Group:

The Upland Development Working Group (UDWG) is a multi-disciplinary group whose main goal is to guide the DENR in a new direction (Gibbs, Payuan & del Castillo, 1990:257). The working group consists of personnel from DENR and members of support institutions. These institutions include the University of the Philippines at Los Baños, Philippine Business for Social Progress, Institute of Philippine Culture, De la Salle University, and the Visayas State College of Agriculture. According to a handout provided at the Acalan conference the “working group concept is a method specifically developed to help government agencies learn to use new, more participatory methods of working with their client groups necessitated by a shift to community-based strategies for development.”

The working group was formed in 1980 with prompting from the Ford Foundation. Members of the group recognized the need to change the way the Uplands were managed. Initially members of the group discussed issues on a one-to-one basis, eventually meeting on a more formal basis. One of the unique aspects of the group was the respect members showed for the other members. Although members came from a variety of fields, all recognized the need for inclusion of other disciplines and the contributions to be made by each. As one of the respondents stated this trans-disciplinary approach allows for the inclusion of not only the “technical but also the inclusion of many other aspects of the program.” Another unique aspect of the working group, as one respondent stated, is the participation of it’s members. Unlike other inter-agency working groups those participating in this group did so “because they were interested in making a difference in the type of program the agency promoted.” This respondent felt in other groups members participated because they were required to do so, but this group consisted of people with a genuine interest in making changes.

The role of the Ford Foundation was one of facilitator. By providing initial funding, the Foundation encouraged people in different organizations to think about the need for change, and come together to initiate new programs. There was a desire within Ford to promote participatory forestry which was recognized as a goal of many others within the country. The representative from Ford was able to work as a “facilitator”, helping to promote to formation of UDWG.

The group was set-up as part of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources to encourage the participation of agency personnel. This allowed the agency to participate in reformulation of policies instead of having them presented by an outside group.

As one of the founding members of UDWG stated the placement of the group as part of the agency has allowed members of the agency to “accept the changes presented because they come from within and belong to the agency, not forced ideas from an outside group.”

Upland Development Program, through the Upland Development Working Group, has produced a variety of publications used within and outside the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Based on lessons learned about policy creation UDWG has been responsible for monitoring the learning sites and culling lessons to be used in future policy creation. UDWG has also pioneered the concepts of process documentation, participatory forest management and the use of field experiences for the development of agency policy within the Philippines* .

* List of Publications and other facts concerning UDP are found in Appendix D.

Chapter 5

RESULTS

In this section reports on the results of the interviews conducted for this study. The responses are discussed in general terms, with specific references to participation and client accountability. The responses support the hypothesis made that **the level of accountability the practitioner feels toward the client (client accountability) and the level of participation the client has in all phases of the program is directly related to the quality of programs developed.** This type of intervention is discussed with examples cited from the Upland Development Program.

One of the prominent outcomes of this study was the difference in perception concerning who the program was designed to benefit. Of those interviewed, only one respondent mentioned the goal of the program as being the restructuring of the agency. The others stated the goal of improving livelihoods of the upland farmers as the main goal of the program.

The documentation on the program identifies restructuring of the agency as the primary goal. However, many interviewed discussed the impossibility of restructuring without participation by the farmers. They stated that if the goal was restructuring it had to take into account the participation of the client. In the view of the majority of those interviewed, these two purposes could not be separated. In the view of those interviewed the program has been successful at both levels. One respondent stated that the program has been able to “reshape the agency,” allowing it to more effectively implement social forestry programs. Another

respondent stated the program has been able to make “social changes” within the communities served. These changes have given communities a greater capacity for the implementation of “better” farming practices, “ones which are more sustainable.”

As one interviewee stated, “the difference can be viewed as a differing of perceptions at the micro-local level, and the macro-policy level”. Those focusing on the micro level stated the program was designed to improve the livelihoods of the farmers, or more at the project level. The person stating the restructuring of the agency as the major goal of the program was focused on what he actually referred to as the “macro-level” of the program. Taking this difference into account all respondents felt the program was meeting the intended goals, whether this was the improvement in the livelihoods or the restructuring of an agency. This study looks at both micro and macro level, because of responses offered during the interview process.

PARTICIPATION

The definition of participation which is used for this study is **the level of involvement an individual feels they have in the project**. Questions measured the level of involvement the respondents felt they had in the program and the involvement they felt others had in the program. Responses of the fifteen interviewees are shown, along with accountability, in table 1.1, located on page 43.

The participation of the client in the program is one aspect all persons interviewed felt was a positive quality of the program. This program is designed to develop participatory approaches to development and according to those interviewed it is meeting this goal. All

interviewees mentioned the ability of the client to participate in the program as the main strength of UDP. As one respondent stated the differing technical committees “really know what is going on out in the field;” they take “time to visit the sites.” These visitations allow those working at various levels an overall knowledge of factors affecting implementation. This program is touted, by many working in the field of development, as one of the few successes of participatory approaches, not only in the Philippines, but throughout the region.

Participation by the client has been a goal of UDP since it began. The main purpose of the program was to develop strategies for participation of clients in agency based programs. Those interviewed said they felt the level of participation in the program was high. This includes the participation of farmers in decisions which affect them. Farmers are the ones who make the decisions concerning their individual farms. They are able to decide what crops to plant, what technologies to adopt, and the mix of these technologies and crops. Farmers frequently work with other farmers in formulating “farm-plans.” These plans are developed by individual farmers with help from UDP personnel. Farmers participate in farmer-to-farmer training where differing types of plans, implementation methods and time-frames are discussed.

Others who participate in UDP included representatives from the support institutions. It was felt by members of these institutions interviewed that the support institutions had high input into the program. These institutions provide information concerning new technologies and methods for improving the program. The support institutions provide technical expertise in specific areas such as agroforestry or community organizing. The ability of the support institutions to focus on individual aspects of the program allow for “greater concentration of

efforts,” as one interviewee stated. Involvement of such a diverse group of individuals allows for better reporting from the field to the UDWG. The ideas expressed in the UDWG meetings are turned into policy of the DENR. Policy changes are a manifestation of the participation of members at various levels, as stated by numerous individuals interviewed.

There are several factors built into the program to help facilitate this participation. A major factor which encourages participation is the personnel of the program. One way the program encourages participation of the client, the farmer, is through the Forest Community Organizer (FCO). These individuals live in the community and are responsible for assisting in implementation of projects. Individual projects are designed by the farmers who live in the site area. The farmers decide what will be the focus of the project and how to implement those ideas. The Forest Community Organizers, UDP and the support institutions help the farmers to turn their plans into action.

The FCOs demonstrate new and different technologies to the community on demonstration plots on government owned lands. The plots are located in individual communities, situated to allow community observation of the techniques. One FCO stated the ability to demonstrate differing technologies allows community members to “realize it is not so difficult to implement technologies which have long-term benefits on individual farms.” He also stated that usually within a month of demonstrating a new technique there is a “flood of requests for assistance on individual farms.”

The FCOs are employed by the regional offices of DENR. One benefit of the presence of the FCOs is the ability to observe and understand the needs of the community. This is accomplished because the individual lives in the community and is able to observe activities

over a long period of time. This observation allows them to avoid what is referred to as development tourism. This phenomenon occurs when individuals from outside visit and make evaluations based on short visits. Longer term observation allows the FCO to better understand what is taking place within each community. One FCO stated she felt living in the community allowed her to have an insight which those from the regional office could not understand.

The presence of the FCOs within the community allows the farmers from the project site to participate in decisions relating to the program. They are able to communicate with the FCO about implementing different technologies and the need for assistance. This assistance may concern adoption of a new technique, additional assistance needed on individual farms, or providing information concerning other aspects of the project. The FCO is able to provide or obtain assistance in helping solve problems.

One drawback of the FCO position, as mentioned by a few interviewed, is that they are usually not from the community. In this respect they are actually outsiders. They are usually from other parts of the country and are employed by the national government. This can cause problems because the FCO is in a career position and individuals are concerned about promotions and advancement within the agency. This creates pressure to make the projects look good. This may manifest itself in the reports written and results reported. However, one FCO stated he felt he is the representative of the farmers and this is where his "loyalties" lie, which affects the way he operates within the program.

On the plus side, the FCO is a conduit for the participation of the local farmers in the entire program. They take the needs of the farmers to heart and are able to report these to the

regional level of the agency, which in turn reports them to the national level. Many initiatives the program implements originated at the local project level. These initiatives are frequently disseminated to other projects throughout the nation. The benefits which one community may get from a new aspect of the program can be shared with other projects.

Another way the program encourages the participation of the farmers is with meetings and seminars. The workshop held at Aclan is an example of this sharing of information. Each group of farmers and project staff were able to discuss ideas concerning successes and failures they had encountered. This discussion was observed and participated in by members of other projects and staff members from the local, regional, and national level. When ideas emerged, participants were able to talk with the farmers and others about how this could help solve a problem in a different site.

An example of this is a discussion of the success of one program in the marketing of a cash crop. Members of one of the sites spoke about the ability of their cooperative to market spring onions in the local market. This crop is viewed as a high value crop with a high demand. Members of other regions were able to ask questions regarding the growing, marketing and value of the crop, with some discussing ways to get “sets” for production on their farms. One of the farmers present, from the site of the spring onions, even discussed his ability to visit the other site and “show the farmers there how to grow the onions.” There was also discussion regarding the visitation of farmers to the cooperative with the onions to observe the growing and processing of the crop. This discussion focused attention on the needs of the individual farm groups as one of the primary goals of the program.

Another aspect of this program which helps ensure participation of the client is the Upland Development Working Group (UDWG). The group is multi-disciplinary with the main goal of guiding the DENR in a new direction. The group also provides another way for the clients to participate in the restructuring of the organization.

The position of the working group in the organizational structure of the agency allows it to act as an advocate for the clients. UDWG is located at the national level of the agency. The group reports directly to the minister for social forestry. Of the fifteen persons interviewed, twelve stated the working group serving as a conduit for ideas from project sites and integration into the program is an aspect of the program which adds to its quality. One interviewee stated the “accessibility of UDWG to all members of the program” as one of the programs greatest strengths.

The FCOs interviewed stated they felt comfortable communicating with members of the working group and this communication produced results. As one respondent stated “we are able to meet with anyone in the program and discuss items of importance to us.” Members of the working group come from a variety of academic disciplines (i.e. Sociology, Forestry, Psychology, Biology) allowing for a “broader understanding of differing aspects of the program.”

UDWG is an entity which is incorporated into the organizational structure of the agency. The committee is responsible to the undersecretary for social forestry programs. The committee is an official part of the organization but is able to work independently of many of the political struggles of the agency. This allows for greater autonomy and effective decision making. Because it is made up of members of various institutions, who are accountable to

their individual agencies, they are able to make decisions and recommendations which might not be able to be made by employees of DENR. This inability to make decisions may be related to infighting within the agency or concerns agency employees have with the possibility of loosing their jobs.

One concern expressed regarding the participation of all stakeholders in UDP is the financial control of the program. Even though each project is responsible for implementation, the money is controlled at the national level. This affects individual projects and employees working at various levels. The individuals have to go to the national level to get moneys needed for implementation of projects.

One goal of the individual projects is self-sufficiency. It is also an overall goal of the program to have the farmers able to provide necessary funds and not be dependent on national government support. To do this most projects encourage income generating activities. These activities allow farmers to purchase inputs needed and have money for other activities they feel are important to the community, such as a truck for transportation of goods and people to the regional center, or books and supplies for the school or health center.

CLIENT ACCOUNTABILITY

The definition of client accountability that is used in this study is the **responsibility the practitioner feels toward the client, or beneficiary, of the program**. Table 1.1 on page 43 shows the responses for this variable along with the other one measured.

As with the creation of a definition for accountability, the measuring of this concept proved difficult. It was difficult to get the interviewees to agree on a definition of the concept. Many interviewed felt the concept referred to the financial management of the program. Because there was such a disparity on the overall goals of the program it was difficult to assess accountability of those involved measured against the overall goal. Because of this, the researcher decided to concentrate on the goal of improving the livelihoods of the upland farmers as the goal against which to compare accountability.

As with participation the responses for accountability are divided into two categories, high and low. This was done by assigning a numeric value, on a scale of one to ten, to each respondent's answers. The responses from the interviewees regarding accountability fall along the dividing line of the two categories. Approximately 80% of the respondents fall into the 6 and 7 range. If there were a medium category for the level of accountability then this is where the majority of the respondents would fall. Those interviewed felt the program held the interest of the farmer above all else. One respondent stated that she was "in the program to represent the uplanders." Because of statements like this it is felt the interest of the upland farmer drives decisions made at all levels of the program, consistent with the restructuring of the agency in terms of greater participation.

Table 1.1
Representation of responses for Accountability and Participation

	High Accountability	Low Accountability
High Participation	<div> <div>x</div> <div> <div>xx</div> <div>xx</div> <div>xx</div> <div>xx</div> </div> <div> <div>x</div> <div>x</div> <div>x</div> <div>xx</div> </div> </div>	<div> <div>x</div> </div>
Low Participation		

For there to be greater participation of the stakeholders in the program there had to be accountability of those individuals at various levels. Some factors of the program which allowed it to be accountable to the client were the inclusion of various actors in the decision process, the ability for comments of farmers to be heard at all levels of the program, and formulation of policy based on these comments. Many of these changes are the results of the working group.

The majority of UDWG members interviewed stated one of their individual goals was to be accessible to the farmers. To accomplish this UDWG members were either available through the FCO or at meetings where representatives of various stakeholder groups were present. UDWG members interviewed stated the best inputs they received came from those working in the field. These inputs were discussed by members of the group and turned into policies for the agency. Frequently different members of the working group visit sites and discuss aspects of the program with members of individual communities. One interviewee stated these visits are the main reason he “had an understanding of what is going on in so many parts of the country.” Not only were the members of UDWG able to visit the sites they also have open frequent communication with the FCOs. The ability of the FCO to communicate freely with members of UDWG was a positive aspect of the program, according to one of the FCOs interviewed.

The presence of the FCO in the project sites allows the community to hold the program accountable for actions taken. If the community feels the program is not meeting their needs they can express this to the FCO. The FCO is then able to communicate this to the Regional office and in turn to the National office. One of the farmers interviewed stated

that she had talked to the FCO about getting “better transportation for her crops” and “he was able to help her find a driver who was going to the market-town and get him to stop for her crops.” The theory behind the FCOs presence is to ensure the needs of the client are being served. This feedback gives farmers a say in decisions with regards to meeting the needs of the community. This feedback is used by UDWG, and UDP in general, to make changes in policy at the national level. As stated by one group member “the number of policy changes which have been made to the agency are an effective measure of the success of UDP.”

Those FCOs interviewed stated the main reason they were involved was because of the type of program. The unique ability of the client to participate in the program and the ability of members of UDWG to represent the client in decisions affecting the client were the main reasons they were involved. The program flexibility and the ability of the farmers to make decisions which affect the implementation were also reasons those interviewed felt the program was accountable to the client.

Chapter 6

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS:

Does participation by the client and accountability to the client affect the quality of international development programs? It is the conclusion of the researcher that the answer to this question is yes. From the literature cited and class material covered this could have been assumed before conducting the research. However, the research supports the hypothesis explored in this study: **The level of accountability the practitioner feels toward the client (client accountability) and the level of participation the client has in all phases of the program ARE directly related to the quality of programs developed.**

These statements are supported by the responses which were given during the interviews. UDP has developed many mechanisms to include the client in the program and this inclusion has improved the quality of the program. This was an observation made not only by those working at the National level but also by the farmers whose lands are part of the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The clients are the ones most affected by programs and should have input in all phases of the development process. Practitioners responsible for implementation of programs need to take the interests of the client into account. Without the inclusion of the client and a degree of accountability on the part of the practitioner, development efforts are doomed to repeat past failures.

During initial planning it is important to evaluate and incorporate the knowledge of the clients into implementation strategies. The knowledge possessed by the client adds to the quality of the program and affects the likelihood for sustainability. Using this knowledge allows programs to build on this base instead of recreating systems which may already exist.

The implementation of programs should allow clients to have more than the traditional manual labor role. Each project is something the client will live with even after the program ends. To ensure program sustainability it is important to encourage client development of programs in a way the client feels is appropriate. It is vital to develop programs which meet the expressed needs of the client. This is a change from some of the past development practices. In the past many programs were top-down driven. There now needs to be a change toward more bottom-up programming. These changes will allow programs to be more responsive to the needs of the client and less driven by desires of outside donor organizations.

The monitoring and evaluation of the entire development process needs to include the clients to ensure that their needs are being met. Who better to know what programs should entail than the clients themselves? With continual monitoring and evaluation it is possible to

make adjustment to the program, in mid-course, if deemed necessary. These adjustments allow for refocusing of efforts to ensure the accomplishing of expressed goals.

The only way to make sure the above mentioned changes are implemented is for the outsider, or practitioner, to be accountable to the client. If the accountability of the practitioner is to the donor the most likely results will be programs which do not meet the needs of the client. And isn't meeting those needs the real reason for development activities in the first place?

Greater accountability to the clients also helps ensure that the client has a say in the type of program developed this allows for greater ability of the clients to determine activities which will take place within their community. It also fosters a better understanding of activities which allow the client to develop. This development can include improved farming techniques, better health and nutrition for community members, or improvement in the client's ability to meet their own needs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

The main limitation of this study is that it was conducted within a minimal amount of time in the Philippines. The researcher was given only one month to prepare to go to the field. This was because this study was conducted as a supplement to another project. The primary project the researcher worked on was the MUCIA internship with Winrock International. A longer preparation time would have allowed for a more in-depth background investigation of UDP. It would have also allowed for creation and testing of a survey to be

used during the interviews. Both of these factors, and many more, would have been able to be addressed with more preparation time.

After arriving in the Philippines the researcher, along with the assistance of many people, determined the substance of the research and how to include this research into the study. Because the researcher was only in-country for three months, this all had to be accomplished with haste. More time for preparation would have allowed for it to be possible to conduct more background work and be better prepared for executing the interviews.

The majority of the interviews were conducted with people present at one of the meetings the researcher attended. This included meetings at DENR and the conference held at Aclan. The fact that the people spoken with were attending meetings arranged by UDP may have led to biased responses. This bias is probably in the favor of the project. With more time for conducting the study it might have been possible to speak with members of the support institutions who did not attend meetings. It might have also been possible to speak with more farmers and get the inputs of other members of the field staff. Unfortunately, due to shortages of time and funding, the researcher was unable to make a more thorough canvassing of stakeholders in the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH:

The conclusion of this study is that UDP is a quality program which has proven successful in comparison to many programs and projects discussed in development literature. The program is staffed by many caring, concerned individuals, who feel the clients are the

reason for the program's existence. However, changes taking place within the country are affecting this program.

The main change is the Local Government Code of 1992. This code relates to the devolution of programs from the national level to the individual local government units (LGU). The code came about at the end of the Aquino administration and was part of the "people-power" revolution which swept her into office. The code devolves numerous functions of the national government to the local level. It is up to LGUs to decide what will receive support and to what level.

Because UDP is a program supported by outside funds it has yet to be devolved. However, the funds are about to end at which time the program will be devolved to the local level. With one of the goals of the program the restructuring of a national level agency, what will happen when devolution takes place? This important question has only been superficially addressed by those involved in the program. As one interviewee stated "we have no idea how, or if, the lessons learned during the last 12 years of UDP are going to be transferred to the local level". The concern of this individual was the possibility that everything the program has accomplished will be lost when the program is devolved.

There is a great potential for research in the area of this devolution. What happens when a national level program, such as UDP, is transferred to the local level? Does it continue or are the funds reallocated toward something the local government unit sees as more vital? It would also be possible to examine how a program which has been touted as participatory in nature fares with the transition to local government control. The ways in which the accountability to the client changes when the program is not controlled at the

national level is another potential area for study. Looking at UDP in five, ten, or fifteen years would possibly provide answers to these questions.

Chapter 7

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Briefing Kit on the Upland Development Program, May 1994, provided by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, unpublished,.

Alfonso, Felipe B.

1986 *Empowering Rural Communities*, in **Beyond Bureaucracy: Strategic Management of Social Development**, Ickis, de Jesus and Maru, editors; Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut.

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language; 3rd. edition, Houghton and Mifflin Company, Boston, MA., 1992.

Arkoff, Russell L.

1984 *On the Nature of Development and Planning*, in **People Centered Development Contributions Toward Theory and Planning Frameworks**, Korten and Klauss, editors; Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut.

Axinn, George H.;

1990 *Accountability and Agricultural Research*, **Eastern India Farming Systems Research and Extension News Letter**, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 7-10.

Bhatnagar and Williams, editors

1992 **Participatory Development and the World Bank: Potential Directions for Change**, World Bank Discussion Papers # 183, Washington DC.

Bryant, C. & White, L.G.

1984 **Managing Rural Development with Small Farmers Participation**, Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut,.

Cernea, Michael; editor,

1991 **Putting People First: Sociological Variables in Rural Development**, second edition, World Bank Publication by Oxford University Press: New York.

Chambers, Robert

1993 **Challenging the Professions: Frontiers for Rural Development**, Intermediate Technology Publications: London.

- Chambers, Robert
1983 **Rural Development: Putting the Last First**, Longman, Inc.: New York.
- Clark, John
1991 **Democratizing Development The Role of Voluntary Organizations**, Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut.
- Cohen, J.M. & Uphoff, N.T.
1977 **Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design, Implementation, and Evaluation**, Rural Development Monograph No. 2: Cornell University.
- George, Susan
1992 **The Debt Boomerang**: Westview Press, Inc. Boulder, CO.
- Gharney, J.B.
1987 **Crisis Accountability and Development in the Third World: The Case of Africa**, Gower Publishing: Brookfield, VT.
- Gharney, James B.
1986 **Consolidating Accountability for Development in Africa**, *Working Paper No. 16*, African Studies Center, Boston University.
- Gibbs, Christopher, Edwin Payuan and Romulo del Castillo
1990 *The Growth of the Philippine Social Forestry Program*, in **Keepers of the Forest: Land Management Alternatives in Southeast Asia**, Mark Poffenberger, ed., Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut, pgs. 253-265.
- Knippers-Black, Jan
1991 **Development in Theory and Practice: Bridging the Gap**, Westview Press: Boulder Colorado.
- Korten, David C., Rudi Klauss, editors
1984 **People Centered Development Contributions Toward Theory and Planning Frameworks**, Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut,.
- Korten, David C.
1984 *Rural Development Programming: The Learning Process Approach*, in **People Centered Development Contributions Toward Theory and Planning Frameworks**, Korten and Klauss, editors, Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut.

Korten, David C.

1986 *Strategic Organization for People-Centered Development*, in **Beyond Bureaucracy: Strategic Management of Social Development**, Ickis, de Jesus and Maru, editors Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut,.

Korten, Frances F.

1989 *The Working Group as a Catalyst for Organizational Change*, in **Transforming A Bureaucracy: The Experience of The Philippine National Irrigation Administration**, Korten and Siy, editors Anteneo de Manila University Press, Quezon City, Philippines.

Kothari, Rajni

1988 **Rethinking Development: In Search of Humane Alternatives**, Ajanta Publications: Delhi, India.

Lineberry, William P. editor

1989 **Assessing Participatory Development Rhetoric Versus Reality**, Westview Press: Boulder, Colorado.

Midgley, James, et al

1986 **Community Participation, Social Development and the State**; Methuen and Company Publishing: London.

Owens, Edgar, Robert Shaw, editors

1972 **Development Reconsidered: Bridging the Gap Between Government and People**, D.C. Heath and Company: Lexington, Massachusetts.

Paul, Samuel

1991 **Strengthening Public Service Accountability: A Conceptual Framework**, World Bank Discussion Paper #136, Washington, DC.

The Challenge to the South:

1990 **The Report of the South Commission**, Oxford University Press: New York.

United Nations Economic Commission for Africa

1991 **Public Participation in Development Planning and Management**, United Nations Economic and Social Council.

Uphoff, Norman

1986 Local Institutional Development: An Analytical Sourcebook with Cases,
Kumarian Press: West Hartford, Connecticut,.

World Bank

1994 Poverty Reduction in South Asia: Promoting Participation by the Poor,
*Report on an Informal Workshop Co-Sponsored by the World Bank and the South
Asia Association for Regional Cooperation,* The World Bank, Washington, DC.

APPENDIX A

Additional information concerning Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development.*

Winrock is an autonomous, nonprofit organization whose activities are funded by grants, contracts and contributions from public and private sources. Its mission statement is:

Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development seeks to reduce poverty and hunger in the world through sustainable agricultural and rural development and enhancement of the rural environment and natural resource base. Winrock helps people expand their institutional and human resources, design and implement environmentally sensitive, sustainable, agricultural systems and improves policies for agricultural and rural development.

In describing how Winrock achieves its mission, Robert Thompson, Winrock's President states the following:

The ways that Winrock attempts to expand food production and rural employment while protecting the environment include the following:

- We train researchers and trainers, who in turn work directly with the farmers -- the ultimate beneficiaries.
- We strengthen institutions that help educate, conduct research, transfer technology, and analyze policies.
- We develop human resources. We participate in educating and preparing individuals to identify and overcome barriers to development within their own countries.
- We provide policy analysis and assistance. We help governments examine how their existing laws and regulations affect rural people and whether or not they impede food production.

For more information about Winrock International, call or write:

Winrock International Headquarters

Route 3, Box 376

Morrilton, AR 72110-9537, USA

(501)727-5435

* All of the information provided in this appendix was taken from "Charting the Course, Winrock International Annual Report, 1993" (Winrock International, 1993)

APPENDIX B

SUPPORT INSTITUTIONS:

Center for Forestry Education and Development, UPLB/FAO

Department of Social Forestry (UPLB)

Ford Foundation

Forestry Development Center

Institute of Philippine Culture, Ateneo de Manila University

Integrated Research Centre, De La Salle University

Philippine Association for Intercultural Development

Program for Environment Science and Management

University of the Philippines at Los Baños - Forestry

Visayas State College of Agriculture

APPENDIX C

The following is a list of names of past and current members of the Upland Development Working Group provided by the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. It lists the names of the institution and the people who have participated in the Working Group.

Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)

Mr. Jesus B. Alvarez, Jr.
Atty. Lope D. Reyes
Vincente C. Magno
Antonio G. Principe
Isidoro D. Esreban
Artemino A. Claeda
Eufresima L. Boado
Alejandro B. Salinas, Jr.
Edwin V. Payuan
Rodolfo M. Leal
Elvira N. Enables
Atty. Owen J. Lynch
Isaias M. Domingo
Cirilo B. Serna
Melanio M. Gacoscocsim
Nicetas B. Bautista
Jose L. Lechonito
Gerondio Panong
Victor O. Ramos
Rolando L. Metin
Ricardo M. Umali
Cirilo B. Serna
Christina Gates
Romon JP Paje
Romeo T. Acosta
Lirio T. Abuyan
Gregorio Magdaraog
Renato de Rueda
Bernardo Agaloas
Elisea Gozun
Reynaldo Bayabos
Doming T. Bacalla
Ana Rose DF Opena
Pedro G. Pangilinan
Emilio Rosario
Rafael Camat

Institute of Philippine Culture (IPC)

Ms. Perla Q. Makil
Mr. Filomeno V. Agular, Jr.
Dr. Wilfredo Arce
Salve B. Borlagdan
Dr. Romena de los Reyes
Sylvia Jopillo

De la Salle University (DLSU)

Rosemary Aquino
Benjamin C. Bernales
Mr. Angelito dela Vega
Trinidad Osteria
Ma. Elena Chiong-Javier
Dr. Robert Salazar
Ma. Victoria Pilar Saban

University of the Philippines at Los Baños-Forestry (UPLB-F)

Dr. Lucercio L. Rebugio
Dr. Adolfo V. Revilla, Jr.
Dr. Perry E. Sajise
Dr. Senesio M. Mariano
Dr. Corazon Lamug
Dr. Rodel Lasco
Prof. Nestor Lawas

Ford Foundation

Dr. Christopher Gibbs
Dr. Romulo A. del Castillo
Dr. Frances Korten
Dr. Mary Racelis

Philippine Association for Intercultural Development (PAFID)

Mr. Benjamin C. Bagadion, Jr.
Winky Fernandez

Philippine Business for Social Progress (PBSP)

Jamie Aristole Alip

Ramon A. Derige

Jose Abraham Ongkiko

Janet Bobadillo

Emily Rosario

Appendix D

Additional Information concerning UDP.⁺

Manual and Materials developed by UDP:

Implementation Manual for Participatory ISF Projects, 1989

Agroforestry Technology Information Kit, 1990

Handbook on Community Training Programs for Participatory ISF, 1991

Handbook on Community Profiling for People-Oriented Forestry Projects, 1991

UDP Site Profile

<u>Location</u>	<u>Size (ha)</u>
Banangan, Sablan, Benguet	688
Liquicia, Caba, La Union	296
Villa Ylanan, Maddela, Quirino	450
Longos, Cabangan, Zambales	77.76
Malan-og, Mansalay Oriental Mindoro	1750
Parang ng Buho Sta. Maria, Laguna	270
Genitigan, Baras, Cantanduanes	261
Dagsaan, Buenavista, Guimara	379

⁺ Information provided in the appendix was furnished by DENR, in the Breifing Kit, 1994.

<u>Location</u>	<u>Size (ha)</u>
Nug-as, Alcoy Cebu	356
Catmondaan, Catmon, Cebu	213
Camansihay Tacloban City, Leyte	1135
Anuling-Balintawak Pamucutan, Zamboanga City	240
San Isidro, Labason Zamboanga del Norte	532
Sungay, Alubijid Misamis, Oriental	500
Upper Bala, Magsaysay Davao del Sur	625
Manirub, Pamantingan, Esperanze, Sultan Kudarat	246

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



3 1293 02579 0456