CONCEPTUALIZATIONS, DEFINITIONS, PRACTICES, AND ACTIVITIES OF PEOPLE’S PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF FUNDING NORTHERN NGOs AND THEIR LOCAL PALESTINIAN PARTNERS.

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of the Ohio State University

By

Eman Y Abu-Sa’da, M.S.W.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
2003

Dissertation Committee: Approved by
Professor Maria Julia, Adviser
Professor Mary Ellen Kondrat (Adviser)
Professor Cathy Rakowski College of Social Work
ABSTRACT

This study examined the participatory development practice of international Northern NGOs in the context of the area governed by the Palestinian Authority. It was conducted in two phases. The first contained a two-round Delphi study to solicit the definitions and conceptualizations of people’s participation in social development projects maintained by policy makers and administrators of NGOs in Northern donor countries assisting the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Thirteen major donor organizations answered a first round open-ended questionnaire, providing data on their conceptualizations and definitions; a question summary from round one was sent to those organizations to establish preliminary priorities of items. Five organizations responded to this second round. Data were collected over a six-month period during 2002 and 2003. A series of structured items based on these Delphi rounds, a Likert-type rating scale, were developed and used in the second phase examining the definitions, attitudes and practices of 109 social workers and supervisors of local Palestinian social development projects in the West Bank. The questionnaire aimed at describing and exploring how actual NGO activities and practices exhibit participatory qualities. Survey data were collected in the summer of 2003.

Factor analysis explored the definitions of various underlying participation constructs, practices and attitudes, and tested whether items reflecting the different definitions (dimensions) unite as a concept. This study’s results showed that donor organizations use ambitious definitions, while social workers were neutral toward participation, reporting lack of training in
the topic and that participatory activities are rarely used, or take place most likely only during identification of needs. While donor organizations focused on empowering beneficiaries and target groups through participation, social workers emphasized beneficiaries’ contribution to projects as the most important participation form. The results showed that despite donor organizations’ advocacy for participation, a gap exists between how they perceive participation and the social workers’ actual practice, since practical implications of the concept in projects they fund or support are not clarified; moreover, donors lack clear criteria to evaluate participatory activities in the projects they fund or run in Palestine.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Statement of the Problem

During the last decade, a wide spectrum of international non-governmental organizations has launched different social development programs and projects to serve the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Most of the donor agencies, mainly European and American non-governmental organizations (NGOs), have expressed their goals to help the Palestinian people build the infrastructure of their social and economic institutions (Brynen, 1996); reduce poverty and relieve suffering; and to develop people rather than technologies (Farraj, 1995). The establishment of a diversity of Northern and local NGOs in Palestine has contributed to the emergence of a social services environment consisting of agencies with divergent philosophies, policies, practices, religious affiliations, and political orientations (Hammami, 1995). Especially with respect to the local NGOs, this diversity represents a strong element of political pluralism, which has been considered an important component in the emerging civil society (Bargouthi, 1994; & Muslih, 1995).

Before the establishment of the Palestinian Authority, NGOs in Palestine played a crucial role in carrying out different social services and social development projects. Historically, these organizations functioned at a time when there were no official governmental bodies working in the area, apart from agents connected with the military occupation whose services were limited to that of providing minimum social services to the Palestinian society. This social service
environment has become more complicated ever since the Palestinian Authority’s (PA) public social service agencies entered the service arena traditionally occupied by NGOs’ following the 1993 Oslo Peace agreement between the PLO (Palestinian Liberation Organization) and Israel. In most cases, many of these organizations (public as well as NGOs) work in parallel fashion and generally share the same beneficiaries (Hammami, 1995).

Administrators and the staff of many of the contributing Northern NGOs have adopted a philosophical position advocating a greater involvement of people in development projects; they expect this philosophy to be realized in practice at the local level (Hammami, 1995; Matteson, 1995; & Sullivan, 1996). In addition, local Palestinian NGOs, along with their Northern NGOs partners, have claimed that they are more active in local communities and more efficient in targeting people’s needs than governmental organizations. One of their main arguments is that they are in a better position to demonstrate the feasibility of people-based development as an alternative or complement to government-led development. Thus, NGOs have emphasized the role they play in contributing to the building of civil society in Palestine (Bargouthi, 1994; & Nimer, 1997): NGOs consider their active involvement to be an essential objective in the formation of a fully democratic and participative Palestinian society (Ibid). Moreover, it is debated that only when the Palestinian community is involved in decision-making, when it is able to influence policy formation and become active in all aspects affecting daily life, will a truly democratic process of development be initiated (Fararaj, 1995 & Matteson, 1995). Thus, it is argued, NGOs could be considered not only as agents of development but also as the basis of civil society (Bargouthi, 1994; Muslih, 1995; Nimer, 1997; Sullivan 1996).

In this regard, Foreign and local NGOs have introduced a new vocabulary, using words such as ‘empowerment’ ‘capacity building’ ‘people’s participation’ and ‘awareness raising’ (Longland, 1994). They have argued that their social development programs are aimed at empowering people through involving them in their own social development; as a result, their programs are
more participatory in nature than projects run by governmental organizations (Farraj, 1995). NGO staff have argued that people’s participation in social development projects is a very important and crucial dimension of their work and its success.

Despite the emphasis of the Northern NGOs and local Palestinian NGOs on people’s participation in their social development projects, a number of issues remain unclear. Such as: what is the nature and definition of people’s participation; in what ways are social development projects participatory; and in which way do the activities and practices implemented by NGOs in social development projects manifest participatory qualities. There is a lack of empirical research examining the work of Northern NGOs in Palestine and of local NGOs funded by Northern NGOs as well as a lack of research analysis of how People’s participation is conceptualized and practiced in social development projects.

The focus of this study is to explore the role of NGOs in social development efforts, specifically by investigating the term "people’s participation" both conceptually and operationally from the viewpoint of the Northern NGOs and their Palestinian local partners. For the purpose of this study the researcher uses the term "people" to refer to persons traditionally known in social work literature as consumers, clients, and beneficiaries. The question to be addressed is: Whether the Northern NGOs have a clear understanding and subsequently unified definition and operationalization of people’s participation in the different stages of designing, implementing, and evaluating social development projects. Under the assumption that NGOs are advocating participatory methods in their social development projects, it is further assumed that such methods would be reflected in the actual practices and activities of the local NGOs’ projects. Thus, in addition to attempting to reach a definition for the term "peoples participation" from the viewpoint of the Northern NGOs, this research explores the definition of participation, participatory practices and activities carried out in the local Palestinian NGOs’ social development projects. An overarching question investigated here is the manner and extent
which participatory definitions and concepts held by Northern NGO officers were actually implemented in the field by the local NGOs in Palestine that are funded and sponsored by Northern NGOs.

Finally, the practices and activities of organizations (any organization!) are carried out in the context of political, economic, and social factors that influence and shape such practices. This investigation seeks to explore the socio-political context of these organizations, as perceived by the donor NGOs, particularly with regard to the way participatory strategies are defined and implemented.

1.2 Background of the Research Study

The unique work of NGOs in the area of social development gave them prominence, so much so that the 1980s has been termed ‘the decade of the NGOs’ (Braton, 1989, p.569). And during the 1990s, their work has contributed to a shift in the social development paradigm from an emphasis on top-down approaches to an emphasis on participatory human development approaches (David, 1991).

As their name indicates, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are those organizations not part of a government and not established as a result of an agreement between governments (Padron, 1987). NGOs can be research institutions, professional associations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, youth organizations, religious institutions, senior citizens’ associations, tourist bodies, private foundations, political parties, funding or development-international and indigenous – agencies, and any other organization of a non-governmental nature (United Nations, 1980). On the other hand, governmental organizations (GOs) are those organizations or agencies that are part of a government, and which are part of the government structure. For the purposes of this study, the researcher will confine the consideration of NGOs to a subset of these
organizations, namely the type of NGOs devoted specifically to the design, study and/or execution of social development programs and projects in the developing countries.

Lane (1995) has summarized the two factors that have contributed towards the prominence of NGOs:

First: The general dissatisfaction and frustration with official aid policies and the role of the state in implementing social development projects, prompting the view of NGOs as alternative development channels in implementing social development projects (Salamon & Anheier, 1996).

Second: With the paradigm shift in development thinking, several new approaches have begun to emerge. Some are concerned with the quality of life and social equity, issues believed to have been neglected within the traditional macro-economic models (Midgley, 1984), while others are concerned with increased popular participation and involvement of local people in the development process (Chambers, 1983; Korten & Klauss, 1984). These new approaches are consonant with strategies that the NGOs are said to advocate.

Despite the fact that governmental organizations are now slowly adopting the participatory development approach, there is still a perception that NGOs might be better at participatory development in practice (Drabek, 1987 & Lane, 1995). Thus, people-centered development has traditionally been considered to be an approach characteristic of NGOs (Lane, 1995 & UNDP, 1990), and popular participation in social development has begun to dominate social development thinking. As a result, the concept of people’s participation has attracted much attention and debate. It is argued that the term has become such a cliché that it has become relatively difficult for NGOs working in social development to ignore the prescription for participation (Elliott, 1987).

Meanwhile, there has been extensive theorizing on what participation means and implies. At a very general level, participation refers to the active involvement of a significant number of persons in situations, which enhances their well being (UNDP, 1996). People’s participation
refers to the participation of people traditionally perceived as beneficiaries, and will be referred to in this study as "development participants" whose rights and responsibilities are recognized. However, conceptually and more specifically, there has been some lack of consensus about the meaning of the term "people’s participation", and the literature contains many definitions of the concept. Empirically, there has been no clear understanding of how people’s participation is operationalized and implemented by NGOs. In practice, the reality concerning People’s participation in social development projects may be quite different than what the prevailing ideology promises (Elliott, 1987). The literature that deals with NGOs does not appear to deal systematically or empirically with questions about the ways in which these NGOs conceptualize concepts such as People’s participation, and the extent to which NGOs are incorporating the people-oriented paradigm in the practice of social development. Unfortunately, empirical literature does not offer any answers to this question.

This study bases its rationale on the extensive theorizing in the literature over the meaning of people’s participation in social development work. The debate and controversy in the literature on social development in the developing countries have been very extensive. The debate raises questions such as: how is the concept understood in the literature and by those people involved in social development; what does participation mean for these organizations; does participation mean the same thing for different organizations, and what are the activities and practices used in implementing "people’s participation“.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher is interested in both the Northern NGOs and the local Palestinian NGOs that are sponsored by those NGOs. “Northern NGOs are organizations from the so-called global North with a variety of interests in promoting social development in the so-called global ‘South’“(Elliot, 1987). In most of the developing countries, Northern NGOs and their local NGO partners are those that have been involved in implementing a participatory development approach. This has been the case in the Palestinian context. During the last 10
years, in the Palestinian West bank and Gaza Strip, social development efforts have escalated (Brynen, 1996). Meanwhile, it is very difficult to make general statements about the character of those organizations referred to as the Northern NGO community, due to the heterogeneous nature of the group (Elliott, 1987 & Lane, 1995). In this study, the researcher explores this question as it applies to the Northern NGOs which fund or sponsor and/or implement social development projects in the West Bank and Gaza Strip—either directly or in partnership with local Palestinian NGOs.

Specifically, the issues related to the impact of Northern NGOs and their local Palestinians NGO partners, as well as the extent to which they are really bringing about and fostering a participatory paradigm in social development in Palestine, are questioned and criticized by many. Historically, it is difficult to conclude that NGOs in the Palestinian context were established as a result of an assessment of the needs of the population, yet they were response to the concrete needs of different sectors of society within the framework of mass organizations (Hammami, 1995). Some argue that they were founded as a result of top-down decisions made by foreign donors and/or local experts claiming to know the needs of the Palestinian society (Nimer, 1997). In contradiction to claims by Palestinian NGOs that they are people-oriented, it has been widely criticized that NGOs have become distanced from the wider community of which they were once an organic part (Hammami, 1995), and become to treat their target groups as passive “constituencies” rather than active participants. (Nimer, 1997). Moreover, there was a criticism that they operate within a supply-led welfare system in which services and programs are determined by funding sources, rather than by the needs of the people (Hammami, 1995). Moreover, NGOs in Palestine were accused of not providing development services, since their services were never channeled to local and communal representatives. Instead, they were directed to individuals to encourage individualism over cooperative activities (Samara, 2001).
Nevertheless, a critical argument of the NGO group (Northern and local) in Palestine is their claim that they are more effective and efficient than government programs-- an effectiveness that they argue comes from placing an emphasis on people’s participation in social development projects. NGO personnel frequently voice the belief that people are situated at the heart of their development practices and activities, and not only at the receiving end of their services. At the same time, they claim that the public sector and governmental organizations usually fail to acknowledge the importance of people’s participation in the different stages of the social development projects. Despite the claim that programs and projects conducted by NGOs (Northern and local) are participatory and people-oriented in nature, this has never been substantiated by empirical data. For many Northern NGOs and their local partners involved in the Palestinian context, the concept of people’s participation in social development projects may mean different things. Moreover, Palestinian NGOs were accused of using this term as a jargon (Farraj, 1995). There is no common approach to people’s participation. The problem is in the lack of a clear, documented conceptualization among workers in the NGO sector on the meaning of the term "people’s participation" as well as the absence of a clear, empirical investigation of how the notion of "people's participation" is actually operationalized in the field. Therefore the critical issue remaining to be explored is how social workers and development practitioners in NGOs perceive, define, conceptualize, and practice people’s participation in social development projects.

In an attempt to reach a common understanding of what the concept means, the research study solicited definitions from policy makers and administrators of the Northern NGOs sponsoring/funding and implementing social development projects in the Palestinian context. The aim of exploring the concept of "people’s participation" from the point of view of the Northern NGOs providing assistance to the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip was to reach a multidimensional definition, if possible. Coupled with this, this study also explores and
describes the types of participatory activities and practices that are implemented in the NGOs’ social development projects to understand the extent to which people’s participation is carried out in practice. This study focuses on both: (1) Northern NGOs directly implementing projects on the ground in Palestine, as well as (2) local NGOs sponsored or funded by Northern NGOs. The overarching question was to explore the extent to which the concept, as defined and understood by policy makers and administrators, is implemented in social development projects as practice.

While working in one of the NGOs in Palestine for almost eight years, the researcher witnessed the rapid expansion of these organizations. The impetus for this study was provided by an interest on the researcher’s part to address and look at the work of Northern NGOs and their local partners in the West Bank and Gaza strip, and to systematically examine and analyze the issue of people’s participation in the Palestinian NGOs. This study will provide valuable insights from the perspective of Northern NGOs and their local Palestinian partners.

1.3 The Setting: Historical, Political and Societal Context of Palestine

1.3.1 The influence of the 1967 and 1948 Wars on the System of Social Services

Since the creation of the State of Israel in 1948, thousands of Palestinians have been forced to live in refugee camps either in the West Bank and Gaza Strip or in other neighboring Arab countries. Estimates vary on the number of Palestinian refugees displaced from within what became the borders of Israel in 1948. The United Nations Conciliation Commission put the number at 726,000; later, the newly established United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) subsequently put the number at 914,000 in 1950 (United Nations Relief and Works Agency, 2000). Of this population, approximately one-third fled to the West Bank, another third to the Gaza Strip, and the remainder to Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, and beyond.

In 1967, Israel occupied the West Bank and Gaza strip. As a result, another 300,000 Palestinians fled from the West Bank and Gaza to Jordan, Syria, Egypt and elsewhere. Of these,
approximately 180,000 were first-time refugees, "displaced persons", while the remainder consisted of refugees from 1948 who were uprooted for the second time (UNRWA, 2003). As a result of the occupation, traditional forms of support, indigenous institutions, including relationships based on kinship, friendship, neighborhood, and village membership were overwhelmed and collapsed under the extreme conditions of war and its aftermath (Hilal & El-Malki, 1997). A large sector of the population was destitute and unable to assist those seeking support, thus hindering indigenous social relationships from remaining the primary vehicle through which people in need and distress received help.

Therefore, UNRWA, along with many other international relief agencies and Western non-governmental organizations, established special operations to provide Palestinian refugees with basic needs to survive the turmoil of their displacement and deal with the aftermath of the war and military occupation. Additionally, most of the local voluntary “charitable“ social organizations working in Palestine before the war were reorganized on the basis of providing relief for the thousands of refugees and people affected by the consequences of war. Besides the new organizations and agencies established to meet the survival needs of the Palestinian people, many charitable activities mandated by religious and cultural beliefs contributed tremendously to the relief efforts. Historically, it is hard to draw a distinction between these local charitable efforts, the United Nations, and other international efforts, either official or voluntary. This is due to the fact that all of these bodies directed their attempts toward the relief of poverty and misery resulting from war and military occupation. Thus, emergency services focused primarily on providing immediate help for refugees and those directly affected by the war (Jerusalem and Media Communication Center 1992)

The relief activities established to meet the urgent survival needs of the Palestinian society were systematically institutionalized in the social and economic system. Although these relief efforts became very crucial and essential in the welfare system in the occupied West Bank and
Gaza Strip, they were far from meeting the basic needs of the Palestinian population. On the contrary, they have had a side effect characterized by the creation of people’s dependency on these services, which in turn has had profound consequences on the general welfare and development of the Palestinian society (Jerusalem and Media Communication Center 1992 & Sullivan, 1996). In this context, it is imperative to point out that the efforts of formal international organizations have had profound side effect in that they created a sense of powerlessness and dependency among local people (Campfens, 1996 & Sullivan, 1996). It has been criticized that these international official organizations and other local and charitable organizations and structures established for relief purposes have exercised a degree of control over the public and personal matters of the needy population, while the political and social reality that created these needs has remained unchanged (Jerusalem and Media Communication Center, 1992). Moreover, there has been an extensive debate over the question whether these efforts have, in fact, enhanced the quality of life of the underprivileged and disenfranchised. Indeed, some argue that these efforts have actually caused demoralization on the part of the people (Hammami, 1995). This new socio-political reality and the criticism toward official international relief efforts have had tremendous consequences in shaping the emerging new non-governmental sector in Palestine.

1.3.2 The Emerging Sector: The Development of the Modern NGOs in Palestine: Northern NGOs and their Palestinian Partners: Description of the Contexts and the Actors

Under Israeli occupation, local and international NGOs have played crucial roles in the development of the Palestinian society. Similar to their history in other developing countries, many NGOs in Palestine before the first Intifada2 started out as relief and charitable agencies, more concerned with charity than with development or social justice (Campfens, 1996 & Sullivan, 1996).
During the late 1970s and more so in the 1980s, political committees for different sectors (e.g. women, students, workers, doctors, professionals committees) started to be formed; their aim being quite different from that of charitable organizations characterizing the efforts of the previous generation. Their purpose was to mobilize different sectors in popular movements, which would raise awareness of their roles in resisting the occupation (Longland, 1994). During the late 1980s and the 1990s, many of these formerly popularly based, grass-roots initiatives had become professionally based, foreign-funded development centers targeting clients as opposed to working with constituency (Hammami, 1995). As a result, these popular political movements gradually evolved into a form of local non-governmental organizations. Thus, historically, most of the NGOs have developed out of popular and mass movements, and many of them originally came into being with the aim to mobilize the population politically (Hammami, 1995; Nimer, 1997 & Taraki, 1989).

With the onset of the Intifada in 1987, and as a means of supporting the Palestinian people, international aid to Palestine was channeled through NGOs, which has further expanded the role of the NGO sector. During the first “Intifada” period, most of the NGOs in Palestine blossomed and expanded their services. Palestinian and International non-governmental organizations provided the majority of services in the West Bank and Gaza Strip (Sullivan, 1996). Hammami (1995) has emphasized that in the first 2-3 years of the Intifada, NGOs acted as the framework and front-line of the uprising, and moreover as its source and continuity. In this regard, Sullivan (1996) argued that for years the Palestinian struggle in the West Bank and Gaza Strip took the form not only of popular resistance against the occupation but also of collective efforts to deliver, often free of charge, an array of relief and developmental services not provided by the military occupation structure. It is argued that in the absence of an autonomous Palestinian government in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, space was created for a range of organizations to grow.
According to Longland (1994) these organizations have shown a high level of vision, energy and effectiveness in many areas of development such as health, agriculture, education, human rights, and research.

By 1991, most of the NGOs in Palestine increasingly underwent a process of institutionalization in which official structures were established dependent on outside funding for survival. This period, which is considered the best period for NGOs in terms of their funding, was advantageous to many of these grassroots-oriented organizations in their process of institutionalization. These organizations have in turn begun to reassert themselves as professional bodies through the help of many Northern NGOs, which sponsored and funded these organizations. Moreover, the abundance of funding during this period resulted in the creation of dozens of local NGOs different from those that began as grassroots organizations; these are completely dependent on the foreign funding sources (mainly Western) for their survival. On the other hand it was argued that, as these organizations shifted focus from the initial popular mass movement organizations to becoming professionally based organizations, they lost their ability to mobilize at the grassroots level (Hammami, 1995 & Taraki, 1989).

With the signing of the Oslo agreement in 1993, the Palestinian National Authority (PNA) was established with an implementation of the initial stages of the Palestinian interim self-government (Jerusalem Media and Communication center, 1997). With this implementation, Palestinian institutions, run by the PNA, assumed responsibility for implementing welfare and social development projects (Jerusalem and Media Communication Center, 1997). Meanwhile, officials in the PNA started to express their concern over the issue of channeling foreign aid through NGOs and started to take steps to make sure that they themselves were not denied funds in favor of NGOs (ibid). Thus, with the inception of the PNA, many NGOs raised their concern about their survival in the new era. In particular, a number of official international donors stated their readiness to cut funding to NGOs and re-allocate all of their former NGO funding to the
PNA (Betz, 1995). In fact, international official donors gradually started to channel their support to the Palestinians through the PNA, which lead to cuts in the funds of the majority of NGOs. This left some NGOs unable to operate some of their projects, subsequently raising the anxiety of NGO officials as to whether they would survive the new era.

Many NGOs were ready to fight against the perceived attempt by the PNA to exert dominance (Betz, 1998). While officials of both NGOs and the PNA claimed to have as their main goal the enhancement of the quality of life for the Palestinian people, there was extensive debate on the NGOs’ comparative advantages over the official Palestinian organizations (GOs). In this regard, NGO officials and proponents argued that qualities such as efficiency and effectiveness in carrying out projects, and flexibility and ability to reach out to those in deepest poverty comprise their comparative advantage over the PA structure. In addition, the NGO sector has started to emphasize its important role in the process of building the civil society in the peace era (Brynen, 1996), a theme that has a special appeal to the international and Northern NGOs who share these values. Increasingly, the NGO sector has come to be perceived not only as a form of civil resistance against Israeli occupation, but also as a form of civil society in building the Palestinian community during the PNA era (Sarraj, 1994). On the other hand, Samara, (2001) has argued that during the PA era, the role of NGOs did not decline or become restricted, in fact it expanded. As a result, many International NGOs started to sponsor local NGO projects to compensate for the loss of official PNA aid to the NGOs. This has resulted in an increased activity on the part of the local NGO sector to maintain, develop and expand old and new social development projects. In this new environment local NGOs and their international NGO partners share the development arena with official organizations of the Palestinian authority (Hammami, 1995) and compete with them to prove their claimed unique qualities. According to Samara (2001) this competition is about who controls the larger share of donations.
Although NGOs in Palestine have faced declining resources because foreign aid funds shifted to the Palestinian authority, their activities, size and scope of work in Palestine attest to their historical importance (Hammami, 1995). Nine years after the Palestinian authority was established, NGOs in Palestine still account for the majority of services in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Moreover, new types of NGOs have been established as a consequence of the implementation of the 1993 Oslo Peace Agreement. These newer organizations focus mainly on the areas of conflict resolution, research, democracy and citizenship, and advocacy work for specific social groups such as women and the disabled. This type of work has received a great deal of support from international NGOs and foreign donors. Currently the NGO sector in the West Bank and Gaza Strip encompasses a few hundred organizations addressing every area of civil life and the development of all aspects of society (Farraj, 1995 & Hammami, 1995). Their field of operation has meanwhile expanded from charitable activities to include social development services in areas of health care, media, culture, labor, education and training, agriculture extension, housing assistance, human and women’s rights and legal aid, charity/welfare, research, and technical assistance (Hammami, 1995).

It is important to address the issue of diversity of Local NGOs and their Northern NGO partners. Some of these NGOs are run by Christian groups, charitable organizations, voluntary associations, political groups or/and independents (Sullivan, 1996). The local organizations are also have diverse sources of sponsorship, consisting of Christian groups, Islamic charitable organizations, voluntary associations, women’s committees, political groups, and independents (Sullivan, 1996). The latter include a range of different institutions based on volunteer work, non-profit associations, including traditional charitable societies, community level service providers, and a number of professional “development”, training and research centers (Hammami, 1995).
To better understand the diversity of NGOs in Palestine, Korten’s (1990) classification of NGOs will be applied to the Palestinian context. This will assist in understanding the entire diversity existing in the current NGOs sector in this specific context.

1.3.3 Korten’s Classification of NGOs and its Application to the Case of Palestine

In this context, Korten’s classification system for NGOs is a useful tool in understanding the NGO sector in Palestine. Korten (1987 and 1990) has identified four generations of voluntary development action, or NGOs. The first generation is focused on relief and welfare, and the strategies involve NGOs as providing direct delivery of services in response to visible need and to meet an immediate deficiency or shortage experienced by the beneficiary population, such as food, health care or shelter. This is the type of NGO that was established in Palestine in response to the urgent needs of the Palestinian people throughout its history; most of them are charitable and religious organizations.

In recognition of the permanency of the occupation - with its social, economic and psychological effects- a new NGOs sector has started to emerge. It is this type of NGO that Korten (1990) has referred to as “Second Generation NGOs” and “Third Generation NGOs”. In this context, the researcher is particularly concerned with this generation of NGOs defined by Korten (1990): those that are small-scale, self-reliant and focused on local development. According to Korten, the strategies of second generation NGOs are focused on developing people’s capacity to better meet their own needs through self-reliant local action; moreover, their attention is on sustainability. They are therefore developmental in concept and employ what is referred to as community strategies. The organizations’ intervention is described by NGOs as an empowerment of the people. In the Palestinian context, the NGO sector, which developed in the 1980s, and increasingly during the Intifada in the early 1990s, tried to shift attention away from strategies designed to meet the urgent needs of the Palestinian population and instead focus on
establishing capacity-building projects encouraging self-reliance, rather than dependency. These organizations, as mentioned earlier, evolved out of the political mass movements and became institutionalized as part of a new NGO sector. Moreover, many NGOs were created with a vision of capacity-building in mind. Some of these were established as a response to local Palestinian initiatives but sought funding from Northern NGOs.

The “Third Generation of NGOs” according to Korten is characterized by the development of sustainable system strategies that seek change beyond the individual community. To this end they address specific policies and institutions at local, national and global levels. Their strategies focus on creating a policy and institutional setting that facilitate rather than constrain a just, sustainable and inclusive local development action. For these types of organizations, creating the necessary changes often depends on simultaneously working towards building people’s capacity to make demands on the system and towards building alliances with enlightened power holders to promote action that makes the system more responsive to the people (Korten, 1990). In the Palestinian context, many NGOs developed according to this vision that represents the third-generation organizations, mostly overlapped with second-generation organizations. Therefore, Korten’s (1990) classifications of the “Second and Third generations of NGOs“ must both be applied in conjunction with the current sector of NGOs in the Palestinian context. These organizations were established with a vision transcending the orientation to relief services (which, as we have seen, is only designed to meet the survival needs of the affected population) and targeting the strategic and long-term development needs instead. Most of these non-governmental social organizations and agencies tried to move away from what Mayadas (1987) termed the Relief/Remedial Model, the main philosophy of which stems from the belief in relief orientation. Increasingly, more NGOs started to reorganize their roles as agents in social development and in building civil society (Hammami, 1995). Since the 1990s many NGOs have started to develop programs and implement services in different social welfare and social development arenas.
They have implemented programs, which they perceive promote social development goals. Currently, there are two ways in which these projects and programs function in their relation to their donors’ organizations:

One way is for Northern NGOs to establish social development projects in a partnership with local NGOs, in which they provide money and the guiding philosophy but leave the daily project administration to the local NGOs. These Northern NGOs require local partners to be accountable to the goals and vision of the donor agency. The staff members of such organizations are usually local Palestinians who report to the Northern NGOs and are "accountable" or "answerable" to them.

In addition to programs and projects that are run as partnerships, some Northern NGOs run their own projects with the assistance of local staff, but the monitoring and the administration of the projects are left to Northern NGOs. For purposes of this research, the researcher is concerned with both of these types of organizations in the Palestinian context.

During the last 3 years, a new reality has crossed the Palestinian scene, „the Second Intifada“, in which all aspects of the Palestinian life have been disturbed by economic closure, restrictions of movement, house demolition, bombing of the PA infrastructure, the killing of and injury to a great number of people by the Israeli army. These tragic events have affected the work of NGOs and GOs in that many of these organizations have begun to direct their efforts to meet the new emerging needs of the Palestinian people. Moreover, most of the NGOs’ outreach projects have been disturbed and are being confronted with enormous difficulties due to continuous Israeli military road closures and the subsequent inaccessibility of villages and towns. All of these circumstances have influenced the work of these NGOs and even the GOs in social development. The deteriorating political, socio-economic situation and the high rate of unemployment and poverty have resulted in an increasingly severe humanitarian crisis. As a result, the attention of many NGOs has been shifting from development to emergency-oriented
activities, where long-term development perspectives are given secondary importance. It is therefore not yet clear what long-term effects these developments will have on these organizations’ operations.

Despite the lack of a systematic understanding of the real impact that NGOs have on Palestinian society, many have argued that the Palestinian NGO sector is to be considered a civil movement, essential to building Palestinian society and promoting social development (Betz, 1995; Hammami, 1995; Longland, 1994; Nimer, 1997 & Sullivian, 1996). This civil movement is considered to be manifested in the local population’s ability to participate in organizations supporting and nurturing their own community, a situation that has served as an antidote to the despotic military occupation and the activity of other official organizations aimed at isolating or excluding people from influencing policies that touch upon their own development. (Hammami, 1995). Moreover, NGOs in Palestine have emphasized their ability to reach the poorest Palestinian communities and become actively involved in helping these communities to meet their needs. NGO personnel frequently voice the belief that people are situated at the heart of their development practices and activities and not only at the receiving end of their services. At the same time they claim that the public sector or governmental organizations usually fail to meet the needs of the remote areas, while NGOs are as a rule able to do a better job through their flexible structures.

Nevertheless, the impact of these Northern NGOs and their local NGO partners is questioned and criticized by many. NGOs have not been able to substantiate their claims with empirical data. Some Palestinian scholars have argued that despite the fact that the majority of NGOs have historically been established to meet the needs of the Palestinian population, the assessment of the need has been more a top-down judgment of foreign donors or/and local experts or the elite of the Palestinian society (Haj-Yaha, 1996; Matteson, 1995; Nimer, 1997; Samara, 2001 & Taraki, 1989). This is in contradiction to claims made by NGOs that they incorporate people’s voices in
their work. Furthermore, a major critique of the NGOs is that they still operate within a supply-led welfare system in which services and programs are determined by funding sources, rather than by the needs of the people (Hammami, 1995; Matteson, 1995 & Farraj, 1995).

The literature that deals with NGOs in general does not appear to deal systematically or empirically with questions about how NGOs define concepts such as People’s participation, and about the extent to which NGOs truly incorporate a people-oriented paradigm in the practice of social development. Unfortunately, empirical literature does not provide any answers to this question. As a consequence, this study examines the issue of people’s participation in the work of Northern NGOs and their local Palestinian partners in the West Bank and Gaza strip.

1.4 Relevance of the Study to Social Work Practice

This study expects to be of a great interest and meaning to the social work profession and to social workers in Palestine. Specifically, most of the NGOs that work in social development in Palestine hire social workers on their staff. Therefore, it is important to discuss the rationale of this research study from a social work point of view.

In this context, the importance of this study to the social work field lies in the relationship between People’s participation and self-determination. The Code of Ethics of the National Association of Social Workers in the United States enjoins the professionals to foster maximum self-determination on the part of their clients (NASW, 1980). The social work profession is expected to encourage inclusion of the clients in the decisions that affect their lives. Thus, the active involvement and participation of people in the services that are provided to them are considered among the important values highlighted in the Code of Ethics for social work. In this regard, the terms self-determination and People’s participation could be used interchangeably.

As a core professional value of social work, self-determination of the clients has been debated in depth in the literature of social work. In fact, it is one of the most debated concepts of
all the intellectual principles underlying social work (Rothman, 1989). There is consensus in the western social work literature that client participation is very critical for social work intervention. Many researchers and writers have claimed that social work intervention is more effective if client participation takes place (Freedberg, 1989 & York & Itzhaky, 1991. Compton and Galloway (1979) have emphasized that the principle of client self-determination derives logically from the belief in the innate dignity of the person. The heart and scope of the concept of self-determination is that social workers should help people to meet the needs that they have identified for themselves as important objectives (Bernstein, 1960). Thus, self-determination implies that people are actively involved and participating in the decisions that affect their lives. Bernstein (1960) has argued that only through the rich, complete, thorough, and comprehensive utilization of this concept can we fully honor the value of human-worth and dignity. Therefore, he concludes it is the concern of social workers to maximize the choices for the people they serve.

Many case studies in the developing countries have shown that the practice of people’s participation in social development projects, despite many setbacks and frustrations, could maximize and operationalize the value of self-determination. Most of the literature on client participation is clearly bound up with that of self-determination (Itzhaky & York, 1994). This is due to the fact that self-determination, as a basic value in social work practice, is operationalized through client participation. In this regard, Pandey (1998) in her case study about Nepal argued that social workers should pay special attention to the importance of empowering disenfranchised marginal groups and communities of people so as to facilitate their movement into societal mainstreams by encouraging broad-based participation of poor ethnic minorities, youth, women, and children. The development of people’s capacities (and thus their empowerment) may be achieved through the active involvement and participation of the people in defining what they need and determining priorities for meeting these needs (Haq, 1995; Kondrat & Julia 1997; Korten, 1980). Kondrat and Julia (1998) are among a growing number of social work scholars
who have emphasized the importance of enlarging people’s choices in matters that are important to their communities. Therefore, the emphasis here is on participation and empowerment, which is appropriate to and consistent with the profession’s humanistic and egalitarian ideals (Bernstein, 1995).

On the other hand, in most of its Human Development Reports beginning in 1990, the UNDP (United Nation Development Program) has emphasized the active participation of individuals in the social development process. Moreover, the UNDP has claimed that the exclusion of people from their own development has been the cause of the failure of development efforts in most of the developing countries (UNDP, 1990, 1993, 1994). In the Palestinian context, the issue of People’s participation in decision-making in their development process has gained special attention in the discussion about human development (Palestine Human Development Profile, 1996-1997). As a result of the specificities of the Palestinian situation, the concept of participation in development has gained a political dimension (Palestine Human Development Profile, 1996-1997). The concept has long been viewed as a mechanism for the realization of the political rights of the Palestinian people. These rights include the rights of self-determination.

People’s participation in social development projects continues to be an issue of great concern to the social work profession and to social workers. While investigating the issue of People’s participation on social development programs, this study will shed light on the issue of participation and self-determination in the context of social development projects. In most of the social development projects in Palestine, the majority of the employees of these organizations are social workers. This study expects to add to their knowledge in the area of participation and self-determination for the people they work with.
1.5 *The Purpose of the Study*

The study looks at the international Northern (i.e. the so-called developed world) NGOs experience in the practice of participatory development in one developing context - the area under direction of the Palestinian Authority. Considering the unique social, political, cultural, and economic conditions of the Palestinian society, this study will solicit a definition of people’s participation in social development projects from the viewpoint of policy makers and administrators of non-governmental organizations in Northern donor countries assisting the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza strip. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to explore and examine how policy makers and administrators of Northern NGOs working in Palestine in development projects for the last 10 years define people’s participation in social development projects. Coupled with this, the purpose is to describe and explore the extent to which actual NGO activities and practices exhibit participatory qualities -that is to say, the extent to which participatory practices and activities are implemented in the work of local NGO partners or in the local projects that Northern NGOs run themselves. Finally, this study examines the social, political, and economic factors that contextualize such activities and practices to elicit a contextual understanding of the implementation of the concept of "people's participation".

The results of this study will help to shed light on the participatory nature of the work of Northern NGOs in the area of social development. This study is the first to look at how administrators and staff of Northern NGOs operating programs and projects in Palestine conceptualize participation. It is the first to systematically examine the actual practices and activities of personnel working for NGOs in Palestine with regard to people's participation in social development projects and programs. In addition, it is anticipated that the results of this study should assist staff and the administrators of these NGOs to examine their own definitions and how they practice participatory development.
1.6 Rationale for the Study

It is widely accepted that participation by local populations is crucial for the success of social and economic social development programs (Chambers, 1991; Esman & Uphoff, 1984; Korten & Alfonso, 1983; Lisk, 1985; Uphoff, 1991). However, there is remarkably little information and systematic evaluation of actual cases. The evidence that does exist seems to be contradictory, and the only consensus in the literature is on the need for more information. A lot of the staff of NGOs working in social development in the developing countries lack a clear understanding of the term people’s participation, therefore, the rationale for such a study is as follows:

It is recognized that Northern NGOs and their local partners in the developing countries play an important role in the preparation, design, and application of social development strategies (Padron, 1987).

1. The increasingly commonplace references in the developing countries context to the formation of civil society, one with democratic, participatory features, represent a welcome recognition of the roles of NGOs (Tandon, 1992). Advocates of the "civil society" view the citizen as an active agent rather than a passive "subject" of government rules and services. Tandon (1992) has argued that in any traditional society, the citizen was engaged in government and community life and in the production of culture, economy and society; as governments became more and more bureaucratic, the role of the citizen was reduced to that of a “client” of the state, a mere passive “consumer” of the culture, products, and policies produced by the states in the name of development. The civic and political roles of citizenship were lost. Hence, civil society re-establishes the citizen in his or her active role. This debate regarding
civil society highlights the status of NGOs and their appropriate political and ideological role in strengthening the material, institutional, and ideological bases of civil society (ibid).

2. Many development actors and scholars have been focusing on participatory approaches to social development as a critical factor in solving problems of underdevelopment in developing countries (David, 1991; Haq, 1995; Kondrat & Julia; 1997; Korten, 1980). Some have argued that grassroots participation is a critical factor in solving problems of poverty and environmental degradation (Jaitli & Brown, 1999). On the other hand, there is a recognized need among NGOs and scholars for increased knowledge and better understanding of the role of NGOs and the issue of participatory approaches to social development.

3. As many, if not most, of the workers hired by Northern NGOs in Palestine have been trained in social work, and as the issue of people’s self-determination (i.e. participation in decisions that affect their lives) is part of the tradition of the social work profession in many countries where social work is viewed as a profession (and included in the code of ethics of social work in the West and also in most developing countries who have established their own codes), the issue of people's participation in social development programs and projects is of direct relevance to the social work profession, particularly social work as practiced in the context of social development.

1.7 Objectives of the Study and Research Questions

This study is an exploratory study. In the first stage, the concept of people’s participation is explored as it is defined and conceptualized by administrators and policy makers of Northern NGOs. Therefore, the questions were given an open-ended format, where selected administrative staffs of Northern NGOs in donor countries assisting the Palestinian people in the West Bank and
Gaza Strip were asked to define and conceptualize their understanding of the concept. The open-ended questions or statements that have guided the initial investigation were based on the literature (see Appendix C).

In keeping with the Delphi technique, participants at this stage of the study were able to define and refine their concepts of participation by means of a one-focused iteration in the open-ended questionnaire. In the second phase of the study, once core concepts were defined and a consensus on the meaning of the concept "people's participation" was derived, a survey was constructed based on the core concepts gleaned from the Delphi query of NGO administrators. The questionnaire targeted social workers and development workers employed at the local NGOs sponsored by Northern NGOs. The study in the second phase explored the kind of participatory practices and activities that are actually carried out as reported by local Palestinian staff. In general, the research objectives of the study are as follows:

1. To describe and examine the variations in definitions and conceptualizations of “beneficiaries’ participation” in social development projects as perceived and conceptualized by donor Northern NGOs.
2. To classify and categorize the different definitions formulated by donor NGOs, in order to find clusters of shared themes among the different definitions.
3. To explore the definitions of social workers engaged in local Palestinian social development and social work projects regarding the concept “beneficiaries’ participation” in social development projects.
4. To explore and describe to what extent the different definitions formulated by the donors are actually expressed in practice at the local Palestinian NGO level.
5. To conduct factor analysis to identify the underlying dimensions of the concept “beneficiaries’ participation”, its practice and activities, and how it is perceived by the local Palestinian NGOs. This is done in order to examine the level at which these
different dimensions of the concept are embodied in the concepts defined and practiced by the local social workers themselves. To address in particular the question whether the dimensions of the definition of “beneficiaries’ participation” diverge in composition or rather ‘group’ together into more general aspects underlying the overall definition. In this regard, specific items in the questionnaire filled out by the local Palestinian NGOs that correlate highly are assumed to belong to that broader ‘dimension’. These dimensions become composites of specific variables, which in turn allow the dimensions to be interpreted and described.

6. To conduct factor analysis to reduce the observed variables describing “beneficiaries’ participation” activities and practices in the different stages of the social development project to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable. This is done in order to examine the different participatory activities carried out by local social workers and NGO development workers during the different stages of social development and social work projects. The question to be answered here is whether these activities are grouped in a specific way to represent specific stages of the project cycle.

7. To conduct factor analysis to reduce the observed variables describing the attitudes toward beneficiaries’ participation to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable. The question to be answered here is whether these activities are grouped in a specific way to represent specific stages of the project cycle, leading to an examination of the social workers’ general attitude toward People’s participation in social development projects.

8. If interpretable dimensions, ‘components’ or ‘factors’ are derived in the factor analysis, the following question is to be investigated: Can factor-based scores guide further interpretations of the derived factors and other comparisons between them.
1.8 Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, and to lay the basic grounds for and help guide the study, the major concepts that are dealt with are defined.

Constitutive Definitions:  

1 - People’s Participation

There is a great debate on what exactly participation means at the project level. When looking at People’s participation, two schools of thought were identified; the first school views people’s participation in projects carried out by development agencies as a way to increase the chances of successful projects. As a result, participation is seen as a means of effectively implementing initiatives where local people cooperate or collaborate on externally introduced development projects or programs (UNDP, 1997). According to this approach, participation is seen as a project means projects and not as a goal for its own sake.

The other school views participation as a goal in itself (UNDP, 1997) and links participation to tackling the structural causes of people’s poverty (Oakley, 1995). In this approach people are considered poor because they are excluded and have little influence upon the forces that affect their lives. Thus, participation is seen as a part of a process where people seek to have some influence, break their exclusion and again have access to the resources, which would help them sustain and improve their living conditions (Oakley, 1995; UNDP, 1997).

Stieffel and Wolfe (1994) have argued that the lack of conceptual clarity on the meaning of participation has contributed to ambiguities in the definition of participation among international organizations. This has resulted, according to these authors, in a growing consensus among international organizations on the need for more participation. On one end of the spectrum, participation is considered as a means of making development projects function better. This type of participation is seen by Oakley (1995) and the UNDP (1997) to be one that functions as a means to maintain the system or the status quo. On the other end one type of participation is
considered transformative by which the excluded groups confront the controllers and supporters of the existing social arrangements determining the patterns of access to resources, services, status and power, and seek a new deal (Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994). In between these two extreme types, UNRISD (1979) identified other forms or dimensions.

This study aims at dealing with all these variations, yet according to the definitions specifically formulated by the NGOs. Despite all the different definitions presented in the literature on the concept, this study will not formulate a definition of People’s participation itself. This serves the study’s purpose to try to come up with some form of core definition of people's participation (based on that of the NGO's).

2 - NGOs (Non-Governmental Organizations)

As their name indicates, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are those organizations that are not part of a government and not established as a result of an agreement between governments (Padron, 1987). NGOs can be research institutions, professional associations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, youth organizations, religious institutions, senior citizens’ associations, tourist bodies, private foundations, political parties, funding or development-international and indigenous – agencies, and any other organization of a non-governmental nature (United Nations, 1980). For the purposes of this study, we will confine our consideration of NGOs to a subset of these organizations, namely to the type of NGOs devoted specifically to the design, study and/or execution of social development programs and projects in the developing countries (in this case, the Palestinian area).

3 - Intermediary Palestinian NGOs

These are the intermediary local organizations working at the grassroots level and functioning as the connection between foreign donor agencies and the local people and communities. In this specific context, borrowing Korten’s (1987) conceptualization of NGOs, these organizations are active in social development work and are characterized by small-scale,
self-reliant local development. Korten views the focus of energies of these NGOs’ strategies to be on developing the capacities of the people to better meet their own needs through self-reliant local action. There are different kinds of intermediary NGOs in the Palestinian context, yet the ones this study is interested in are those that implement social development projects in partnership with Northern NGOs. These organizations implement projects usually funded by Northern NGOs, where the staff is Palestinian and the administration of the projects are in the hands of local Palestinians. These projects usually have a reporting system enabling their donors to monitor the projects and therefore making the local NGOs accountable to their funding organizations.

4 - Northern NGOs

In most of the developing countries, Northern NGOs are organizations from the so-called global North (including countries from North America, Europe, and Australia) with a variety of interests in promoting development in the so-called global "South". We are concerned here with those who are involved in the relief and development work of these countries. The organizations (for example, Oxfam, Save the Children Federation, Grassroots International…etc.) come from several northern nations and represent varying interests and sizes. In the Palestinian context, we refer specifically to those Northern NGOs that administrate or fund social development projects in West Bank and Gaza Strip. These projects are not only funded by these organizations, but are also administrated by them either through local partner NGOs or directly.

5 - Social Development

The meanings given to social development are diverse and varied (Dominelli, 1997). For the purpose of this study, we will use Omer’s definition (1979) expanded by the UNDP in the 1990. The reason these definitions are used is because they emphasize people’s participation in social development as critical to the success of social development goals.
“Based on principles of human dignity, equality and social justice, social development can be defined as a goal and a process that aims to achieve an integrated balanced and unified (social and economic) development of society“ (Omer, 1979). To expand Omer’s definition, UNDP (1990) has emphasized that social and human development are processes of enlarging people’s choices, and as a consequence, strategies that help people to ensure their own livelihood should be adopted (UNDP, 1990). People must participate fully in the decisions and processes that shape their lives“ (UNDP, 1995, pp. 11-13).

6 - Social development Projects

Social development projects are those projects that are implemented by either Northern NGOs or their local NGO partners (also called “intermediary” NGOs) dealing with issues of social development such as health, education, poverty reduction programs, and projects aimed at empowering special sectors of the communities such as women, children, youth, and the disabled.

7 - Staff of the NGO

Staff will be divided onto two categories.

- Those development workers in the Northern NGOs who are in direct contact with the local NGOs and are aware of their work, through reporting system or visits.
- Administrators who are in charge of developing policies of the Northern NGOs, including, directors, and supervisors.

8 - Activities and Practices of Participation

Different variations of participatory activities and practices are carried out in the different stages of the NGOs’ social development projects; their existence will be assessed through the different definitions and conceptualizations that were delineated, based on phase one of the study and on the answers of the Northern NGOs.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The debate outlined in Chapter 1 regarding the Palestinian NGOs and their comparative advantage is part of a larger debate taking place in developing countries on the role of NGOs. In general, NGOs have been thought to assist in shifting the social development paradigm from an emphasis on top-down approaches to an emphasis on participatory human development approaches (David, 1991; Carroll, 1992 & Clark, 1991). This shift has led NGOs supporters to claim that they are more able than governments and official agencies to provide an efficient and effective alternative paradigm for social development. To understand the larger theoretical framework of this debate, in the following sections we will illustrate the development of social development paradigms from economic, top-down human development approaches to those that are more people-oriented. Moreover, a closer look at the theoretical debate on people-centered paradigms will shed light on the role that NGOs play in this debate.

Thus, a critical review of the different aspects of the social development field as well as of how participation concepts developed over the time will place this study within its proper framework, and will help to clarify the concepts. In the first section we will shed more in-depth light on the different paradigms of social development, and we will look at how alternative participatory development has evolved out of frustration with the economic development
paradigms. We will see how the reality of development practice follows this same history, from top-down, technocratic strategies to more self-sustaining growth, in which they become more participatory and people-oriented.

It was claimed that participatory strategies could not have developed fully in the formal governmental sector, which has generally practiced development in a very technocratic, centralized and detached way (Wright & Nelson, 1995). As a result, the development of the NGO sector has been linked to the development of participatory development strategies. Thus, in the section on NGOs, we will discuss the link and the debate that is related to the issue how effective these NGOs are in carrying out and developing alternative participatory development programs.

Nevertheless, NGOs have not been protected from criticism, and their ability in carrying out such strategies of development has been debatable. In this section we will look at these criticisms and place them in the context of the claim that NGOs are more effective and efficient than government organizations in carrying out social development projects because they are more participatory and can reach more people.

The widespread use of the word ‘participation’ in the language of social development, and specifically its renaissance in the 1990s, has created a lot of debate over its meaning and its different ramifications in the field of social development. Therefore, it is important to address the definitions of people’s participation. At the same time, different definitions to a great extent express the different schools of thought that have existed and have addressed people’s participation in social development. These schools of thought will be highlighted and discussed to place this study in its proper terminology.

This section will conclude by laying out the specific framework of the study in its appropriate theoretical context. It will address the way in which this study will handle the theoretical debate underlying this study. It will also address the way in which this study relates
the differing ideas that are discussed to serve the purpose of this study in its specific context.

Finally, in this section the terminologies used in this study will be specified and clarified.

2.1 Different Paradigms of Social Development: From Economic Top-Down Models to More Participatory Human Social Development: An Overview

2.1.1 Development: The Concept and Paradigms Revisited

The notion of word development has remained ambiguous, polemicized, and debated (Freeman, 1989). Besides being equated with industrialization or economic growth, development has also been equated with quality of life (length of life expectancy, leisure time, public health or education and political evolution), the extent to which collective goals can be defined and implemented, and/or the degree of popular participation in decision-making (Heller, 1986). These different and sometimes contradictory affiliations of development manifest how the history of the concept and the field unfolded and developed over time. Thus, different frameworks of knowledge of development theory and practice have shaped the different development paradigms.

Chambers (1995) & Uphoff (1992) and others argue that the different paradigms of development coexist, overlap each other, coalesce and separate, although in development paradigm shifts differ from those in the physical sciences where one paradigm replaces the other. In fact for some writers, social development is considered to be a paradigm that has evolved from general development theories and models (Billups, 1994; Jayasuriya, 1997; Midgley, 1994; & Paiva, 1977). For those and others, social development is considered to be the overarching framework that expands development’s scope to include political, social, and cultural dimensions (Heller, 1986; & Helm, 1985). To be able to understand social development paradigms, it is essential to define what a “paradigm” is in order to provide the basis for the discussion on those regarding social development.

Paradigm\textsuperscript{11} is looked at as a simplified or familiar structure, which is used to gain insight into phenomena that scientists want to explain (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1996). Paradigms give
explanations, and they may be value-laden, based on a specific ideological orientation. As Jevons (1973) argues, a paradigm is a line of thought carrying a set of assumptions and guidelines, a way of seeing problems; therefore, paradigms guide the terms of thought and the type of analysis for a given set of phenomena. Notwithstanding, paradigms suggest what kinds of solutions are acceptable and what kinds of problems can be addressed (Shuftan, 1988). We will rely on Chambers’ (1995) summary of the notion paradigm in which he stated that the term ‘paradigm’ could be used to mean a pattern of ideas, values, methods and behavior that fit together and are mutually reinforcing.

In this regard, it is not strange that the word development has been defined differently, depending on the paradigm from which it is looked at. Moreover, the word has also evolved and many variations of it have appeared one of the latest is in human social development. Thus, it is worthwhile to present a sample of these definitions, which represents the different paradigms of development thinking.

Webb (1972) defined development as the process by which both persons and societies come to realize the full potential of human life in the context of social justice, with an emphasis on self-reliance and economic growth as one of the means for carrying this process forward. On the other hand, Dichter (1986) viewed it as an effort made by outsiders to assist the “Third World” in altering the conditions that maintain low productivity and poverty. Heller (1986) contends that “development is a process in which people and their communities change to improve their lives in material but also other ways - economic, social, at times technological, and political (i.e., related to the decision-making process)” (p. 3). In contrast, Omer (1979) emphasized that the basic principles of social development are human dignity, equality, and social justice. On the same line, the United Nations Development Program has promulgated human social development as a paradigm of thinking which is concerned more with people than with things (UNDP, 1990). Amartya Sen’s work as economist has broadened the perspective of economists; his critique of
welfarism, his concept of capabilities and his contributions to development economics have found expression in the UNDP’s reports (Atkinson, 1999). Sen, along with Martha Nussbaum, have introduced a new way of looking at development through capabilities. Sen defines basic capabilities as “a person being able to do certain things” (1980, p.367). For Nussbaum the central question asked by this approach is “what the person is able to do and to be” (Nussbaum, 2002).

Sen (1993) emphasizes

“The freedom to lead different types of life is reflected in the person’s capability set. The capability of a person depends on a variety of factors, including personal characteristics and social arrangements. A full accounting of individual freedom must, of course go beyond the capabilities of personal living and pay attention to the person’s other objectives (e.g. social goals not directly related to one’s own life), but human capabilities constitute an important part of individual freedom” (p.33).

Hence, the capability approach stresses that development concerns allowing persons to function fully; so the approach deals not only with existing resources but with people who do or do not go to work, enabling these persons to function (Nussbaum, 2002).

Based on the ideas of Sen and Nussbaum, Al-Haq -who is considered one of the architects of the human development concept - provides a definition for development, he states:

“The ultimate goal of a society’s development is the well-being of its people, and well-being is defined in terms of people’s ability to have real choices about such things as living a long and healthy life, becoming educated, being able to enjoy a decent standard of living, having political freedom and guaranteed human rights, and a right to self-respect” (UNDP, 1990, p.10).

Each of these above different definitions has a different focus in looking at development. Thus, different development strategies were implemented to achieve different goals. The basic economic model has seen development as an objective and as a goal where there are desired ends that should be sought (So, 1990); while the people-oriented paradigm has seen development as a process where people are seen at the heart of this process (Heller, 1986).
After considering these approaches to definitions, the questions appearing would be: Is there a dominant or monopolistic paradigm in development; is development a multidisciplinary paradigm; or does each contributing discipline have its own paradigm of development (Shuftan, 1988). In order to answer these questions, we should recognize the fact that these paradigms tend to overlap and coexist. Therefore, the discussion of development paradigms needs to address the different schemes or ways of explaining development. Some of these schemes may be well developed conceptually, while others may not be so well conceptualized. We will explain how different disciplines contribute to different paradigms of development, and how development is explained or viewed in different ways, based on each discipline’s focus. This all will lead us to discuss the participatory development paradigm and how it has evolved. This discussion of paradigms will help to set the basis for the discussion of that paradigm which will be used as the framework for this study. Since we cannot discuss people’s participation in development in isolation of its origins and its evolution in the area of development thinking, it is important to understand within the larger framework of development thinking.

2.1.2 The Economic Paradigm

During the second half of this past century, economic growth was emphasized as a major objective of economic policy and the dominant paradigm for development in the developing countries (Arndt, 1987). This model has been known as the ‘Economic Growth Model’, which claimed that in order to create a larger pie rather than a “redistributing misery”, economic progress has to be sought (Rostow, 1968). The theoretical heritage of this economic approach can be traced from a variety of economical and sociological origins (So, 1990).

One of the major influences on this economic model has been from classical evolutionary theory as influenced by Comte, which assumed that social change is unidirectional; that is, human society invariably moves in one direction from a primitive to an advanced state, thus the fate of
human evolution is predetermined. Comte’s schema imposes a value judgment on the evolutionary process, in which movement toward the final phase is considered to be good because it represents progress, humanity, and civilization.

Another influence is represented by the functionalist theory, which was influenced by Parsons. According to Parsons, society strives for homeostasis among its various components; therefore there are constant interactions among institutions to maintain homeostatic equilibrium (Parsons, 1951). Moreover, Parsons has formulated the concept “pattern variables” to distinguish traditional societies from modern societies. According to Parsons, these variables are the key social relations, which are enduring, recurring, and embedded in the cultural system. The sociological influences on this economic model can also be seen in Levy’s scheme on relatively modernized societies. Therefore, the economic model is known also for its roots in the modernization theory. According to Levy (1967), modernization is defined by the extent to which tools and inanimate resources of power are utilized. Levy distinguishes relatively modernized societies and relatively non-modernized societies as two locations at the opposite ends of a continuum, and he treats modernization as a universal social solvent.

Rostow has also been another influence on the development of the economic. Rostow has identified five stages of economic growth: these stages begin with traditional society and end with high mass-consumption society. In the middle, between these two poles of development, there is what Rostow calls the „the takeoff stage“ (Rostow, 1964). The very fact that economists evolved their theories from very early times on has given them a head start over other social scientists as those recognized experts on development who have largely influenced the field (Arndt, 1987; & Hulme and Turner, 1990). Consequently, economics has taken the lead in establishing the major theories, practices and prescriptions of development, which has been the major focus of development theorizing (Midgley, 1984 & Hulme & Turner, 1990).
The above-mentioned origins of the economic model have resulted in not only considering economic growth as a necessary condition to modernization and prosperity, but also to social development. As a result, maximization of economic production was considered the basic goal for development, and development in turn became equated with progress and growth. The belief that development is equated with economic growth was emphasized largely in the period after World War Two when Harry S. Truman, the president of the United States, launched his plan for development and divided the world between those who were ‘modern’ and ‘developed’ and those who were not.

According to Escobar, the state of underdevelopment started in the developing countries with this division. ‘Modern’ became the standard against which other societies were judged. That assumed that the underdeveloped world had only to follow the example of the ‘modern’ world. In addition, as McMichael (1996) notes, the emphasis on economic growth allowed for the application of a universal standard to national development.

The perception of development as economic growth was further emphasized by the advent of the first United Nations Development Decade in 1961, in which the equation of development with economic growth was promoted (Billups, 1994; & Heller, 1986). The First Development Decade sought a 5% minimum annual growth rate in GNP of countries receiving development aid (Helm, 1985). The economic system was the only target of the first development decade. It was assumed that economic development as a process brought about by industrialization has a welfare component, suggesting that development would enhance people’s incomes and as a result would improve their lives by enhancing educational levels, housing conditions, and health status (Midgely, 1995). In this regard, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) established within this paradigm of thinking appeared as instruments to implement projects whose main goal was economic growth.
Many developing countries that have had to come grips with either the problems of income inequality or environmental destruction that economic growth entailed have had to realize that the promise of meeting social needs as a result of economic growth was an impossible dream. Therefore, the ‘trickle-down effect’ promised by economic growth and which was to reach all sectors of the society, especially the poor ones, has failed to take place. In many developing societies, the policies and practices that were adopted to achieve economic growth, even if they have brought some growth, have in general generated highly stratified societies (Lusk & Hoff, 1994), and have proven to be disastrous to the disadvantaged sectors of the society and to the environment. Social injustices persisted in spite of economic growth. Improvement in the quality of life was neither a major goal, an end result, nor even a by-product of economic growth. This caused some disillusionment with economic policies as the source of social development (Helm, 1985; Midgley, 1995).

2.1.3 Dependency Paradigm

By the late 1960s, the experiences of developing countries opened a fundamental challenge to the entire mainstream paradigm of developmentalism. These experiences have shown that economic growth does not by itself lead to improved living standards for the majority (Clark, 1991). Issues of redistribution of income, equity, and justice in the development process may have begun to be addressed. As a result, development thinkers started to recognize that the problems with Third World States were less due to ‘traditional attitudes’ but due more to a combination of other historical, socio-economic and political factors, which have influenced the developing countries (Manzo, 1991). These factors were manifested in economic and political domination of the nations of the North over Third World countries of the South, which have resulted in imperialist policies, resource inequalities, inequities in international trade, biases in international lending, greed on the part of the multinationals, and so forth (Frank, 1986).
An alternative paradigm was sought. A variety of new perspectives have been employed to understand and address the development crisis. One of the major approaches is the dependency paradigm. This paradigm was found in Marxist-influenced literature from Latin America, which came to be referred to as the dependency school (Frank, 1986). Dependency perspective places responsibility for underdevelopment on external and political factors (Sharma, & Walz, 1992). It considers colonization and exploitation as the reasons behind underdevelopment in developing countries. Moreover, dependency approach was considered to perceive development from a Third World perspective (So, 1990).

The main assumptions, key concepts, and basic strategies of the dependency paradigm are derived from neo-Marxist ideas (Midgley, 1984): These could be summarized as follows:

1. Underdevelopment in the third World resulted not only in the subjugation of indigenous institutions but in their transformation and integration into the world capitalist system (Frank, 1968). Therefore, the regions that were most exposed to colonial influences are today the most backward. A prominent dependency writer, Frank (1986) introduced the idea that the presence and dominance of the Western World in the history of the Third World countries, culminating in colonization, itself created underdevelopment. Frank stressed that underdevelopment was caused by the loss of economic surplus to foreigners (with surplus defined simply as the difference between production and consumption).

2. The use of metropolis-satellite relations, where the economic surplus is transferred from the periphery (the South) to the center (the North) is considered exploitive. The Third World strategy for economic development would therefore require detaching itself from the center (Midgley, 1984). According to Scott, “For dependency theory, rationalized
revolutionary politics by a subordinated class of men promises to break the hold of stagnation and usher in self-reliant, self-creating, and autonomous development” (1995, p 5).

3. According to the dependency paradigm, underdevelopment in the developing countries is a dynamic and continuing consequence of enrichment for the industrial world (Midgley, 1984). It is the result of the flow of economic surplus from Third World countries to Western capitalist countries (So, 1990).

4. In this regard dependency school refuses to accept the assumptions of the modernization theorists, which perceive underdevelopment as an original state of backwardness. Instead, they argue that the transfer wealth from these regions to the metropolitan centers, beginning in the fifteenth century with colonialism, was what impoverished the Third World 16 (So, 1990).

Despite the new dependency studies (Cardoso, 1973), which tried to re-examine the relationship between dependence and development, some dependency theorists still strongly hold to the belief that no development is possible in dependency. Nevertheless, the dependency school advocates government-enforced policies of redistribution and nationalization of host corporations. It advocates significant political-economic reforms to enhance welfare goals along with economic growth (Palley, 1984). The role of the state according to dependency school is very important; one study by O’Donnell (as cited in So, 1990) emphasized the role of authoritarian government and examined the internal forces and dynamics in addition to the external ones. Although advocates of the dependency approach have proposed a radical strategy of socialist revolution in order to eradicate this externally imposed dependency situation (So, 1990), they have been unable to provide either a sound basis for social planning or a clear conception of welfare in the developing countries (Midgley, 1984). The fact that socio-economic problems continue to
escalate in the developing countries despite three decades of development efforts - problems of
debt, famine, environmental devastation, genocide, and civil war, to name but a few - dependency
theorists have not been able to offer either a convincing explanation for these conditions or a set
of propositions for solving them.

2.1.4 Moving Away from Perceiving Development from an Economic Point of View

Dissatisfaction with mainstream paradigms and strategies became widespread within the
development community during the early 1970s (Brohman, 1996). In fact, neither the economic
growth strategies for development, which were part of the modernization paradigm, nor the
enforced government policies of redistribution and nationalization advocated by the dependency
paradigm have succeeded to improve the economic welfare of the mass population in developing
countries (ibid.).

The realization that economic growth does not necessarily mean a better distribution of
income and services inspired the second UN Development Decade in the 1970s. The Second UN
Development Decade stated “What development implies for the developing countries is not
simply an increase in productive capacity but major transformations in their social and economic
structures” (Omer, 1979, p. 14). As a result of the realization of the fact that economic
development should be accompanied by an attendant degree of social progress 17, the social
dimensions of development began to be recognized in the development field (Hardiman &
Midglely, 1982; & Helm, 1985). As a result, throughout the 1970s and part of the 1980s, the
term social development started to emerge. The emphasis on social and human needs that marked
the Second Development Decade of the United Nations, the Basic Human Needs Approach18
emerged to broaden the concept of development to include all spheres of economic life, such as
employment and education, health and housing (Heller, 1986; & Streeten, 1981). Also, a concern
over equity and redistribution of wealth has contributed to the adoption of the basic human needs
approach, which has tried to tackle the social conditions of the poorest people in the poor countries (Tang, 1996). Basic needs emphasized the importance of meeting a core of human needs as an early priority in development strategy and poverty reduction. However, the basic-needs approach was silent on what should occur after basic needs were met (Jolly, 1998).

Thus, other concepts such as grass-roots development, human development, measures of welfare, social indicators, social aspects of economic development, human capabilities and new bargains with the rich countries (Helm, 1985) began to emerge. Furthermore, social development started to be distinguished by its emphasis on growth and change and its attempts to foster welfare within the context of wider efforts to promote economic development (Midgley, 1994). Midgley further argued that the most distinctive feature of social development is its attempt to harmonize social policies with measures designed to promote economic development.

Omer (1979) and Singh (1981) identified this new emphasis as a unified approach to development and recognized that it had started to gain prominence in the development field. Also, the term “integrated development” came into popular usage (Midgley, 1995). Development has started to be conceived as having two main components -- economic development and social development (Omer, 1979). It was assumed that the unified approach brings all elements together into harmony. These elements could be summed up as economic growth, expansion of economic capacity and utilization of human power, social and institutional change, balanced social development, and integration between the modern and unorganized sectors of the national economy (Midgley, 1995; Omer, 1979; & Singh, 1981). Such a paradigm is said to consider a synthesis of the social, economic, cultural, and political realities of human beings and their societies (David, 1991), with the recognition that people’s reality is not fragmented as it seems when we look at it. This approach looks at people and their living conditions in a unified pattern, yet harmonizing the economic and social objectives of the human being. In addition, the capability approach developed by Amartya Sen and by Martha Nussbaum
offered another base for upon which development could be considered, one that basically criticizes the welfarism and utilitarianism that the development approach has been based on (Gasper 1997).

As a result of this shift of focus, development, instead of being equated with industrialization or economic growth, started to be equated with quality of life (length of life expectancy, leisure time, public health, education and political evolution), the extent to which collective goals can be defined and implemented, and/or the degree of popular participation in decision making (Heller, 1986). This shift was clearly manifested in the emergence of new development strategies. Strategies such as Basic Human Needs, (BHN), redistribute now, ‘grow later’ strategy, or growth with redistribution, or the “Development from Tradition” approach, as well as the capabilities approach questioned the line of thinking adopted by the economic growth model (Heller, 1986; Jolly, 1998; & Sen, 1980). All these approaches questioned the claim that distributive justice would flow from trickle-down economic policies or even welfare policies, and proposed that equity as well as growth must be planned as a direct objective of development strategy. A brief summary of these strategies is as follows:

1. Basic Human Needs: (BHN): This strategy involves an emphasis on the satisfaction of not only the physical but also the emotional and psychological needs, such as dignity and self-reliance (Streeten, 1981). This strategy of development emphasizes the right of people to participate in their own development decisions and achieve a sense of self-reliance. The underlying value of this approach is in recognizing that the interrelationship of economic, social, environmental, and political factors would lead to practices promoting integrated development (Heller, 1986). Moreover, the Basic Needs Approach stressed the need to mobilize the social and political power of the poor and to permit full participation in the design, execution, and monitoring of anti-poverty projects (Streeten, 1981). Spalding (1990) further explained the relationship between
meeting basic needs and economic growth. He considered that meeting basic needs has a role in stimulating economic activity and even more, in increasing government’s ability to mobilize the population around its policies.

2. Redistribute now, ‘grow later’ strategy: Also called the growth with redistribution approach. This approach denies that distributive justice can flow from trickle-down or even welfare policies. Instead, it advocates that equity as well as growth must be planned as a direct objective of development strategy (Heller, 1986).

3. “Development from Tradition” approach: This approach favors the indigenous development of goals: not ‘borrowing’ goals from ‘developed’ Western societies but rather defining them from within the latent dynamism of the native community’s value system, namely, its traditional beliefs, meanings, local institutions, and popular practices, i.e. the society’s own images of the good life (Grabowski, 1989). This view suggests that modern ideas, goods, and services should be accepted only if they are concomitant with traditional values.

4. Capabilities approach has provided a new base for thinking about the goals of development (Nussbaum, 2000). Despite being an economist, Sen recognized clearly that the social dimension of development had been woefully neglected (Gore, 1997; & Sugden, 1993). Sen advocated adopting new measures to understand development; he argued that capabilities provide us with an attractive way of understanding the normative content of the idea of development (Sen. 1999). In his paper, “Equality of What?” he argued that evaluations of equality should not be solely based on information about people’s sense of happiness or fulfillment of desire, or on their attainment of primary goods. Rather they should include objective features of the way people actually live (e.g. whether they are cold or hungry) (Gore, 1997). He proposed that some notion of basic capabilities should be considered in the evaluation of equality,
and defined basic capabilities as a “person being able to do certain thing” (Sen, 1980, p.367). The empirical implementation of the capability approach was manifested in the Human Development Index, published by the United Nations Development Program (Atkinson, 1999). The measures of life expectancy at birth, literacy, and real income per head have been greatly influenced by Sen’s concept of capability (ibid).

These above-mentioned strategies represent efforts to uncouple the direct, exclusive relationship between economic growth and development, in order to make room in development programs for other considerations, such as distributional equity and poverty alleviation, basic needs provisions, capabilities realizing, and the adoption of appropriate technologies (Brohman, 1996; & Robins, 1990).

While efforts to promote the social development approach in both industrial and developing countries were being made in the late 1970s, the ascendancy of the Radical Right impeded these attempts (Glennerster & Midgley, 1991). Thus, the strategies that have emphasized the importance of involvement of governments in the social welfare of their people in order to insure more redistributive justice were challenged by the market economy approach (Midgley, 1994). As a result, the belief that government alone should be responsible for social development attracted a great deal of opposition. This new realization was substantiated by the fact that in developing countries overall, growth had fallen from 5.9% to 3.9%. In the wake of economic turmoil, many developing countries have backed away from developmental projects, particularly those of a so-called social development nature (Sharma, & Walz, 1992).

In addition, in many places, the old faith resurfaced in the trickling down effects of economic growth as a means to alleviate (Portes, 1996), and the old argument that the welfare of the population is automatically enhanced as a natural result of economic growth started to reemerge. This time, it was inspired by the neo-liberal economic [turned neo-conservative]
conceptual framework, which has praised the market-oriented approach (Portes, 1996). The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) heavily supported this approach, and it involved several strategies. These strategies included: the liberalization of the capital market, with extensive privatization and restructuring and downscaling of state-supported social programs, which focus on compensatory schemes for the neediest groups (Midgley, 1994; & Portes, 1996). Nevertheless, the realization that these cuts in investment in social services have had devastating effects on the majority of the poor people in the developing countries has characterized the new era of development thinking and theorizing.

2.1.5 The Alternative Paradigm of Development: Human Social Development with its Focus on People’s Participation.

The problems of poverty and social deprivation have again reached serious proportions. Cutbacks in social investments, the privatization of social programs, and the abandonment of social planning have all contributed significantly to the increase in unmet social needs which characterized the 1980s (Midgley, 1994). Despite the prevailing anti-interventionist climate, social issues were again placed on the development agenda in the late 1980s (Midgley, 1993, 1994, 1995). While Northern thinkers were struggling with the “impasse in development” (Schuurman, 1990), Escobar argues that Southern scholars rejected the entire economic paradigm (as cited in Crush, 1995). Midgley (1994) argues that the emphasis on development and the attempt to link social programs with economic development also characterize the concept’s historical evolution. As a result, the new focus of development, as argued by many, should not be restricted to the economic dimension but also be extended to social development, together with a belief in interventionism and a universal macro-focus on communities and societies (Midgley, 1994). In this regard, new conceptions have become emphasized. Concepts such as sustainable development, capacity building, capabilities approach, participatory development, and human development were more than attempts to replace the top-down thinking of development. In
addition, they were responses to the failure of the economic models in finding solutions to the ever-increasing problems of the developing countries. On the other hand, the focus on the social dimension of development was highlighted in development practice and theory (Midgley, 1995; & Clark, 1991). In the following section we will provide an overview of these concepts and their role in development thinking and practice.

One of those concepts is the notion of sustainable development, which has gained currency in development circles. The term sustainable development first appeared in 1987 in the World Commission on Environment and Development report, which is referred to as the Brundtland Commission. The report called for new conceptions of development to fulfill the material needs of the present generation without depriving future generations of the resources required to satisfy their needs. Estes (1993) argued that sustainable development has replaced concepts such as modernization, growth, progress, and accelerated development, to be considered as a unifying concept. Sustainable development challenged the idea that economic growth of itself can solve the pressing social problems facing society (ibid). Indeed, the proponents of sustainable development have criticized harshly the relentless pursuit of growth and profits for the damage this singular drive has caused to both the environment and human beings (Midgley, 1994).

UNDP (1992) identified the requirements for achieving the goal of sustainable development: elimination of poverty; reduction in population growth; more equitable distribution of resources; healthier, more educated and better trained people; decentralized and more participatory government; more equitable, liberal trading systems within and among countries; and better understanding of the diversity of ecosystems, including locally adapted solutions to environmental problems and better monitoring of the environmental impact of development activities.

The concept of human development has presented a challenge to the primacy of sustainable development in the hierarchy of development concepts, which was considered the most recent
term in the context of development concepts, synonymous for social development (Estes, 1993 & Midgley, 1994). In this regard “adjustment with a human face” has been put forward, and many UN organizations have taken the lead in advancing it, especially the UNDP, which took the intellectual lead in developing some of the analytical tools and statistical data by which to assess the quality of development from a human perspective (Rahman, 1995). Since 1990 the UNDP Human Development Reports Series has argued that “people are the real wealth of a nation”, and has contrasted conventional economic indicators (such as Gross National Product or per capita income) with others (such as food security, employment, military expenditure, literacy, mortality rate, life expectancy at birth and educational performance), to produce a composite Human Development Index (HDI). Actually the Human Development Index, published by the United Nations Development Program, based on life expectancy at birth, literacy, and real income per head, has been greatly influenced by Sen’s concept. The first of these dimensions has been the subject of considerable work by Sen himself (Atkinson, 1999).

The United Nations Development Program was the first to use the term “human development” in their Human Development Report for 1990 (UNDP, 1990). The 1990 UNDP Report stated that “civil and political rights tend broadly to correlate with equitable economic arrangements…(and) therefore…that civil and political freedoms are an essential element of human development, not an optional extra” (UNDP, 1990). Human development has been defined in successive Human Development Reports as "a process of expanding people's choices, opportunities and strengthening their human capabilities". This is not an abstract process. The successive Human Development Reports have emphasized the centrality of expanding people's choices and opportunities to live long, healthy, and creative lives. They have also emphasized important dimensions of human development: participation, co-operation, equity, sustainability, and security (Jolly, 1998).
So the basic objective of human development, according to the UNDP Human Developments Reports, is to increase the range of people’s choices towards making development more democratic and participatory (UNDP, 1990). Such choices include better access to income and employment opportunities, education and health, and a wholesome environment. In this report a great emphasis was put on the importance of people’s options to participate in decision making and to enjoy civil and political and economic, social and cultural rights. UNDP’s 1995 Report introduced the Gender-Related Development Index (GDI). This was based on factors such as the female share of earned income, as well as educational performance and participation in public and political life (as cited in Eade, 1997, pp. 15-17). UNDP’s reports have, therefore, helped to show that economic growth is a necessary but insufficient condition for human development. Their new vision has been influenced by many emerging theories, especially the Capabilities Theory of Sen and Nussbaum which states that in order to enlarge the capacity for choice, all women and men can become agents of change (as cited in Eade, 1997), and capability should entail that individuals in the society be provided with conscious social choices by governments (Sen, 1985).

In this regard, during the mid 1980s, and increasingly in the 1990s, a human development paradigm with a focus on people-oriented approaches began to influence development thinking and practice (Brohman, 1996; UNDP, 1996; & Uphoff, Cohen, & Goldsmith, 1979). Concepts such as participatory development, people’s participation, or popular participation – all considered as variations connoting the involvement and participation of people in their own development – are increasingly being considered in development thinking and practice. The great dissatisfaction with the old economic and top-down paradigms which dominated development thinking from the end of World War II until the late 1960s was to a great extent linked to their lack of interest in involving people in their own development.
The people-centered paradigm began to emerge as a response to the previous mechanistic model (UNDP, 1996). While the mainstream approaches to development equated economic growth with development and adopted top-down strategies, the alternative approach called for a bottom-up strategy in which poor people are not only targeted but also have a central and active role in the development process, and in which they are considered the most important actors in their own development (Korten, 1987, 1990). The human development paradigm, therefore, with its emphasis on people’s participation in development began to emerge as the main strategy and principle in development in general. In addition, participation has become the key concept in the people-centered approach to development, which has dominated the field of development in the last 3 decades (Brown, 1985; Cohen & Uphoff, 1977; Korten, 1990; & UNRISD, 1979).

Thus, the alternative paradigm not only transcends the modernization paradigm, but also the Marxist and dependency paradigms. Trainer (1996) has summarized the four principles underlying the alternative paradigm. These are: sustainability, building simple systems that use local resources, the preservation of cultural uniqueness, and people’s participation. To some extent the principle of people’s participation encompasses all the other principles, as a way in which all the other three principles are to be achieved.

In practice, the shift in paradigm towards empowering participation has been facilitated by new practices, including participatory action research (PAR) and many other research appraisals that have been developed to express the values of people’s participation. Kondrat and Julia (1997) outlined comparative elements of people-centered or human social development and participatory action research. They found many common elements. Both share the worldview that inequalities result in the marginalization and disempowerment of weaker sectors, separating them from the arenas in which decisions are made and resources are distributed. Both approaches focus on the need for greater participation and the empowerment of people. Both approaches also call for increased access to the decision-making process, and their methods of participation and
social action aim at the social and material betterment of the weakest sector of the society. The purpose of both approaches is to collectively investigate social reality in order to transform it through encouraging self-reliance and the realization of people’s full potential. Both value the economic and social well being of all sectors of the society; they value social justice, the democratic, participatory process, self-reliance, capacity building, and the cultural and historical relevance of strategies and technologies. According to the epistemology of both approaches, they share the idea that knowledge and technology are not culture-neutral. Therefore the social context must be accounted for in inquiry and in applying of knowledge in development, since knowledge is considered to be constructed socially (Kondrat & Julia, 1997, pp. 36-37).

To summarize, most of the alternative paradigm development strategies mentioned earlier emphasize the right of people to participate in their development, and seek to promote a sense of self-reliance. These approaches stress integrated development - in that the interrelationship of economic, social, environmental, and political factors is emphasized, by which any efforts to improve one thing must include the wider goal of improving everything. These approaches promoted bottom-up, or participatory development strategies that they considered more likely to reach the most underprivileged elements in the community (Crush, 1995).

Therefore, we will discuss the alternative paradigm with its focus on people’s participation.

2.2 The Focus On People’s Participation in The Human Social Development Paradigm And The Research Methodologies that are Associated with the Paradigm

It is argued that the value of people’s participation in development stems not only from such idealistic considerations as basic human rights or “the rejection of authoritarian and paternalistic alternatives”, but also from an inherent strength of participation as a means of articulating genuine needs and satisfying them through self-reliance and mass mobilization (Ghai, 1988). Since the 1990s, there has been a plethora of literature dealing with the issue of people’s participation in social development projects. This growing interest is based on the fact that
participation is considered a key issue in the alternative paradigm of social development. This paradigm shows the changes that have taken place in the field of development, from take-off, economic, top-down practices of development to a more people-oriented and participatory development (Chambers, 1995). What is unique about this new paradigm is its recognition of people as the primary actors in development, as opposed to the mainstream development paradigms, which looked at people as objects of change (Chambers, 1995). Since development is considered a form of change that takes place in society, in social development theory the concept of change is therefore fundamental. Thus, current attempts to develop a sociological theory of social change which pays due attention to people and to their active roles in their own lives are perceived to stem from a focus on people as social actors and subjects of their own change (Long, 1990). This approach primarily emphasizes people and their roles in the social processes. People are viewed as actors, as able to formulate decisions, to act upon them and take responsibility for innovation and experimentation (Long, 1990). As a consequence, it becomes possible to explain different responses to similar structural circumstances. As a new theoretical framework, unlike the other ones this paradigm attempts to examine how people are positioned in the society, how they act in these roles, how they perceive their constraints and act to overcome them (ibid.). It is recognized that people’s actions and behaviors are also based on their positions in society, their ethnicity, class, or gender (Hulme & Turner, 1990). According to Hulme & Turner (1990), this approach does not fall into the trap of generalization, because people’s positions in their own societies vary, and as a result encompass a wide range of behaviors and responses. To build on this idea, some explanations may apply to one country/society and yet may not apply to another, even if they both face similar conditions and circumstances (ibid).

Chambers (1995) argues that in theory, this shift from a paradigm of things to a paradigm of people entails much change: Top-down becomes more bottom-up and the transfer of packages of technology is replaced by the presentation of baskets of choice. As a result, people’s
participation in their own social development has become very popular in the last two decades. Chambers (1995) summaries the reasons behind this popularity. According to Chambers, these newer ideas stem from the recognition that

“Many development failures originate in attempts to impose standard top-down programs and projects on diverse local realities where they do not fit or meet needs; concern for cost-effectiveness, recognizing that the more local people do, the less capital costs are likely to be; preoccupation with sustainability, and the insight that if local people themselves design and construct they are more likely to meet running costs and undertake maintenance; and ideologically for some development professionals, the belief that it is right that poor people should be empowered and should have more command over their lives” (p.30-32).

Hence, the alternative human development paradigm has changed development thinking and has contributed to revising development directions (Clark, 1991). The assumption of the paradigm is decentralization and empowerment (Chambers, 1986a; Friedmann, 1992). And development was perceived to be a process which seeks to transform the social and political reality of the powerless by engaging them in the struggle for emancipation on a larger -national and international - terrain (Friedmann, 1992). The alternative human development paradigm has manifested not only a shift in the philosophy of how development should be practiced, but has also highlighted the need for alternative ways of accumulating knowledge in the field of social development (Kondrat & Julia, 1997). Recognizing the fact that traditional research methods exclude people from the investigating processes of their lives, the alternative human development approach has emphasized the need to shift the way research is conducted. It is argued that since knowledge is linked to politics, and thereby to power, the question of who participates in the process of inquiry becomes a potentially emancipatory one (Hall, 1981). Thus, research can be a powerful tool both for those who have access to its procedures and those who may benefit from its conclusions (Kondrat & Julia, 1998). And since it is recognized that knowledge is power (Fals Borda, 1988 & Kondrat, 1994), the call is for conditional theories that are grounded in research
on people and their specific situations, which may be generalized to other situations if conditions are met (Fals Borda, 1988). In an attempt to go beyond the polarity of an objectivist realism and ‘anything goes relativism’, Kvale (1995) argues for an approach involving the view that all concepts of knowledge, truth, reality are relative to a specific theoretical framework, form of life, or culture, where knowledge is sought through rational argument in a process of discourse. In this regard, many call for a type of knowledge building approach in which the researcher does not attempt to control people’s responses by designing the research in such a way as to provide his/her own answers to questions (Chambers, 1986a). This demands for a type of a research, which involves the people as a part of partnership (ibid.). The call is for a transformative and proactive type of research which does not aim to control people or force them to ‘adjust to the world’, thus inhibiting their creative power (Freire, 1970). The scope of people’s involvement extends beyond such passive roles as vessels for information storage or objects of intervention (Freire, 1973). This approach as perceived by Freire 22, aims at raising consciousness and empowering people to act in changing their own reality 23.

Base on this, many participatory processes and tools such as participatory action research (PAR), rapid rural appraisal, SARAR 24 (World Bank, 1996)) and gender analysis were created to enable development practitioners to work effectively with the poor (Long, 2001). Freire’s work and that of others engaged in empowering the poor to change their conditions and shape their own lives were shared with others and contributed to the early body of knowledge on popular participation and self-reliant development. Some argue that the genesis of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) and rapid rural appraisal (RRA), including their proto-types, are connected to those individuals who initiated action programs in agriculture and agro-forestry in Africa and Latin America (Chhetri, 1996). However, it is largely recognized that these methods were mainly influenced by the work of participation pioneers such as Freire (Long, 2001). While these egalitarian/equitable tools became quite useful since they contributed to a swift understanding of
community issues for outsiders whose biggest constraint was time (Chhetri, 1996), they have gained a great popularity in the field of social development (Long, 2001). As a result, emerging practitioners in social development believe that PRA, RRA and their variants provide undisputed solutions to the practice of development (Chhetri, 1996).

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is considered a research approach which follows the principles of the alternative paradigm and which also has had and influence on the direction the paradigm has taken. PAR is considered a possible strategy for using scientific methods in solving practical problems in a way that contributes to general social science theory and knowledge (Brown & Tandon, 1983; & Vandenberg & Fear, 1983). PAR is also perceived as a paradigm, which maximizes people’s involvement in knowledge building on behalf of their own social development, and allows people to define their own development and not be dependent on the state (Fals Borda, 1988; Hall, 1981 & Kondrat and Julia, 1997). The emphasis in PAR is on participation, which means sharing in the way research is conceptualized (Brown & Tandon, 1983). It means ownership-responsible agency in the production of knowledge and the improvement of practice, and thus has a commitment to improving social conditions (Hall, 1981). This type of research is conducted with, or alongside those people whose lives will be affected (Kondrat and Julia, 1997). Moreover, PAR is considered social action and change-oriented, because it represents a collective search for knowledge which promotes collective action (Kondrat and Julia, 1998). Hence, it entails constructivist epistemology: What one knows and how one knows it are functions of a social context and social cultural position (Hall, 1981). Therefore, indigenous understanding of the entire research process on the part of all participants is established through PAR (Hall, 1981). As a result, participation in the inquiry process helps assure that decisions based on research are relevant to the cultural conditions of the people who are presumed to benefit (Vandenberg & Fear, 1983). Thus, top-down research is often absent from the historical and cultural authenticity that the process of PAR is said to include (Hall,
The maximization of contextual and cultural relevance that many advocates of PAR call for is viewed as essential to the human development model. This approach to research fits the alternative paradigm in that the people who are affected by proposed changes in their own development should contribute to defining their needs and be consulted in determining appropriate action (Kondrat & Julia, 1998). The people are therefore perceived as creators of knowledge, and the emphasis is on the usefulness of knowledge for people’s self-development as well as on the advancement of a formal body of knowledge (Brown & Tandon, 1983). Here, people are not treated as objects; they become co-investigators in developing, conducting, and evaluating research (Chambers, 1986a). The role of the researcher becomes that of catalyst and supporter of people in their exploration of social conditions and needs. This approach to research considers that the collective analysis of life experiences produces knowledge more reflective of actual social conditions than simply data collected and analyzed by an isolated researcher. It is argued that if research is conducted with this understanding, then our knowledge of social change will be improved through understanding people’s experiences of change and the ways they make sense out of their lives, which in turn lead to the improvement of theories of social change and processes.

Kondrat & Julia (1997) have argued that it is not strange that PAR had its origins in the developing countries and in the people’s struggle to resist the dehumanizing elements of early development models. The above writers have drawn close comparisons between human social development and PAR and concluded that PAR philosophy, values and goals are identical to, or consistent with, those espoused by other participating, people-oriented approaches to development. In this regard they argue that since grass-roots participation is a key element in human social development strategies, empowerment, self-reliance and capacity building are therefore key values, which matches the views, values, purposes, means and methods, and the epistemology of PAR (Kondrat & Julia, 1997).
The alternative new approaches to development reflect deep shifts in methods and behavior, not only in most of the non-governmental organizations, but also in governmental organizations and global institutions such as the World Bank and IMF, and the UN, regional development banks, as well as the bi-lateral agencies-- and indeed any organization that has recognized the need to move toward less authoritarian and centralized styles of management (Long, 2001). Hence, conceptions that are related to participation of the targeted beneficiaries in the development process (as manifested in their participation in the projects) have received a great deal of attention from these traditional development actors such as the World Bank, IMF and the UN (Eade, 1997). Moreover, these institutions have developed and used these conceptions gradually and to a great degree; people’s involvement in the development process is increasingly considered a very crucial condition in ensuring the success of development projects (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980 & Spalding, 1990). Nevertheless, NGOs performing within the framework of the alternative paradigm were still considered the parents of this new development paradigm, which contributed to the belief among NGOs and other development actors that NGOs are to be considered an alternative approach to the failed development efforts on the part of governments and official aid agencies. Thus, it is important to discuss the debate over the NGOs and their role in developing the human development paradigm with its focus on people’s participation in development. In the next section we will discuss the role of NGOs within this paradigm, as well as the criticism that NGOs receive.

2.3 Non-governmental Organizations 25 and Their Role in People’s-centered Development

The criticism leveled at official development work is directed at the lack of concern for people’s input in social development. Subsequently, an increasing emphasis on the importance of people’s participation in social development projects began to dominate development thinking. As a result, many NGOs, and even the governmental organizations, began to look for ways in
which a greater participation for the people could be guaranteed in development projects (Long, 2001), in which people would be the major actors in the social development process. Moreover, people’s participation began to be considered a crucial indicator of the success of development projects (Clark, 1991; Cohen & Uphoff, 1980, & Spalding, 1990).

Traditionally, in the early years of development, governments and donor agencies, both bilateral organizations (organizations associated with and run only by one country) and multilateral organizations (organizations affiliated and associated with many countries (e.g. UN, IMF, World Bank) were considered the main players in designing and implementing social development programs and projects (Finterbush & Wicklin, 1989 & Long, 2001). These organizations tended to adopt top-down and centralized decision-making structures. On the one hand, the donor agencies’ became involved in development with the understanding that their mission was to ‘deliver’ development to poor countries (Long, 2001). On the other hand, governmental programs also understood development as means of improving their countries’ economic performance. The way in which state and donor agencies implemented such practices and structures to achieve social development goals became broadly criticized (Clark; 1991; Finterbush & Wicklin, 1989; & Korten, 1990). The criticism was directed to the way people were being treated as passive recipients in development process, with participation confined to that of receiving services (Cernea, 1989; Clark, 1991; & Korten, 1990). As a result, many began to look at how the role of people in social development was neglected by the mainstream development perspectives (Korten & Klauss, 1984; & Chambers, 1983).

The alternative paradigm of social development, with its commitment to people’s involvement in the planning and implementation of development projects, started to emerge in the last 3 decades as a response to the critique of the top-down, non-participatory model (Long, 2001). In its approach to social development, this model is considered to challenge the conventional economic paradigm where people are treated as objects in the process of
development. Despite the fact that meanwhile the call for participation is echoed by a broad spectrum of those concerned with development, and for a wide variety of reasons (Finterbush & Wicklin, 1989), it is recognized that people’s participation in development has greatly been linked to NGOs’ projects. Therefore, NGOs, especially those that began as grassroots initiatives, have gained more credibility than the governmental sector in effectively practicing this alternative paradigm of development (Clark, 1991 & Lane, 1995). Thus, one of the main arguments in defense of NGOs’ is that they can best demonstrate the feasibility of people-based development as an alternative or complement to government-led development. This explains to some extent why NGOs were perceived to be more effective than governmental agencies in implementing development projects (Drabek, 1987; & Spalding, 1990).

As the interest in NGOs has increased tremendously, the creation and diffusion of NGOs in the developing countries have attracted much recognition and debate. Over the last two decades, NGOs gained a more positive reputation for their work in social development (Long, 2001). They have adopted the strategy of developing the people-centered paradigm or the alternative human development paradigm. This strategy calls for putting people first, and learning from the poor, decentralization, empowerment, local initiative and diversity, and the determination to help people at the grassroots level to become organized and involved in their own development (Chambers, 1986a; Cernea, 1989; & Long, 2001). Heller (1986) argues that the strategy of development adopted by NGOs sought to optimize (rather than maximize) social and economic growth in light of equity objectives, involving a large degree of decision-making by the beneficiaries themselves who know best how to optimize development assistance.

Thus, NGOs involved in relief and social development work have become popular, this popularity according to many writers stems from; first, the fact that they have emerged as an organizational response, most often instrumental and proactive and sometimes political, on the part of the community or its subgroups, in pursuit of alternative strategies (i.e. alternative to those
provided by government based programs) for local social development; and second, they have emerged as an informal, voluntary, and popular response to the failure of the development paradigm adopted by their own countries’ governments (Cernea, 1989; Clark; 1991; Korten, 1990; Nelson, 1995; & Salamon & Anheier, 1996).

In this regard, NGOs were hailed for their effectiveness in dealing with situations where governmental agencies were ineffective and their ability to respond to unfamiliar situations when new demands arise, or when the traditional structures break down and become unresponsive (Cernea, 1989; Garilao, 1987; & Padron, 1987). Moreover, one of the major contributions that the NGOs sector has made, is that it has brought NGOs to the center of development work and initiated their role in shifting the philosophy of aid from the relief to development 26 (Clark, 1991; Heller, 1986; & Nelson, 1995). Moreover, NGOs were hailed for their work in remote communities and their promotion of sustainable development (Nelson, 1995); for their work in promoting human rights and social justice; for their belief in implementing grass-roots development (Fisher, 1997); for their ability to engage with local populations and command their trust in ways which governments find impossible (Clark, 1991); and for their encouragement of participation in decision making in development projects (Bratton, 1990). As a result, NGOs have been acknowledged not only for their advocacy for change from a relief aid to development aid (Heller, 1986 & Nelson, 1995), but also for championing the cause of active participation of local people in the social development process as essential to the success of the goals of social development (Chambers, 1983).

2.3.1 Criticism of NGOs

The creation and diffusion of NGOs in the developing countries has not only attracted recognition and acknowledgment, but also criticism, debate, and controversy. For example, Dichter (1988) suggested that NGOs are more conditioned than governmental organizations to
consider themselves more essential to the lives of people -which would imply dependence. Others have questioned whether NGOs are able to live up to their own performance and expectations (Najam, 1996). This criticism sometimes becomes quite sharp. For example, Gideon Erasmus (as cited in Najam, 1996) questioned whether NGOs involved in international development are actually the development ‘saints’ they proclaim to be. As much as NGOs have been hailed for their people oriented ideologies in social development work, they have also been criticized when their actual practice has failed to live up to their participatory promise.

Hence, the same reasons, which brought recognition to NGOs, have resulted in much criticism. The failure of development in the 1980s called for a re-examination of past practices and policies; and for a re-examination of the roles of not only governments and multinational donors, but also of NGOs (Korten, 1990). A more critical look at the work of NGOs showed that NGOs were not able to meet their objectives of reaching the poorest sector of the society, of being accountable to their beneficiaries, of being more efficient and effective than the governmental organizations, and of focusing on grassroots participation as an approach to social development (Najam, 1996). Moreover, serious questions have risen whether NGOs in international development are saints or sinners (Gideon Erasmus, cited in Najam, 1996). The criticism was mainly directed toward their presumed and claimed effectiveness, since NGOs have been criticized for lacking strategies to assess their own effectiveness (Finsterbusch, & Wicklin, 1989). Thus, the question of whether NGOs are actually implementing more participatory development then the GOs is highly debated.

There have been many attempts to theorize about the issues of NGO accountability and efficiency in development. Similie (1997) discussed three basic problems faced by most NGOs, these are: the real cost of doing business; the enduring problem of evaluation and quality control; and accountability. The accountability problem has attracted a lot of attention (Clark, 1991; Korten, 1990; Kramer, 1981; & Najam, 1996). Accountability appears clearly in the issues of
legitimacy, representation and democracy (Najam, 1996). While the issue of control over resources was seen as detrimental to accountability, the way that the decision-making processes of the organization were altered or compromised by receiving external funds was considered more crucial (Fowler, 1991). Furthermore, the NGOs tended to be more upwardly accountable to their funding sources than to the people they serve (ibid). Within the transfer of technology, NGOs are considered less accountable if their projects reflect the values of the donors or transfer agents rather than those of the basic needs (as well as the working methods, environment) and the values of the project beneficiaries (Heller, 1986). Despite these attempt to theorize on the problem of efficiency and accountability, there has been a lack of developed conceptual framework or theoretical models capable of dealing with issues of NGO efficiency and accountability, in order for the NGOs to be seen within such framework.

Some studies examine NGOs from an organizational perspective, where issues such as competition, performance, and integrity, use of resources, decision-making processes and accountability were studied (Monje, 1995; & Mufune, Mwansa & Siamwiza, 1996). The case study of NGOs in Zambia by Mufune et al. (1996) suggested that NGOs suffer from the problem of coordination, cooperation and communication, which affect their performance. This study used a focus group discussion and content analysis of NGO documents to gather data about the NGOs and their effectiveness. While the findings could be valuable, the small sample size limits the usefulness of the study in terms of generalization. However, it could serve as a basis for more empirical research study. Similarly, Monjo (1995), looking at NGOs also from the organizational perspective, addressed the issue of competition among NGOs in Bolivia. The objective of this study as stated by the researcher was to examine organizational relationships, including competition, and their impact on NGOs and other related agencies, and on grassroots beneficiaries. However, constructs such as competition, NGOs and grassroots beneficiaries were not defined clearly. The study is exploratory and based on qualitative data. The small size of the
sample has not allowed the researcher to test the relationships that he proposed or to generalize the findings because the sample was limited to two regions in Bolivia and not representative of the NGO population. Despite the fact the study is exploratory, the researcher used hypothesis to guide his research rather than questions.

It is not clear how NGOs’ projects are more participatory than other kinds of projects. NGOs identify several reasons why they might be better able to put participation in practice. They claim to be innovative, flexible and not weighed down by bureaucracy; they are able to rely on voluntary and committed staff, which may allow them to successfully follow risky and non-conventional policies; others claim that they already operate at the grass roots level, close to the poorest of the poor (Lane, 1995 & Tandon, 2000). Nevertheless, NGOs were criticized for having experts externally determine projects who allow only specific and short periods of time to implement the projects (Lane, 1995). This allows for little participation of the people. Moreover, the theoretical concept of participation and its association in practice is both ambiguous and controversial. Actually, there have been shortcomings in the way that NGOs’ projects are evaluated. Most of the studies that looked at participation in the work of NGOs dealt with them in a one-dimensional way and neglected the larger socio-economic, cultural, and historical context within which NGOs interact. Moreover, these studies failed to address the wide variety of these organizations, the complexity of their structures and the multifaceted dimensions that these organizations possess.

Since this research is concerned with the notion of how NGOs define and implement participation in social development projects, it is crucial to discuss how this relationship has been presented in research. The next section will discuss research studies, which deal with the specific way in which NGOs are linked to the concept of people’s participation.
2.3.2 NGOs and People’s Participation: Research Studies

It is widely accepted that there are two reasons why NGOs are perceived as better in implementing development projects: the first one is the general dissatisfaction with official aid policies, promoting the view of NGOs as alternative development channels. The second one is the paradigm shift in development thinking which has stressed the active participation of local people in the development process, an approach traditionally considered characteristic of NGOs (Lane, 1995 & Tandon, 2000). Thus it is widely argued that NGOs might be better at participatory development in practice. Nevertheless, many NGO programs and projects were heavily criticized for paying only lip service to local participation (Caroll, 1992). Most NGOs initiated within the people-oriented paradigm of development have considered people’s participation in development as their main development strategy. But many of these NGOs have been criticized for not living up to their rhetoric (Clark, 1991 & Tandon, 2000).

Thus, it is not evident how NGOs have helped people at the grassroots level to become organized and involved in development programs (Cernea, 1989). Moreover, the notion that NGO programs are more participatory in nature than programs sponsored by the public agencies has been questioned (Clark, 1991). A fundamental problem in critically assessing the experience of Northern NGOs with respect of participation is that the concept is unclear in practice (Lane, 1995). Questions such as: What is participation and what are we trying to achieve in promoting it? Are NGOs successful in practice? Does this present a challenge for any study on NGOs? This study attempts to answer some of these questions with reference to the experience of Northern NGOs in Palestine.

There is little systematic knowledge and paucity in research studies to draw on in the social sciences concerning NGOs and particularly people’s participation in their social development projects, besides the little consensus on how participation is to be viewed and what are its dimensions. In a review of the literature on participation, Uphoff, Cohen & Goldsmith (1979)
concluded that the existing body of theory was too abstract or unfocused, and the wealth of case materials too diffuse and uneven for a well-grounded theoretical argument. While today there have been various case studies, reports, and analysis of experiences from various disciplines, which have contributed to some understanding of people’s participation in development over the years, there is a still weak link between theory and practice. One major problem is that NGOs do not document their experiences as a rule, and when they do, they are not published; and even if they are published, they are published in closed circles and not accessible a greater sector of those who are interested in the issue. On the other hand those studies that do exist are limited in their scope and cannot be generally applied to the larger population of NGOs. These facts have limited the dissemination of knowledge about the subject; moreover, a lot of work needs to be done to generate systematic theory and research.

A seminal work on intermediary NGOs by Carroll (1992) suggests that it is in fact those grassroots level organizations, which have shown effectiveness in promoting participation. On the other hand his research cast doubt upon the supposed extraordinary participatory qualities of intermediary NGOs in terms of promoting the participation of their project beneficiaries. Bebbington and Farrington (1993) argued that there is a strong feeling among intermediary NGOs that they are both more efficient and have been more effective in promoting people’s participation in development projects at the grassroots level. Carroll’s distinction between NGOs, which are oriented toward service delivery, and those intent on empowerment is significant (1992). He emphasized that when NGOs essentially supply services, there is little effective participation; on the other hand, when they seek to promote ‘capacity building’ the evidence is more favorable and participation is equated with ‘empowerment’.

A study by Yadama (1995) went further in investigating the level of people’s participation of in NGOs in comparison to governmental organizations. The sample for this study comprised 200 participants, 100 from governmental organizations and 100 from NGOs. Based on Actor-System
Dynamics theory, the author hypothesized that economic status and organizational trust have a positive effect on participation in decision making, and suggested that participation is better facilitated by NGOs than the governmental organizations. The researcher of this study acknowledged its limitations, especially regarding the sampling procedures due to the lack of proper information on the population and the study area, which caused frame error. In testing his model through structural equation the researcher found that trust between the beneficiaries and the organization has a significant positive effect on participation in both the governmental (ML estimate = .65) and non-governmental programs (ML= 1.11). In addition, economic status did not have a significant effect on participation in either the governmental (ML estimate .00) or non-governmental (ML estimate .07) programs. On the other hand, economic status did not have a significant effect on benefits in the governmental programs (ML= -.03); it had a significant positive effect on benefits in the NGOs program (ML=.73). The author concluded from his findings that economic status has a direct effect on benefits from the program; meanwhile, this effect has become stronger in NGO-led programs (Yadama, 1995). Moreover, this study found that the rural elite have benefited more from non-governmental programs, which means that participation has improved the status of the elite and not of the poor. This issue of ‘who benefits’ from participation is considered to be an important one, yet it has not been addressed probably in research studies.

In conclusion, most studies suffer from small sample sizes that limit general applicability or affect the power of the studies. These studies use uncomplicated designs with few single variables. The different factors, which play a major role in the work of NGOs, are not addressed. Moreover, the wide variety of NGOs, the complexity of their structures and the multifaceted dimensions that these organizations possess limit the type of the studies that researchers tackle.
Because of the above-mentioned problems, most research studies relied heavily on case studies. Having said that, there is only a scattering of literature on NGOs, which also suffer from a lack of consistent theoretical framework or systematic research study.

Some of the studies attempted to establish a causal relationship between participation and project’s success, the degree in which people’s participation in development projects accounts for the success of those projects. This kind of investigation requires a more complex design, and such a causal relationship is not easy to investigate. In some studies, participation activities were investigated at a specific stage of the project. In this case there was more emphasis on the kind of resource contribution that beneficiaries brought to the projects as opposed to their degree of involvement in the project’s decision-making process. It is also difficult to make comparison between these studies since the various projects investigated varied in nature and bore different affiliations, such as official aid projects, governmental development projects, grassroots projects, or intermediary NGOs projects. Some of them also designed different stages, or levels, of participation, which take place in the project cycle. For example, Finsterbush and Wicklin (1989) examined 52 AID development projects with respect to how participation contributes to project success. The researchers analyzed a set of project evaluation studies to determine which factors contribute to project success. The data indicated that the participation variables contribute significantly to project success in projects with organized beneficiaries, but the same variables are on average inconsequential to project success in projects with less organized beneficiaries. They have found that the extent to which beneficiaries are organized is correlated with increasing social benefits (r = .46), overall effectiveness (r = .26), and with increased community capacity at (r = .61). The projects that were evaluated are all AID projects, which allowed the researcher to define some variables that they could compare throughout the projects. The researchers clarified that these projects’ evaluation reports follow a common format that they consider sufficiently standardized to permit cross-project comparisons. With regard to NGO projects, it is at times not
easy to make comparisons between projects because NGOs often maintain different reporting systems depending on their funding organizations. The conclusion made in this study that participation is beneficial cannot be generalized to all NGO projects in general due to the nature of the study itself, the small size of the cases used, and the limitation of the sample. The study attempted to prove the hypothesis even though its methodology involved subjective judgments without verification, and its data sources were less optimal for such testing.

A study by Thudipara (1992) used an Indian case study to look at the issue of people’s participation in urban development. A content analysis of a specific area in India was used to examine the participatory approach adopted by a NGO project. This case showed how the involvement of people and community participation in the implementation of the project and its planning accounted for its success. Nevertheless, it did not explain the type of participation nor the levels at which it took place.

The DAI study on Strategies for Small Farmer Development (cited in Cohen and Uphoff, (1977)); based on an evaluation of over 50 rural development projects, found that local participation in decision-making during implementation was more critical to the program success than such participation in the initial design. Participation took place here in the form of resource commitment, which was the factor found to have accounted for overall project success. Project success was measured in terms of an increase in farmer income and agricultural knowledge as well as the capacity to self-help capacity and the probability of project benefits becoming self-sustaining. Accordingly, local action taken by farmers to complement outside management and resources accounted for half of the variation in overall success rankings, and farmer involvement in decision-making in the implementation phase was one of the two factors found to be most significant in promoting overall project success.

A study conducted in cooperation between the New-Delhi-based Society and the Institute for Development Research (IDR) in Boston looked grassroots participation in development projects.
This study focused a large-scale, government-sponsored forestry program in the Indian state of West Bengal, in which experiences were made with grassroots participation. The questions that this study tried to answer were: 1- whether there is a relationship between high levels of local participation and the effectiveness of some kinds of development projects; 2- the kinds of preconditions associated with high levels of participation; and 3- the relationship between participation and various program results. The study used interview schedules, which included both open-ended and semi-structured items. The sample comprised twenty forestry officials in three areas. The analysis of variance of member perceptions of participation and performance for groups, rated high, medium, and low in performance, found that participation is significant in these groups. The differences among the groups are also found to be highly significant (p< .0001), as well as the predicted direction on both variables (effectiveness and participation). The second hypothesis focused on the preconditions associated with successful participation. The study suggested that participation is associated with certain preconditions, such as information sharing, extensively sharing the understanding of how important local participation is, the preparation of forest office staff, and the preparation of FPC. The study reported the correlations among the indices of participation preconditions, perceived participation and effectiveness, and participation consequence. Shared understanding of the importance of participation is significantly related to both effectiveness and participation (r= .92 and .93, p< .001). Preparation is also significantly related to effectiveness and participation (r = .65 and p < .01).

The limitation of this study is represented by the self-reported data, which may be biased as it reflects the opinions of the grassroots members of the committees, and by the fact that the data was collected all at one time. The ability to generally apply the results is also limited, because there is a lack of access to a larger sample size, which restricted more powerful statistical analyses and more rigorous generalization.
Social work literature has documented studies, which looked at the concepts of client, or citizen participation in community work and at the effectiveness in social work and other related fields. In their review of the literature, York & Itzhaky (1991) have found that the amount of published literature on client participation and effectiveness, however, is not extensive. To examine the assumption that client participation makes for a better social work intervention, the above writers reviewed the literature regarding what effectiveness means, and presented the relationship between participation and effectiveness. They found that research on participation tends to center around forms of participation (inputs) and its effect on the change agent and action systems (processes), but little attention is paid to the results of participation (outputs) in general, and in achieving the specific goals of the activity involved. Moreover, they argued that the conclusions of the studies, which do consider the effectiveness of participation, are by no means clear or unanimous (York & Itzhaky, 1991).

On the other hand, to solve the problem on how to evaluate the effectiveness of citizen participation programs, Rosner (1978) proposed a particular methodology of evaluation. She proposed to consider participation in terms of a matrix. The relationships in that matrix which help to answer questions regarding the effectiveness of citizen participation programs are between knowledge of a cause/effect relationship between participation program or activity, the achievement of specified goals and objectives (complete or incomplete), and the agreement on program goals and objectives, whose goals and objectives they are, and the criteria by which success or failure will be measured (yes or no). The author emphasized the importance of clarifying participation objectives, since assessments of the effectiveness of participation will be suspect if the objectives are not clear (Rosner, 1978).

Itzhaky and York (1994) tried to empirically test the assumption that client participation in community social work intervention leads to improved outputs. The researchers examined two hundred senior community centers, where staff were asked questions on the output of their
community centers. The criteria for the measurement of effectiveness (dependent variable) were set as the classification of effectiveness by ‘goal attainment’ (task achievement, productivity) and ‘system processes’ (adaptiveness, participation satisfaction, inner processes, system resources), and effectiveness evaluated by whom. It is believed that the persons doing the evaluation influences the evaluation of effectiveness, whether they involve change agents, or administrative staff or the clients themselves. In a seminar, senior community center officials identified the measures of client participation (the independent variable). These involve practices, policies and techniques used in the community center movement. The study found that most of the measures of client participation predicted the types of output at a moderate to high level, and together explained about one fifth of the variance in each type of output. The study suggests that client participation is not only a value of community-social work, but also contributes to its effectiveness and success (Itzhaky & York, 1991, 1994). The researchers recognized that their study is limited and preliminary in nature. One of the problems they identified is that the assessment of both of participation and effectiveness is very objective and was made by the staff themselves, excluding the clients who might have had different views regarding the terms.

The literature described above is concerned with the relationship between effectiveness of the projects and the use of participatory methods. This research study is not going to deal with this issue, but in its description of the literature it is aimed at presenting the problem that these studies face in defining the concept ‘client participation’. It also aims at addressing the issue of how much the objectives of participation in the programs are actually clarified.

There is a recognized need among NGO staff and administrators, as well as scholars, for a greater accumulation and knowledge of NGOs, taking into consideration the importance of investigating people’s participation in NGOs projects in a systematic and empirical way. The lack of such framework has obstructed designing and conducting empirical studies that look at NGOs in a systematic way. In fact, the few studies that looked at NGOs did not pay attention to
the complex dynamics and dimensions of participation for social development. Too many questions need to be answered through research. Some of these are: How is people’s participation perceived in social development agencies? Does participation differ according to different organizations? Do those organizations that began their work as a grassroots response differ in their perception on people’s participation from those who receive funding from foreign sources? What are the different types of people’s participation? What kinds of people’s participation take place? Who participates in these projects and how does the process of participation takes place? Also, how is participation for development different from participation in politics (Cohen & Uphoff, 1980), and in what aspect it is different? How can participation lead to the empowerment of the most disadvantaged people in the society, who are the presumed targets of NGOs work?

A very serious problem in assessing people’s participation in practice is the lack of clarity of the meaning of the concept among different actors in social development, specifically among NGOs- Northern and local ones. This research study will not try to answer all these questions, but it will examine the definition and the conceptualization of the concept by specific actors in development in a specific context -- Northern NGOs who are active in Palestine. It will also examine the activities and behaviors regarding participation of the local Palestinian NGOs, which are sponsored by the Northern ones. Its is recognized that Northern NGOs, as social development agencies, have different and various methods or strategies of implementing social development projects, depending on their position in development thinking. These strategies are usually based on their philosophical, political and social values and beliefs, which define their orientation and scope of work. Since NGOs play a crucial role in advancing the social development agenda, and since they claim to use alternative strategies based on involving people in the planning and implementation of the development projects, participation in social development projects has been a focal concern of the NGOs.
The reason behind choosing to examine the definition of participation by Northern NGO policy makers and directors is that there is a lack of unified definition among the Northern NGOs regarding the concept, which will in turn influence its practice. Policy makers and directors of the Northern NGOs may have the philosophy of promoting participation, which should be manifested in their conceptualizations of the concept, but many problems appearing on the surface hinder these strategies from being implemented. One of the greatest problems is how the front-line staff in the actual projects, which deal with people, implement these participatory strategies.

It may seem that we are using individual variables, such as the definitions of the policy makers and directors, to explain organizational phenomenon, but it is believed that people make up the organizations, so without understanding how those directors and policy makers define the concept of participation, we could not assess whether participation takes place or not, what kinds of participation take place, and how much it is effective with regard to the success of the projects’ output. Moreover, the question of a clear and specific definition of participation is considered to be problematic in the literature on the NGOs’ work and on people’s participation in social development projects. In the literature, people’s participation is described in many different ways, and we could easily find ourselves face with the problem of not having a unified definition of the concept. Often the way participation is defined differs in theory differs and praxis, therefore, it is important to elicit the definition of the concept from the people who encounter and deal with it. This will help us to find the mutual components of the concept, and will help in composing the larger picture of how people’s participation in social development projects is actually implemented in a specific context, in this case Palestine. The goal of this study is therefore to explore the definitions and conceptualizations, and then the practice of the concept ‘people’s participation’ in the social development projects as it is seen by the social workers of
the Northern NGOs and their local Palestinian partners in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. Based on this rationale, we will explain the specific framework of this research study in the next section.

2.4 The Conceptual Framework of the Research Study

2.4.1 People’s participation: Debate and definitions

People’s participation has meant not only different things to different people but also different things to the same people at different times. Thus a wide variety of interpretation is associated with the concept (Lisk, 1985). So it is argued that people’s participation as defined has to be seen and understood adequately to realize its complex nature in different contexts (Chhetri, 1996). Therefore, the term people’s participation is considered very ambiguous, and the definitions of participation refer to a vast range of different processes (Kelly & Vlaenderen, 1995). Moreover, there have been so many terms, which refer to the process of involvement of people in social development -people’s participation, popular participation, citizen participation, beneficiary participation and community participation to name some. Whatever the term existing in the literature, we are concerned here with the concepts that used to express the different ways of people's involvement in development projects and programs. For the purpose of unifying the usage, we the term people’s participation will be used here.

Today, an interest in analyzing the question of people’s participation in social development is being indicated by many international programs, multilateral, and lateral organizations, the UN organizations, local and international NGOs and also governmental organizations (Long, 2001). Thus, there have been many attempts to define the concept people’s participation, some of these definitions were general and others tried to be more specific, it is therefore important to present some of these definitions.

Lisk (1985) used the term popular participation in his attempt to present a relevant operational definition, thus he stated that “popular participation in development should be broadly
understood as the active involvement of people in the making and implementation of decisions at all levels and forms of political and socio-economic activities” (p.15). He added, “…. in the context of the formal planning process, the concept relates to the involvement of the broad mass of the population in the choice, execution and evaluation of programs and projects designed to bring about a significant upward movement in the levels of living” (p.15).

In the same line, but with regard to rural development, Cohen & Uphoff (1977) considered that “Participation includes people's involvement in the decision-making process about what would be done and how, their involvement in implementing programs and decisions by contributing various resources or cooperating in specific organizations or activities; their sharing in the benefits of development programs; and/or their involvement in efforts to evaluate such programs” (p.4).

A similar definition to the above one is provided by Oakley (1995) and states that “people’s participation is an active process of direct involvement in the political structures which govern national life, in the decision-making and implementation procedures of development programs and projects and, most importantly, in the taking of action by people to confront and tackle the issues which affect their livelihoods in a whole range of activities and in many different context” (p.6). This definition tackles the issue of people’s participation as an empowerment tool.

Uphoff, Cohen, and Goldsmith (1979) have argued that participation should be regarded as a “descriptive term denoting the involvement of a significant number of persons in situations or actions which enhance their well-being, e.g., their income, security or self esteem” (p.4). UNRISD researchers have adopted a working definition as a result of an overview to many studies. They defined popular participation as the organized efforts to increase the control over resources and regulative institutions in given social situations, on the part of groups and movements of those hitherto excluded from such control. (UNRISD, 1979). Baetz (1975) has proposed another definition that is no less general: it considers that participation in development
means how community members can be assured the opportunity of contributing to the creation of the communities’ goods and services. In a more specific term, Paul (1987) defined community participation as an active process by which beneficiary or client groups influence the direction of a development project with a view of enhancing their well-being in terms of income, personal growth, self-reliance or other values they cherish.

Another definition is similar to the previous one that is of the ILO Rural Employment and Policies Branch, Employment and Development Department, which says that participation involves active, collectively organized and continuous efforts by the people themselves in setting goals, pooling resources and taking actions aimed at improving their living conditions.

Some other approaches to participation different from those above have tackled the issues of inequality and power. The Peasants’ Charter, FAO, (as cited in Burkey, 1993), concluded that participation by the people in the institutions and systems, which govern their lives, is a basic human right and also essential for the realignment of political power in favor of disadvantaged groups and for social and economic development. In a further elaboration they argue that rural development strategies can realize their full potential only through the motivation, active involvement and organization at the grassroots level of rural people, with special emphasis on the least advantaged, in conceptualizing and designing policies and programs and in creating administrative, social and economic institutions, including cooperative and other voluntary forms of organization for implementing and evaluating them. Such a definition views participation as “more than a technique to support the progress of the program or project, but on the contrary it is seen as a process of empowerment of the deprived and the excluded”. This view is based on the recognition of differences in political and economic power among different groups and classes. Participation in this sense necessitates “the creation of organizations of the poor which are democratic, independent and self-reliant” (Ghai, 1988). On the same line, Pearse and Stifel’s approach (1980) suggests a more structural and political role for participation and not one simply
linked to development practice. They maintain, “Participation is concerned with the organized efforts to increase control over resources and regulative institutions in given social situations on the part of groups and movements of those hitherto excluded from such control”.

The different definitions of people’s participation tackle the issue of power and the ability of people to influence the direction and implementation of the projects that are targeting them. Some of these definitions deal with the structural change in the social system resulting from participation, and others deal with participation as the specific targeting of project benefits. So issue of empowerment is considered implicit in people’s participation. As Zimmerman (1990) indicated, empowerment involves three levels: At the individual level, it includes participatory behavior, motivations to exert control, feelings of efficacy and control. At the organizational level, it includes shared leadership, opportunities to develop skills, expansion, and effective community influence. At the community level, it compromises empowered organizations, which includes opportunities for citizen participation in community decision making, and allow for fair consideration of multiple perspectives in the community. Therefore, participation for empowerment is a complex process incorporating a wide range of actions, practices, activities and opportunities for people and communities to be involved in NGO projects with the aim of their personal, interpersonal and political empowerment.

For the purpose of this study, we will not adopt a specific definition. The aim is to explore how is the concept defined and practiced in a specific context by specific actors, those being Northern NGOs and their local Palestinian partners.
2.4.2 Schools of Thought on Participation

In the same line of classification of thoughts dealing with people’s participation, David (1991); Oakley (1995); UNDP (1997) have identified two schools of thought in social development literature which have dealt with the notion of participation since its rising dominance:

One school sees that participation of the people on social development projects is a way to increase the chances of successful projects. Participation is therefore seen as a means to effectively implement initiatives, where local people cooperate or collaborate with externally introduced development projects or programs (UNDP, 1997). According to this approach, participation is considered to be a project means and not as a goal for its own sake. This approach advocates that through persuading people to participate, which means inclusion of the human resources in development efforts, people will have a greater vested interest in these projects and as a result, the projects will be more likely to succeed (Oakley, 1995). The term “participatory development” is more commonly used to describe this approach and it implies externally designed development activities implemented in a participatory manner (UNDP Guidebook on Participation, 1997).

The other school sees participation as a goal in itself (UNDP Guidebook on Participation, 1997), and links participation to tackling the structural causes of people’s poverty (Oakley, 1995). In this approach people are considered poor because they are excluded and have little influence upon the forces that affect their lives. Thus, participation is seen as a part of a process where people seek to have some influence, break their exclusion and to again access the resources which would help them sustain and improve their living conditions (Oakley, 1995 & UNDP, 1997).

David (1993) has emphasized that participation should be seen as an end as well as means for development. David (1991) quoted the Australian National Report of 1974, which states - what David considered as the best statement on participation- that participation of people in
decisions directly affecting them is a right. In this report participation was seen as an essential element of development, as an end as well as means. In further elaboration, participation as an end is viewed as an essential condition for social development where people’s rights to express their consent for actions taken on their behalf is a process. As a means, participation ensures involvement of people and their approval of the development actions whether governmental or non-governmental agents accept them.

In this regard David (1991) emphasized that the prerequisite for effective participation is the right of the people to have access to information. Connell (1997), among many others, emphasized the sharing of knowledge and also stressed the significance of the process of learning itself in the service of people’s self-development as an agent of transformation. In this regard Connell (1997) stated that if the conceptual orientation and the language of that process do not relate to people’s experience, and if they lack the tools to assess their needs effectively and to know what options are available to them to bring about constructive change, then engagement of the people in a development process is not enough.

On the other hand, Midgley (1986) has emphasized that it is not enough for participation to serve immediate instrumental goals such as the identification of felt needs as well as the mobilization of local resources, but it should promote broader social development ideals: by including full participation in decision-making for social development. Barraclough (as cited in Huizer, 1997) argued that the determining factor for one development approach or the other is the political will, and this depends on the institutional set-up prevailing in a country or region which may or may not give certain influence to underprivileged groups. So the context where participation takes place is very important, and it is hard to exclude that context when analyzing participatory efforts. Therefore, it is the aim of the study to explore such contexts, and to relate the definition and the practices of participation to a specific context and specific actors, in this case Northern NGOs and their Palestinian partners in the West Bank and Gaza strip.
2.4.3 Dimensions of Participation

The UNRISD (1979) report (as cited in Stiefel and Wolfe, 1994, pp.6-11) has identified six dimensions of participation. These constituted different perspectives or points of entry into the study of the question. We will present these six dimensions because they represent the different variations of participation in general: These dimensions viewed participation

1. As an encounter between the hitherto excluded and those elements in the society that maintain or enforce exclusion: In viewing participation as an encounter, attention is paid to the tactics of effective struggle and points to the relevance of popular resistance to real processes of modernization or development.

2. As ‘movements’ and ‘organizations’ of would-be participants: This perspective points to a broad range of questions: factors influencing capacity to maintain permanent organizational structures; leadership and member ability to choose and control leaders; class homogeneity or heterogeneity of the organized group; alliances between organized groupings of the excluded and religious organizations, non-governmental organizations, political parties, trade unions and other governmental organizations, political parties.

3. As ‘biography’; i.e. the individual participatory experience. Biographical testimony from members of participatory movements about their personal experience and the evolution of their perception of the social world around them should therefore be of great importance in complementing the perspectives of encounter and organizations.

4. As ‘program’ or ‘project’ proposed and executed by government agency, voluntary organization or international body. This distinctive feature of this perspective is that the program or project has been initiated from above or outside; that the impetus for the participatory activity does not come from the disadvantaged group but from some relatively privileged or powerful entity which has its own idea of what ought to be done, can command certain human and financial resources and believes the
participation of a ‘target group’ can be enlisted provided it applies the correct methods. This approach has been criticized in that it doesn’t maximize people’s participation. Nevertheless, most development programs and projects follow this lead. Whether or not they could be expected to generate major changes the betterment in the livelihood of the poor, or to be replicated and expanded on a scale making this possible, some of them evidently do function more effectively and corresponded better to their proclaimed purposes than others.

5. As a ‘component of national policy’ under this heading, there are 3 different approaches
1. The first deals with participation as a component of the current development policies and plans undertaken by the state, with their typical emphasis on industrialization, targets for increase in the national product and expansion of public social services and infrastructure investment. 2. The second is concerned with the long-debated questions of representative democracy. 3. The third is participation as a component of national policy which takes a radically different form in the case of governments seeking to mobilize the whole population in the name of development, or to organize the hitherto excluded for the purpose of carrying through and consolidating revolutionary shifts in the distribution of power.

6. Anti-participatory structures and ideologies. In this perspective, the reference is to societies that develop complex batteries of defenses against popular participation, and even those institutions supposed to realize the participation of the many are vulnerable to the ‘iron law of oligarchy’ and thus liable to turn into instruments of manipulation operated by the few.

Number four of the above dimensions looks at participation within a project cycle, which represents the actual concern of most social development projects interested in participation.

Most of the literature dealing with people’s participation in social development context evaluates
this within the project perspective. Regardless of their agenda, philosophy and goals, the
majority of actors in the social development scene (whether governmental, multi-lateral
organizations, or non-governmental organization) are interested in this specific dimension of
participation where the debate relates to the question who can best present participatory
philosophy in their social development projects where people are involved in their own
development through these projects. Thus, Stiefel and Wolfe (1994) argued that there should be
serious and critical evaluations of the projects’ or programs’ origins, their sources of support and
their functioning in the field when studying participation. Moreover, the above writers proposed
the kind of questions that should be tackled in any inquiry regarding participation in projects,
these are: how does the program under scrutiny relate to a wider national policy and its social and
ideological context? If the program is initiated in a society characterized by gross inequalities of
power and wealth, how is this reflected in the participatory program, its staffing and its aims?
Does the initiative stem from ‘system-maintaining’ objectives of social control, or from ‘system-
transforming’ objectives of groups inside or outside the state apparatus aiming to change the
distribution of power and livelihood opportunities, from social amelioration concerns of external
sources of funds and advice, or from an unresolved mixture of all these? At the local level, what
systems of incentives and motivations shape the recruitment and actions of the officials and field
workers in promotion campaigns? How does the ‘change agent’ relate to the ‘target group’ of the
program? What level of participation seems actually to have been achieved; to what extent does
it seem potentially self-sustaining once the focus of the program has shifted elsewhere; which
sectors of the target group participate most effectively and which benefit most? Lastly, how do
the intended beneficiaries, the participants themselves, assess the gains and costs of their
participatory action? To what extent and under what circumstances can localized and externally
promoted ‘participation’ lead to democratic political organization and a real voice in the control
of resources and regulative institutions?
So the issue of whether projects are participatory or not and how we can evaluate that has gained interest in the literature. Carroll (1992) suggested a number of indicators to assess the participatory qualities of NGO projects. These indicators are dealt with at the project level, and address the type of activities and practices that these NGOs have at that level. The indicators proposed by Carroll (1992) are the activities and practices that take place within the project cycle and are considered indicators which should be explored when assessing the ‘participatory qualities’ of NGOs, these are: participation as an institutional objective of the NGO, Field presence (proportion of staff in provincial or district centers as against metropolitan areas), staff incentives and training which support participation, iterative planning in consultation with local communities, bottom-up accountability mechanisms, contribution of cash, labor, raw material or local facilities by local communities which makes the communities clients of the intermediary, horizontal and vertical linkages to other institutions, prior experience in the target community and awareness of local conditions on the part of the NGO, the community/beneficiaries have a positive perception of the NGO, the NGO and its personnel have an understanding of and sensitivity to issues concerning women and other marginalized groups, and the philosophy of the NGO on community participation is reflected in other work it has undertaken.

The above may be useful guide when evaluating participatory activities. Carroll (1992) argued that there is a direct link between field presence and operational structure and the ability of an NGO to promote people’s participation. He also argued that the notion of participation has not been limited to the public discourse on NGOs but that it has been internalized in several facets if its institutional practice, for example, training, planning and processes of accountability.

The questions suggested by Stiefel and Wolfe (1994) and Carroll (1992) are very important ones, but in order to be able to yield some in-depth results they need to be investigated largely in each specific project. Evaluation of each project within such a framework of questions can yield much information. In any specific country, this task could be hard to achieve. Nevertheless, some
questions could be explored simultaneously in different projects. It is therefore the concern of this study to explore the definition and participatory practices and behaviors in specific social development projects in Palestine as Northern NGOs and their local Palestinian partners’ projects see it.

Moreover, the question of what kind of participation takes place in these projects has been of great interest to many. The importance of this question is related to the urge to evaluate the nature of participation and not only to state whether it happens or it does not happen. It is argued that participation takes place at different levels, and that it also deals with the issue of power that people have in the project cycle. Arnstein (1969) developed the most powerful analysis of these levels. He developed a typology of eight levels of participation, which he used to analyze the nature of the activities and practices of organizations regarding participation and the function they serve. This typology aims to determine people’s power in deciding the end product. Each level determines the degree of power people have in the different aspects of the project development. These levels are arranged in a ladder pattern with each rung corresponding to the extent of people’s power in determining the end product. The bottom rungs of the ladder are 1-manipulation and 2-therapy. These two describe non-participation. Rungs 3 and 4 progress to a level of tokenism, which allows people to hear and to have a voice: 3-informing and 4-consultation. Rung 5-placation, which is a higher level of tokenism because people are allowed to advise. Further up the ladder are levels of people power with increasing degrees of decision-making. Rung 6-a people centered partnership that enables them to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional power-holders. At the topmost rungs, 7-delegated power and 8-citizen control; people obtain the majority of decision-making seats, or full managerial power (Arnstein, 1969, p. 217). This typology has been used in studies regarding citizen participation. A study by Breitenbach (1997) looked at the way in which participation was encouraged in a specific project, and applied the assessment typology for participation.
A very comprehensive and elaborate framework in exploring participation at the different cycle of the project was one suggested by Cohen & Uphoff (1977) in which the different dimensions of participation were emphasized. These dimensions of participation are related to the type of the involvement of people in development projects and concern the kind of participation taking place, the sets of individuals involved in the participatory process, and the specific characteristics of that process (Uphoff, Cohen, & Goldsmith, 1979). The first three dimensions of participation answer the questions:

- What kinds of participation can take place? What distinguishes the different kinds of participation taking place at the different stages of the project cycle? These are:
  - Participation in decision-making processes about what is to be done and how.
  - Participation in implementing programs and decisions by contributing resources and cooperating in specific organizations or activities. Some of the proposed variables related to participation in the implementation stage of the project are as follows:
    - Resource Contributions: It is concerned with who contributes various kinds of input needed to carry out a project and how these contributions are made. Important aspects of participation in implementation concern the way it occurs, the extent to which participation is voluntary, remunerated, or coerced (p. 94), cone on an individual or collective basis, intermittently or continuously (how variables).
    - Participation in work of project (labor). How much labor is provided from whom and how (individual or collective basis, intermittently or continuously).
    - Contribution of material input (cash and In-kind). How these material contributions are made and who is making them.
    - Provision of information by local people.
• Administration and coordination: the involvement of local people in this aspect can occur in various ways, the most common are: as project-employees, or as members of project-related committees or in project-specific roles. To increase participation in this aspect is to recruit local people for the project staff as paraprofessionals, skilled workers or manual laborers. Who is participating (which groups are adequately represented and which ones not) and at what levels. Here the how dimension becomes important for understanding this kind of participation in implementation.

• Enlistment in Programs. Include participation in certain program activities implementing a project’s purposes. There is a difference between whether the participant is enlisting himself or herself for the program or is enlisted by someone else.
  - Sharing in the benefits of development programs.
  - Participation in efforts to evaluate such programs.

• Who participates in them?

The main question is: will people effectively participate in (and share in the results of) development projects or will they participate in resistance or revolt against developments, which frustrate their expectations, or are at a disadvantage to them. According to the suggested framework, the term popular participation is very broad and serves no analytical or evaluative purposes unless greatly refined, therefore, Cohen & Uphoff (1977) tried to identify several basic sets of persons whose participation in the various aspects of development project should be analyzed. Each of the categories may in turn be broken down according to relevant characteristics. Cohen & Uphoff (1977) identified three classifications of persons who are distinguished in terms of the kind of differing backgrounds and responsibilities people have in development activities:
Local residents, different groups participate in different activities and in different dimensions of participation. Those are the persons or groups in question who relate to a project’s goals. These are sets of persons and groups of persons, which could be the most poor and marginalized, usually not considered to be a homogenous group. They have different income, educational level, and social status. The questions that are asked are: whose participation is required for successful functioning of the project, and whose involvement is desired if a project’s objectives for creating and distributing benefits are to be met.

- Local leaders who are acknowledged spokespersons for the community or for their own particular group. They could be elected or appointed, formal or informal, traditional or modern.
- Government personnel.
- Participation of foreign personnel.

- How does the process of participation take place? This helps to understand the context of participation. The context of participation focuses on
  - The relationship between a rural development project’s characteristics and the patterns of actual participation that emerge.
  - Concerns the project’s task environment, specifically the analysis of the nature of development task and the most salient feature of the environment in which projects are undertaken.

The above framework entails many measures, which could be studied, although the project would be too extensive to do in one study. Cohen and Uphoff (1977) have emphasized that the measures proposed here are intended to provide a conceptually consistent basis for research. Moreover, the framework is oriented to the analysis of participation with reference to projects and localities, rather than to whole sectors or nations. This approach is somehow an attempt to be
concrete about what we are measuring in the area of people’s participation in social development activities; as a result, researchers could analyze participation in development at the local or project level. Cohen and Uphoff (1977) argued in their framework that participation is not a thing that exists in certain quantities and can be measured; therefore, they treated participation as a rubric under which a number of clearly definable elements can be assembled. In this sense, they have considered participation as an overarching concept best approached by looking at its more specific components. In their framework, the authors highlighted the importance of dealing with the concept participation as an adjective, describing whether certain kinds of development activity are participatory or how participatory they are. In this conceptual framework, the authors have tried to establish indicators, which may measure the presence, extent, and effects of participation in development activities (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977).

2.5 Conclusion

The focus of this study is to explore the definition and conceptualization, practices and activities of people’s participation in the different stages of designing, implementing, and evaluating social development projects. Specifically by investigating the concept people’s participation, both conceptually and operationally, from the viewpoint of the Northern NGO policy makers and administrators. Coupled with this, the definitions, the participatory practices and activities carried out in their local Palestinian partners’ development projects in the West Bank and Gaza Strip will be explored. So the overarching question to be investigated is the manner and extent to which participatory definitions and concepts held by the Northern NGO officers are actually implemented in the field. Moreover, the political, economic, and social context that influence and shape such practices will be explored.

Since the aim of this study is to explore the concept within a specific context, we will not decide in advance the variables to be used in this specific study. Nevertheless, it is expected that
when we look at the participatory activities and practices of the NGOs, some of these variables or measures presented above will be helpful in explaining some of the results. Thus, the different conceptualizations, dimensions, frameworks and ways in looking at participation are presented with a goal of providing a general framework of reference for the study, which manifest the different debates regarding the concept, and the complex nature of it. Therefore, building on the above conceptualizations covering the development of the concept of participation in social development, this research study will make an attempt to explore the concept in a specific setting of social development projects where mostly social workers are involved. To summarize, the approach of this research will identify participation from the following general dimensions:

1. Whether it is treated as a means to achieve the goals of the development projects as well as an end, and as a goal in itself (David, 1991; UNDP, 1990).

2. At the level of a program or project proposed and executed by an NGO, which is one dimension of participation proposed for research by Stiefel & Wolfe, (1994) based on the UNRISD’s conceptualization of participation.

3. Within the different stages of social development projects in which participation could occur as stated by Cohen and Uphoff’s (1977) seminal work on people’s participation in rural development. Their approach has been most influential in identifying the key-stages of the project cycle (these are in the decision-making, implementation, benefits and evaluation phases of the project) in which participation could occur.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The overarching purpose of this study was to explore the way in which the concept of people’s participation (or beneficiaries’ participation) is defined, conceptualized, and understood by policy makers and administrators of international Northern NGOs and the way the concept is defined, conceptualized and implemented or practiced in social development projects by their local Palestinian NGO partners who they fund. A descriptive, non-experimental research design using a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methodologies was applied in order to answer this question. While descriptive studies describe a given state of affairs as scientifically complete and careful as possible, descriptive research is carried out to describe existing conditions without analyzing the relationships among variables (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Qualitative research, on the other hand allows the investigator to study naturally occurring phenomena in all their complexity for the purpose of discovering the underlying meanings and patterns of relationships (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996).

In this study, the use of open-ended questions in phase one of the study has allowed the experts of Northern NGOs to provide their own definitions and conceptualizations on the concept
people’s participation in social development projects. The answers that were provided were coded and categorized for analysis. This qualitative analysis carried out nonnumeric examination and interpretation of observations (Rubin & Babbie, 1993).

The use of a survey in the second phase of the study, on the other hand, has provided quantitative data on the definitions, actual practices and activities of people’s participation in local social development projects. For the purpose of describing and explaining the phenomena reflected by those observations, quantitative analysis used a numerical representation and manipulation of observations (Rubin & Babbie, 1993). This study was conducted in two phases:

- The Delphi Technique was used for a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches. The Delphi Technique is usually applied in order to obtain a consensus of opinion about a topic not subject to precise quantification (Ludwig, 1999). It comprises a set of procedures characterized by the iterative use of a survey over time with the same panel of respondents (Witkin, & Altschuld, 1995). For purposes of this study, the initial Delphi steps entailed sending a semi-structured open-ended questionnaire to "decision-makers" or "policy makers" in the donor’s headquarters of Northern NGOs to solicit their definitions and conceptualizations of people’s participation in social development projects (see Appendix C). In the Delphi process, the semi-structured questionnaire usually consists of a set of basic questions and issues relevant to the overall study/interest to be explored (Gamon, 1991). This study questions the way those decision or/and policy makers define the concept of beneficiary participation in social development projects and the way beneficiaries participate in the actual projects they fund. Based on the responses of the participants in the first round of the Delphi Technique, another round of questions was conducted, allowing participants to reflect on their answers and to compare them with other respondents. These two Delphi rounds guided the survey development in the second phase. This survey was subsequently sent to the local NGOs
in Palestine. Studies comparing the Delphi's results with other methods have confirmed the effectiveness of the method in generating ideas and use of participants' time (Ulschak, 1983).

- The quantitative, exploratory phase. Phase two of the study consisted of a cross-sectional, Likert-type survey, resulting from the first phase that was sent to social workers at the local NGOs projects in the West-Bank and Gaza-Strip funded or administrated by Northern NGOs. This survey allowed the researcher to collect detailed data on the actual practices and activities of people’s participation in social development projects for descriptive inference. Exploratory research is employed when the research intends to “break new ground” (Rubin & Babbie, 1993), and this research project was designed with this intention.

The survey in the second phase provided data, which explored and described:

1. Definitions and conceptualizations of social workers at the local NGOs, who work directly with communities and beneficiaries on people’s participation in actual social development projects in Palestine.

2. The kinds of participatory practices and activities performed by the staff of NGOs in Palestine, as the social workers of those NGOs perceive them, also their attitudes toward people’s participation in social development projects. The purpose of this survey was to explore what these practices, activities and attitudes are, and not to evaluate these practices and activities and attitudes. This information is expected to help future evaluation of the participatory qualities of these NGOs.

Using the results of Delphi in constructing the questionnaire for the second phase has helped to overcome the weakness that usually exists in survey design due to misinterpretation (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991 & Rubin & Babbie, 1993).
3.2 Delphi Technique

Delphi Methodology Overview

The Technique is considered to be both a quantitative and qualitative method. It is a method dating back to the 1950s, which was developed by a team of researchers consisting of Dalkey and Helmer (cited at Ludwig, 1997). The Delphi Technique comprises a set of procedures characterized by the iterative use of a survey over time with the same panel of respondents (Witkin, & Altschuld, 1995). The use of multiple iterations and feedback is designed to accomplish a convergence of opinion. The group of respondents is assumed to make conjectures based upon rational judgment rather than on mere guessing (Weaver, 1971). Thus, the technique is a group process utilizing individual responses, as opposed to bringing individuals together for discussion. Rather than gathering people together for oral discussion, individuals provide written responses to questions derived from the literature (Ludwig, 1997). This is considered an advantage when participants are not in close proximity to each other. In this Delphi study, the participants from Northern NGOs were spread across all the Northern countries, including Australia, Europe, USA and Canada.

This technique, as argued by Deshler (1989), is considered to work in the spirit of participatory research. Since participants are asked more than once to review their answers and are given a summary of the comments at the end, they become aware of the opinions and reasons underlying their considerations. In this particular study, the Delphi Technique was used to solicit ideas about the meaning of the concept “people's participation” and to explore the definitions and the conceptualizations of this concept on the part of the policy makers or experts of Northern NGOs in relation to their organizational goals and objectives in carrying out social development projects. The Delphi normally uses 3 to 5 rounds of multiple iterations or feedback to reach a consensus on the conceptualization and definition of the concept (Witkin & Altschuld, 1995). In
This study, only two rounds were used, which is justified by the small sample size obtained in the first round (n=13) and second round (n=5), and the fear of losing more respondents if more rounds were sought (J. W. Alschuld, personal communication, January 8, 2002.

After coding and categorizing the answers from the open-ended questions, a second questionnaire was developed based on the information and data from the first round, which in turn was sent back to the Northern NGOs to comment on (see Appendix E). Since the number of respondents to the second round was small (n=5), the results of the second round were used partially in verifying the answers of the first round. Moreover, the feedback from the second round was used in further designing the questionnaire for the second phase, which was aimed at gathering information from social workers in the local Palestinian social development projects on the actual practices and activities pertaining to this concept. These local projects were those that were either funded or administrated directly by the Northern NGOs. Additional questions allowed the exploration of the social workers’ and organizations’ background, which helped to understand the setting. These questions touched upon the make-up of the staff and the organizations’ particular characteristics related to the concept of beneficiaries’ participation.

3.3 Sampling Design for the Two Phases of the Study

Since this study was conducted in two phases, the samples obtained were different for each phase.

3.3.1 Sampling procedures for the first phase

A purposive sample from Northern NGOs was selected from a list representing those major Northern NGO donors assisting the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. A directory of these non-governmental organizations in donor countries assisting the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza-strip, designed and developed by the - UNSCO (United Nations Social Cultural Organization, 1999) was the population frame for choosing the sample. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, 45 Northern NGOs were chosen from a directory of 155
organizations in total. Those Northern NGOs carrying out projects directed at providing social
development and social work services were selected. These NGOs are the ones who support,
administrate, and/or fund social development projects in Palestine. Moreover, these organizations
are considered to have a long tradition and history in social development and social welfare work
in Palestine, and also the ones listed in the directory as considering involvement or participation
of the people essential to their work.

The purposive sampling method was used here because it met the needs of the Delphi
Technique study. The study’s aim was to solicit opinions, ideas, and philosophies of the Northern
NGOs’ administrators and policy makers regarding their definitions and conceptualizations of
people's participation in the social development projects they run. It is typical for the Delphi
Technique that characteristics and qualifications of desirable respondents are identified and a
nomination process is used to select participants, since randomly selecting participants is not
acceptable (Ludwig, 1997).

Out of the 45 organizations contacted, 10 organizations responded negatively and apologized
for not being able to participate. The reasons for their refusal to participate varied, but the most
common were:

1. Limited staff with enormous responsibilities.
2. Non-ability of the staff, due to time constraints, to provide the kind of meaningful
   contribution that this study deserves.
3. Very large volume of such requests (participation in research studies) that the
   organizations regularly receive; as a result these organizations have an overall policy of
   not responding to and/or refusing such requests.
4. Some organizations clarified that they no longer undertake development projects in
   Palestine and have ended their projects in Palestine, thus considering themselves unable
   to contribute to the study.
5. Other organizations alluded to their shift of focus in their services from development to relief due to the current political situation in Palestine, a situation that does not promote developmental services encouraging participation, thus forcing them to alter their organization’s priorities. As a consequence, they have become unable to contribute to this study.

6. Other organizations saw that their experience does not meet the criteria of participation.

3.3.2 The Detailed Procedure of ‘Selection of Panel’ Sampling for the Delphi Technique and Data Collection Procedure

The participants for the panel were selected through the following procedure:

- Prior approval from the “Office of Research Risks Protection” Human Subjects Institutional Review Board of The Ohio State University was obtained on October 4th, 2002 (see Appendix I).

- After receiving approval from the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at the Ohio State University, contacts with the selected Northern organizations were initiated through a letter sent to the Northern NGOs’ directors and administrators to explain the research study, its goals, objectives and its methodology, and to solicit their interest in and cooperation with the study (see Appendix A). The first solicitation letters to the NGOs were faxed to each of the selected 45 NGOs directors on October 21st, 2002 (see Appendix A). The method of recruitment for this phase applied the Salant and Dillman approach on how to increase response rates (Salant & Dillman, 1994). On November 4th, 2002 a second letter was sent to the NGOs to solicit their participation (see Appendix A). On November 13th a third letter was sent to the NGOs to attract their interest and to convince them that the study was worth their time (see Appendix A). After the third round of letters, 23 NGOs responded positively and expressed their willingness to take part in the study. Most Delphi studies use between 15 to 50 participants, the minimal number needed to constitute a representative pooling of
judgments and information processing capability of the group (Ludwig, 1999 & Witkin, & Altschuld, 1995). Debecq, Van de Ven & Gustafson (1975) suggest using the minimally sufficient number of respondents. Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis & Snyder (1972) reported there is a definite and monolithic increase in the reliability of group responses with increasing group size. Reliability, with a correlation coefficient approaching .9, was found by utilizing a group size of 13. The study’s aim was to solicit at least 20 participants, but more were sought because of the possibility of losing participants throughout the process.

- Each NGO director approached by this study was asked to nominate a person from its staff to participate in the research, particularly one who is regarded within his/her organization as an expert on ‘beneficiary participation in social development projects’ and who is familiar with the operation of the organization in the Palestinian areas. The need to locate and target self-motivated individuals as "experts" in their organizations and in the topic was crucial.

- The sample, which is called panel in the Delphi Technique, should consist of individuals with specialized knowledge on the topic (Witkin, & Altschuld, 1995). For research purposes, it was asked that the nominated participants meet specific criteria. A criteria for choosing the desirable participants was set as follows: They should:

1. Have worked with their particular NGO for at least one year
2. Be considered by the administrations of the organizations as representative of the organizations, and thus should be informed about the procedures of the organization related to the issue of people’s participation
3. Be knowledgeable of their organizations’ polices and procedures regarding the issue of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects, and hence should be regarded by the administrations of their organizations as ‘experts’ in the area of beneficiaries’ participation in their organizations; they should be familiar with the topic...
of people’s participation in social development projects; and they should have experiences to share on the topic of people’s participation in social development projects.

4. Have had experiences with beneficiaries’ participation in West Bank and Gaza Strip social development projects, and have knowledge and experience to base their participatory activities upon.

- Twenty-three organizations responded positively. Given the qualifications identified above, the directors or administrators of the organizations nominated a staff member who was supposed to participate in the Delphi panel. The directors or administrators were left with the choice of nominating themselves if they considered themselves to fit the above criteria. In this study, those nominated were mostly decision-makers and policy-makers working for Northern NGOs, most of them holding offices in the Middle East regional offices. The respondents were asked to contact the researcher preferably by e-mail.

- After identifying the participants’ names and contact information by the organizations’ directors or administrators, a contact letter and an explanation of the process were sent to the potential members of the developing panel to solicit their cooperation and interest (see Appendix B).

- The solicitation/data collection process in this phase (the two rounds of Delphi) was extended to cover a 6 month period, from October 2002 until the end of April 2003. The nature of the research required that the participants be committed to answering the first detailed open-ended questionnaire, which required deep input, analysis and thought on the part of the participants. They then should commit themselves to answer the second questionnaire developed as a result of the open-ended questionnaire. The researcher was therefore faced with many delays and problems in getting the panel to provide their answers.
within a reasonable time frame. The reasons behind these delays were expressed by the participants as follows: that they are overloaded with daily work, report writing, other priorities such as internal evaluation, and time-intensive strategic planning for the region where they serve; that the Middle East area where they work is an unpredictable area – thus short-notice changes to their planning had to be carried out due to emergencies; the long traveling time required to go to the countries where they operate and fund projects; and personal vacations and holiday time. Many additional solicitation methods were implemented, e-mails and faxes were sent to remind the panel of their commitment to the study, in some cases where the selected person did not respond at all to the researcher; and letters to the directors themselves were sent to ask them to urge the nominated person to respond.

- The nature of research, which does not allow for a great loss in the number of the panel, made it very crucial to send more than 7 reminders to the participants, and in many times to call them personally in the regional offices to encourage them to respond. Despite all the attempts to keep the number of the panel to 23 from the first initial positive responses, only 13 participated in the first phase. Of those of the original number of organizations whose directors agreed to nominate a person to participate in the research study, 3 organizations dropped the process, referring to the amount of time the research needed which they did not calculate in the beginning; one organization referred to internal restructuring within the organization, preventing the participant from committing the effort and the time for the research. One participant dropped out due to sickness, and three others stated that they could not participate at this point due to lack of time, or long traveling periods, but would be available after few months, which was unsuitable for the research study time frame, given
the fact the time frame for this specific stage of the study was extended many times over a 6-month period. The researcher lost touch with a few organizations despite many attempts to make contact by Fax, e-mail, or phone.

- Subsequent to receiving the answers from the open-ended questionnaire, the coding, categorizing and clustering of the data from the first round resulted in another questionnaire, in which all the answers in the first open-ended round were coded, clustered and then summarized in a structured way (see Appendix C). The 13 respondents were sent this questionnaire. In the second round of Delphi, only 5 participants responded despite all the efforts that the researcher made to increase the number. The main issue at this stage was time, which the participants lacked, and the researcher could not extend the time frame for data collection in the second round, given the fact that the research consists of two phases. Moreover, a third round of Delphi was dropped due to the small size in the second round. It was believed that the results of the second survey, consisting of such a small number (n=5), would be not reliable; therefore, the researcher depended mainly on the results from the first open-ended questionnaire, and used the results from the second round as validation to the answers of the first round. The first round provided thick data on the issues that were discussed, and it was possible to use this data extensively. As a result a likert type questionnaire was constructed to use in the second phase of the study.

3.3.3 **Study Population and Sampling Procedures for the Second Phase**

In the second phase of the study, the population examined in this study consisted of Palestinian social workers in social development and social work projects that the Northern NGOs administrate or fund in the West Bank. These social workers were surveyed in the second phase of the study to solicit their definitions on the concept beneficiaries’ participation, and to examine the actual practices of and attitudes toward beneficiaries’ participation in those projects.
It was evident that the population was too small to secure an adequate probability sample; therefore, a purposive sampling strategy was utilized. Due to the small population size, all eligible social workers engaged in social development and social work projects funded or administrated by Northern NGOs were solicited to participate in this study. The proposal for this study indicated that the Northern NGOs participating in the first phase would nominate those social development projects considered to be participatory as well as those projects perceived to be implementing participatory practices and activities. These would then be examined in the second phase as a way of exploring how people’s participation is understood, practiced, and implemented in the projects sponsored by those specific NGOs. Due to the small number of those organizations participating in the first phase (n=13), it was clear that the number of social workers who would be participating in the second phase would be too small to conduct any analysis; moreover, there was the possibility that those NGO panel members would nominate projects that they consider to be the best projects with regard to participatory practices. Due to reasons such as the small sample size and the hidden bias in choosing the sample for the second phase, it was decided that all social workers engaged in local NGOs would be asked to fill out the questionnaire in the second phase of the study. Since it is the aim of this research study to explore to what extent the concept ‘beneficiary participation’ is implemented in the practice on the level of local projects based on how the Northern NGOs’ policy and decision makers conceptualize and define it, it was reasonable to solicit the participation of social workers employed at these local organizations, since they worked directly with beneficiaries and communities and would carry out those practices regarding participation.

In this phase, The East Jerusalem YMCA Rehabilitation Program based in Beit Sahour in the West Bank, whose services cover all West Bank areas with branch offices in all the seven major cities of the West Bank, supervised the distribution and the collection of the questionnaires to the local NGOs (see Appendix G). Each office of the YMCA program, whose social workers
operated in this specific area, was responsible for the distribution of the questionnaires and for collecting them. The staff of the YMCA, mainly social workers, delivered the questionnaires in person along with a cover letter explaining the research and its procedures to all the local NGOs in the West Bank (see Appendix G). Depending on the local NGO lists available to these YMCA branches, and depending on their local knowledge of the organizations in the area they operate, 150 questionnaires in all areas were distributed to local NGOs. Not every social worker engaged at the NGOs completed the survey. When number of responses was less then expected, the staff of the YMCA visited the organizations more than once to encourage the social workers to fill the questionnaires; moreover, many telephone contacts with the organizations were made to encourage them to participate. In the cover letter it was stated that by filling the questionnaires and returning them to the YMCA’s staff member, the participants would also provide their consent to participate.

Between June and July of 2003, 109 self-administrated surveys were filled out by the NGO social workers and returned to the YMCA.

3.4 Instrument Developments and Data Collection

3.4.1 Instrument Development and Data Collection for the Delphi Technique

In the Delphi Technique, instrumentation and data collection are interconnected (Witkin, & Altschuld, 1995). Participants in a Delphi agree to receive and respond to a questionnaire in a series of rounds. The number of rounds may vary from 2 to 5 depending upon the degree of agreement sought. Delphi rounds of questionnaires continue until a predetermined level of consensus is reached, or no new information is gained. In this study, two rounds were conducted. In a review of literature, Altschuld (1993) suggests that in most instances three iterations are sufficient when not enough new information has been gained to warrant the cost of more iterations. Moreover, if there is a concern regarding loss of participants, 2 rounds would also be
sufficient (J. W. Altschuld, personal communication, January 8, 2003). This was indeed the case in this study: the responses to the first round were 13, in the second round 5 participants responded only. Therefore, given these numbers, a third round would have been problematic.

The data collection process is viewed as a series of rounds; in each round every participant works through a survey which is returned to the researcher who edits, and returns to each participant a statement representing the position of the whole group and the participant's own position.

In developing and administrating the instrument for the Delphi study, the following steps were performed:

Round One: The participants were asked to write responses to a set of open-ended questions. A series of questions were designed to explore the variations that exist regarding the definitions and conceptualizations, applications and evaluation of the concept ‘beneficiary participation’ in social development projects (see Appendix C). The questions were divided into three sections, the first section dealt with definitions and conceptualizations, where the panel participants were asked to define the concept “people's participation” and to describe the potential benefits and liabilities of beneficiaries’ participation. The second section dealt with the application and evaluation of the concept, where they were asked to describe the kinds of development activities in which people's participation may be useful, beneficial and those that may be problematic; any criteria that their organization as donor NGO has used which allows them to evaluate the activities of people’s participation in the projects; if they think that participation is essential and/or not essential to the success of the projects’ goals; and in what ways do they believe participation influences the direction of the projects. The second section dealt with the Palestinian context, where they were asked to list the conditions in Palestine that facilitate and those that hinder people’s participation in the development projects.
In general, the aim of the Delphi is to reach consensus on a specific concept. This could be achieved through different rounds. In this particular study, the aim of consensus was not achieved, but other valid variations were used, which has met the aim of the study. This variation explored the different definitions and conceptualizations of the concept ‘people’s participation’ according to donor agencies, in order to examine the level that these variations exist in the praxis of the concept as it is perceived by the social workers of the local NGOs funded by the donor Northern NGOs. Therefore, the degree of agreement (consensus) sought in this study was the extent to which participants agreed on the topics, but also the extent to which they differed on them. Consensus on a topic was determined by coding and categorizing the responses in the first round, and deciding the most frequent categories by having a certain percentage (usually 50%) of the participants’ answers fall within specific range of answers.

**Round Two:** Based on the information collected during the first round, a second questionnaire was developed (see Appendix E). Based on the responses to the original open-ended questions, a series of structured items on definitions, conceptualizations, activities, and practices of people’s participation was developed. During this second round, the questionnaire asked participants to review all items or statements identified by the first round of the Delphi Technique, which were coded, categorized and then summarized by the researcher. Participants asked to evaluate in a Likert-type rating scale their answers in order to establish preliminary priorities among items. Participants were invited to comment on their rationale for the rating and to add additional items. The result of round two was to be used to identify the areas of disagreement and agreement.

**Round Three:** It was proposed that this study should have a third round, but as explained earlier, the third round was not conducted due to the fact that the number of respondents to the second round was small (n=5). If it had been conducted, the participants in round three would have been asked to review their prior responses and express their individual judgments as to the
importance of each item. The third round usually would provide closure for the instrument development portion of the study. In the third round, the respondents would be asked to re-rate each item. To assist in their consideration, participants would be provided with: (a) statistical feedback related to their own rating on each item, (b) how the group of participants rated the same item and (c) a summation of comments made by each participant. This feedback process makes the Delphi respondents aware of the range of opinions and the reasons underlying those opinions.

3.4.2 Instrument Development for the Second Phase

As a result of phase one of the Delphi Technique process, an instrument was created which in turn was used in phase two of the study. It consisted of a self-administrated questionnaire encompassing the following sections:

1. The first section attempted to measure the actual kinds of participatory practices and activities taking place in the local NGOs. A Likert-type scale contained 112 item-questions which are related to: the definitions and conceptualization of beneficiary participation in social development projects as perceived by social workers engaged in these projects; the actual ways beneficiaries participate in these organization’s social development projects, their general attitude, beliefs statements, and definitions related to the implementation of the concept in practice. Moreover, it included additional open-ended questions asking the participants about their definitions of beneficiaries’ participation.

2. The second section represents descriptive data consisting of general background questions on the social workers and their organizations as related to the concept. It contained questions regarding the respondents’ characteristics such gender, education, area of study, years of experience, position and status in the organization, and any
training they received in the area of beneficiaries’ participation, as well as the level at which this training was relevant to their work. In addition, it included questions on the organizations related to the type of services provided, sources of funding, areas that the organization serves, target groups, number of social workers in the organization and any evaluation that is conducted by the donors of the organization with respect to beneficiaries’ participation. This data was treated as categorical data, except the data on years of experience, number of social workers in the organization, and the level at which the training on beneficiaries’ participation was relevant to their work.

As of the first section that consists of 112 items, it was divided as follows:

1. In the first division, all participation items are included which reflect the importance of participation in different stages of the project; these are items 1-23 (see Appendix F). These items were organized according to a Likert-type, five-item scale, where the respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe that each of the listed project/program activities is an important form of beneficiary participation in social development projects. The ranges of the answers were 1) not important; 2) of little importance; 3) not sure; 4) important; and 5) very important.

2. The second one includes all the items reflecting the level at which participation actually takes place in different phases of the projects; these items are 24-46 (see Appendix F). These are also organized according to a Likert-type, five-item scale, where the respondents were asked to indicate to which extent beneficiaries in their project/program have actually participated in each of the listed activities. The ranges of the answers were 1) never; 2) some of the time; 3) not sure; 4) most of the time; and 5) all of the time.
3. The third includes items 47-112, reflecting the attitudes, practices, and definitions of participation in general. In the items 47-112, reversed statements were used, then reversed scoring were applied as follows (1=5, 2=4, 4=2, 5=1, 3=3), where the first number is the respondent’s answer and the second number is the value that was attributed to it. The third division was meant to measure three aspects of participation, these are:

- The first aspect is ‘what is people’s participation’: the items are statements about how participants define people’s participation in social development projects; these are represented in items 47-55, 102-103, 108-110. Respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on a five-item scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) undecided or no opinion; 4) agree; 5) strongly agree. The aim was to identify any constructs in their definitions that could be extracted. A reliability analysis was calculated using Cronbach alpha coefficients to test these items on definitions for internal consistency. The resulting reliability of the 14 items used in this study to explore the definitions of participation as it is perceived by the social workers was very low (coefficient alpha = .5648); therefore, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the 14 items on definitions was conducted to extract those items exhibiting higher internal consistency and which together best represent the different constructs. The results will be reported in detail in chapter 4.

- The second aspect is ‘the value of people’s participation to the respondents’, which represents the overall respondents’ attitude toward people’s participation in social development projects. The items are 56-57, 59-69, 72, 78-79, 81-82, 86, 90-93, 104, and 111-112. 22 Reversed statements were used and 4 non-reversed to ensure
reliability of the scoring. These 26 items reflect the general opinion of the respondents as a whole toward participation in social development projects. The resulting reliability of the 26 items used in this study to explore opinions toward participation as perceived by the social workers was acceptable (coefficient alpha = .8649); nevertheless, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the 26 items on definitions was conducted to extract the items exhibiting higher internal consistency and which together best represent the construct. The results will be reported in detail in chapter 4.

- The third aspect represents the actual practice in organization, and consists of items 58, 70-71, 73-77, 80, 83-85, 87-89, 94-101, and 105-107. In these 26 items, 13 reversed statements were used and 13 non-reversed, to insure the reliability of the scoring. The resulting reliability of the 26 items used in this study to explore the actual practice of participation as perceived by the social workers was considered acceptable (coefficient alpha = .7903); nevertheless, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the 26 items on definitions was conducted to extract the items exhibiting higher internal consistency and which together best represent the different construct. The results will be reported in detail in chapter four.

3.5 Reliability and Validity of the Measurements

Phase One

The Delphi study: Conventional means of determining reliability are not appropriate for a Delphi Study Technique (Ludwig, 1999). Reliability for the Delphi Technique can be considered to be similar to reproducibility in experimental studies (ibid) or triangulation in qualitative studies.
A form of reliability in a Delphi study exists when the same method is used over a number of different experts who arrive at similar results at which point consensus is reached.

The study’s initial instrument, ‘the open-ended questionnaire’, contained general statements and questions derived from the literature. Face and content validity of the initial instrument were assured through the use of a content validity panel. The panel consisted of two professors from the College of Social Work, and one from the Department of Human Resources at Ohio State University, who are the committee for this research study. The professors are known for their expertise in international social development, and the issue of participation in development. They have also written and published in this area. Their feedback was used to ensure the questions’ validity. Given the nature of the Delphi Technique, additional types of validity and reliability estimates are not appropriate (Dalkey, Rourke, Lewis and Snyder, 1972). Since the aim was to construct an instrument based on the Delphi which measures the concept in practice, and to use it in the second phase, it was assumed that the panel of the Delphi study would act as judges for the validity and the reliability of the second round of the Delphi. The respondents were asked to add comments, to clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Moreover, this questionnaire was sent to the research advisor at the Ohio State University, who commented on it. These comments have helped in refining the questionnaire for the second phase.

**Phase Two**

Delphi study has guided the construction of the instrument items for the second phase. This instrument was supposed to be filled out by social workers in the local NGOs in Palestine, where Arabic is the speaking language of the respondents. The instrument was originally developed in the English language, and then translated into Arabic. Therefore, measurements of validity and reliability were performed to ensure the validity and the reliability of the instrument.
Face Validity: To establish face validity of the English language questionnaire, the instrument was sent to a friend of the researcher, who is an assistant professor at the School of Social Work at the University of Missouri, and who is familiar with the topic of the research. She provided comments on the clarity and appropriateness of the instrument. She focused on spelling/grammar, typos, readability, layout (increasing white space on each page), and formatting (making sure that there was consistency throughout the document, and that the items were lined up in a way making the survey easy to understand).

After the researcher translated the instrument, the Arabic and the English versions were sent to one of NGO’s director at the Center for Conflict Resolution and Research in Palestine. The director is fluent in both languages and has expertise in instrument constructions in Arabic and has supervised more then 80 polls in the Palestinian society. Moreover, as a director of one of the NGOs, he is familiar with how the NGOs work in Palestine. He commented on the accuracy of the translation and the appropriateness of it to the Palestinian culture. One faculty member at Al-Quds University in Palestine, who also commented on the appropriateness and clarity of the instrument, performed another check for face validity in the Arabic version of the questionnaire. All the comments were incorporated in the final version of the questionnaire.

Content Validity: Content validity refers to the degree to which a measure covers the range of meanings included within the concept (Rubin & Babbie, 1993). To establish content validity, two steps were taken:

1. Two professors at the College of Social Work and one at the Department of Human Resources at Ohio State University, who are the committee for this research study, commented on the English version of the questionnaire. The professors are known for their expertise in international social development and the issue of participation in development. Moreover, they have practical expertise in social development projects in developing countries, and thus have extensive knowledge of the NGOs’ activities in social
development projects and are familiar with the debate regarding the issue of participation in social development projects. In addition, they have published extensively in this field in international journals such as the Journal of Social Development Issues and Development in Practice. The faculty members were asked to assess the instrument during and after its development. Their comments were incorporated in the instrument.

2. A field test of social science university professors and experts in the field of social development in the West Bank and Gaza Strip were contacted to establish the content validity of the instrument (the Arabic version). These individuals were asked to comment on the clarity, wording, thoroughness, easy use, and appropriateness of the instrument. Moreover, this local Palestinian panel of experts evaluated its cultural soundness and appropriateness. These consisted of two university professors and two Palestinian NGO directors and staff who are known to have interest in this area and are known for their expertise in the work of NGOs and the issue of People’s involvement in social development projects in the Palestinian context; two of them have published locally regarding the issue of development. This field test group was given specific direction, specification, and parameters to make their judgment (see Appendix H).

**Reliability:** A reliability analysis was calculated using Cronbach alpha coefficients to test the internal consistency of the instrument. For the different sections of the scale, three different tests were calculated:

1. The first was to test the internal consistency of the first 23 items. This sub-scale measures the extent to which the respondents believe that each of the different project/program activities is an important form of beneficiary participation in social development projects. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for this particular scale yielded a coefficient of .92.
2. The second was to test the internal consistency of the items from 24-46. This sub-scale measures the degree to which beneficiaries in the respondents’ project/program have actually participated in the different stages of the projects. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for this particular scale yielded a coefficient of .94.

3. The third was to test the internal consistency of the items from 47-112. This sub-scale measures the attitude of the respondents toward people’s participation. Cronbach’s coefficient alpha for this particular scale yielded a coefficient of .87.

3.6 Sample Size

In this study the sample size was not an issue because in both phases purposive samples were used. The aim was to choose cases representing that represent the kinds of participatory practices and activities this study aimed to look at.

In phase one, the number of subjects participating in the first round of the Delphi was purposively selected and an even bigger number was sought. However, in the end, 13 participants responded in the first round and 5 in the second round of the Delphi study. Even if this is considered a small number, it is justified by the use and nature of the Delphi Technique, as was discussed earlier.

In phase two of the study, the sampling procedure was also purposive and the size was determined based on the number of local NGOs staff who agreed to participate in this study. 109 social workers in different NGOs participated in this study. Nevertheless, many factors played a role in the efforts to increase the size of the sample in phase two:

1. Population size: since the population frame is not identified, it was not easy to achieve a large number of participants willing to participate in this study. Moreover, most of the NGOs in Palestine have multiple sources of funding, so it is not feasible to identify
organizations that depend solely on the Northern NGOs for funding. Therefore, all social workers employed in the NGOs were solicited to participate in this study.

2. The variability in the composition of the population with respect to their characteristic of interests has been considered. In this population a wide variety of opinions regarding the characteristic of interests was sought. In trying to achieve a larger sample size different NGOs were targeted, allowing for the greatest possible diversity of participatory activities and practices reported by social workers engaged in local NGOs.

3. The type of analysis used, i.e. factor analysis, made it preferable to have a sample size of 100 or larger. As a general rule, the minimum should at least comprise five times as many variables as to be analyzed (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). It is argued that in carrying out factor analysis attempts should be made to obtain an adequate sample size for the number of variables examined, in order to minimize the chances of ‘over-fitting’ the data (ibid). Moreover, sample size is very important with regard to the significance of factor loadings when employing the concept of statistical power. In our sample of 109 respondents, factor loadings of .55 and above are considered significant (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998, p.111).

3.7 Rationale for the Selection of the Overall Design

Phase one: There are important elements in the Delphi Technique making it applicable to this study, these are:

1. The Delphi provides a means for obtaining a structured input from a group of experts without requiring face-to-face meetings (Witkin, & Altshul, 1995). In this study, the different Northern NGOs are located in different countries, making it unfeasible to establish one to one contact with them, including a group and face-to-face meeting.
2. The Delphi Technique encourages innovative thinking in the areas of forecasting, policy investigation, and goal setting (Witkin, & Altshuld, 1995). In this specific study, the definitions and conceptualizations of these Northern NGOs regarding people’s participation in social development projects were investigated. As an issue that these NGOs deal with and tackle, the study allowed them to provide extensive input with regard to the topic.

3. Multiple rounds with feedback permit time for reflection (Witkin, & Altshuld, 1995).

4. Measurements of consensus as well as a clarification of views result from this process. In this study, the consensus measurement was used to develop a tool that allows for the collection of information on these local Northern NGO projects.

Phase two: The survey design is better able to answer the kind of questions that are descriptive and exploratory.

1. Exploratory analysis allows for the investigation into a topic that is not well understood, empirically explored, tested, or proven (Rubin & Babbie, 1993). It is the aim of this research to touch new ground, which has not been fully explored. Moreover, survey research is a well-suited technique to obtain facts on people and their beliefs, opinions, attitudes, and behaviors (Rubin & Babbie, 1993).

2. The purpose of descriptive research is to describe a sample exhibiting certain characteristics and interprets the sample findings (Rubin & Babbie, 1993). Since it is the aim of this study to examine the participatory practices and activities of non-governmental organizations regarding people’s participation in social development projects, descriptive analysis has helped the researcher to become familiar with the
chosen sample, its characteristics and the characteristics of the organizations as they are related to the topic of the research; it also describes how people’s participation is defined, practiced and implemented in projects carried out by NGOs.

3.8 Feasibility

The UNESCO conducted a comprehensive and detailed survey of those Northern NGOs donors assisting Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza-Strip in 1999. This comprised the population frame of phase one. The list is thorough and covers a wide and comprehensive array of information on the kind of work and activities carried out by Northern NGOs, which made the purposive sampling possible.

The Delphi study is limited by the time it takes to send and receive replies and by the lack of stimulation due to the impossibility of face-to-face contact (Witkin, & Altshuld, 1995). Therefore, special efforts were made to obtain the commitment of the participants. Measures were taken to solicit the participation of panel members, since this was crucial to the ultimate success of the Delphi. These measures included e-mailing the participants frequently, sending them frequent letter of reminders, and contacting them by telephone.

Technology facilitated the Delphi process. Using electronic mail in phase one helped to reduce the costs and time of research. The anonymity of the respondents during the process was an important aspect of the Delphi. As a result, it was imperative to maintain anonymity even when electronic mail was used. The participants were assured that their names would remain anonymous, only the researcher would be able to review their answers, other respondents would not be able to relate answers to any other respondent.

Aided by the East Jerusalem YMCA Rehabilitation program’s’ staff in collecting the data in phase two, the study was conducted in a reasonable amount of time, which totaled 2 months.
despite all the difficulties faced by the Palestinians regarding restrictions of movement, curfews, closures…. etc. The fact that the YMCA program has offices and teams all over the West Bank facilitated the distribution of the questionnaires throughout the West Bank.

The sampling procedure was feasible. There were no problems in obtaining the sample. The sample population was accessible. The researcher’s personal funds were used to implement this study. The YMCA Rehabilitation program printed and distributed all the questionnaires free of charge. The work carried out by their staff in distributing the questionnaires and collecting them was also done at no cost.

3.9 Summary of the Procedures for the Research Study

Phase one

1. A complete Directory of Northern NGOs Donors working in the West Bank and Gaza-Strip was reviewed. The directory included complete contact information. Forty-five major organizations were selected in total. These represent those Northern NGOs who, according to the UNSCO directory, have major social development projects in the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

2. Letters were sent to each CEO of these organizations to explain the research study and to solicit participation (see Appendix A). A request was made to each CEO to nominate one staff member to participate in the Delphi study, based on the criteria identified earlier by the researcher.

3. After receiving the names of the recommended persons from the organizations’ CEO, a letter was sent to those persons to explain the process and to solicit their interest and participation in it (see Appendix B). The initial questionnaire was then sent accordingly (see Appendix C).
4. The solicitation letter accompanying the questionnaire assured the respondents that their participation is voluntary and that the data for this study would be kept strictly confidential during and after the study. Respondents were not required to submit their personal identification (see Appendix B).

5. Protection of human subjects: No harm was expected to come to the subjects of the study. Participants’ anonymity among each other was assured. In addition, the entire research process received prior approval from the Office of Research Risks Protection, Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, the Ohio State University (see Appendix I).

6. Participants of the Delphi were assured that the end result of the process would comprise of a final questionnaire in which the participants or their organizations would not be able to identify any other participant, and thus not become influenced by any of them.

Phase Two

1. The questionnaire was developed and tested for face and content validity.

2. The English version of the questionnaire, along with its Arabic translation and the solicitation letter to the participants in the second phase, were sent to the Ohio State University Institutional Review Board and received approval on June 11th, 2003.

3. The questionnaire was distributed to the local organizations. The solicitation letters requested that the social workers or supervisors in the project/organization fill out the questionnaire.
Phase One

1. Analyses of data of the first open-ended questionnaire: In the first round of Delphi the open-ended questionnaire contained much qualitative data which needed to be analyzed according to analysis procedures for qualitative data. The analysis of the answers to the open-ended questions were carried out using the following procedures:

   - Reviewing the data in each question separately
   - Organizing the results into sets according to question
   - Finding repetitive patterns in the answers
   - Clustering similar thoughts and ideas
   - Identifying similar themes
   - Naming clusters
   - Providing key word identifiers or short phrases per cluster
   - Writing a brief sentence describing the essential nature of each cluster.
   - Developing a questionnaire, consisting of scaled items representing the main ideas, themes, and issues generated from the responses to answers to the open-ended questions (see Appendix E).

2. Only 5 respondents returned the second questionnaire (see Appendix E), which the researcher was to summarize and provide the respondents with statistical feedback: i.e. group responses on frequency tables and individual responses, statistics regarding central tendency and variability calculated for all items of consensus as means of describing their level of importance. Moreover, an anonymous report of the comments would have been given to the respondents as well as the comments, which could have been used to aid in the interpretation of results on items where consensus is not reached. Due to the small number of respondents,
this analysis would not have been meaningful; as a result, the participants’ answers to the questionnaire were only used in guiding the construction of the final instrument.

Furthermore, a typology of the definitions was created, in which the statements relating specifically to the definition question from the first and second rounds of the Delphi were incorporated. This typology presented the variations in the definitions of people’s participation as Northern NGOs’ decision makers and administrators perceive them, and it would have been sent to all participants to rate their answers on what participation actually is. Unfortunately, due to a lack of time it was not possible to carry this out. Nevertheless this typology had guided the construction of the instrument of phase two.

*Phase Two*

By means of the first phase of research, in which a Delphi technique was used to solicit Donor’s NGOs conceptionalizations and definitions of people’s participation in social development projects, different definitions of participation were identified. In this first phase Western NGOs identified different dimensions of participation, which they perceived, should be implemented in projects carried out by their partner NGOs.

The second phase of research aimed at understanding how social workers in those local NGOs funded by Western donors perceive the different dimensions of people’s participation in social development projects in actual practice. Moreover, the aim was to explore the underlying different constructs of the definitions, practices of participation and attitudes toward participation. For this purpose a questionnaire was designed in which each of these definitions (dimensions) contained specific items that represented a facet of the broader definition (dimension), and in which social workers were asked to evaluate these dimensions. The social workers were also asked to evaluate what level of beneficiaries’ participation actually occurs in practice during the different phases of their projects.
Factor analysis was used to test if items reflecting the different definitions (dimensions) hang together as a concept. In this case, factor analysis was used to identify the underlying evaluative dimensions. Specific items exhibiting a high degree of correlation are assumed to be ‘members of a broader dimension’. These dimensions represent composites of specific variables, which in turn allow the dimensions to be interpreted and described. In this regard, using the different definitions, factor analysis was performed to create participation sub-scales as a means to answer the hypothesis whether the social workers would or would not use the same definitions as their funding NGOs.

It is known that any extraction method should try to answer two questions: the one is, “How many components (factors) are needed to represent the variables?”, and the other is “What do these components represent?” (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). Therefore, in the analysis plan these questions are answered through the use of different extraction methods in factor analysis. As the goal of factor analysis in this research was to obtain several theoretically meaningful factors or constructs, an oblique solution of extraction would be appropriate to use (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). Nevertheless, comparing the orthogonal and the oblique solutions would help in examining the stability and the reliability of the produced structure.

The following statistics were used to calculate the descriptive statistics representing the organizations’ and social workers’ characteristics

1. For the metric variable years of experience, number of social workers working in the organization, the number of training provided, and the extent to which training is related to work and helpful to work frequency, and percentage distribution were calculated. Measures of central tendency (means) and measures of variability (standard deviation) were generated from the data on these descriptive variables.
2. Categorical and nominal data in the descriptive section were collated using percentages and frequencies. Demographic statistics of the respondents and of the NGOs were presented utilizing frequency tables.

3.11 Ethical Issues

The Behavioral and Social Science Human Subjects Institutional Board at the Ohio State University reviewed this study and approved the human subjects procedures in October 2002 (see Appendix I). The committee granted a waiver of written consent for this study. The committee saw that the research involved no more than minimal risk to the subject, and the rights and welfare of the subjects were protected. Subjects had the opportunity to choose whether they wanted to participate. Since the research was conducted in two phases, the approval form required that a copy of the questionnaire of the second phase, as well as the Arabic version of the questionnaire along with the cover letter to the social workers should be submitted for review. The above mentioned were submitted with the amendment form for the Review Board in May, and it was approved on June 11th (see Appendix I).

3.12 Strengths

This study was among one of the first to address the issue of definitions of beneficiaries’ participation and the variation on the conceptualization of the concept in social development projects as understood, defined, and conceptualized by the Northern NGO decision-makers. Moreover, the study took the additional step to explore the nature of participatory practices and activities carried out by the Palestinian non-governmental organizations. The strength of such inquiry was based on the attempt to develop a survey designed as a result of phase one of the study.
People’s participation in social development projects is considered an important attribute of NGOs, but to the knowledge of this researcher, it has never been looked at in a systematic way. This study carried out pioneer work that would lay the ground for other research studies in this area to accumulate more grounded knowledge on the issue of people’s participation in the future. In addition, and in order to evaluate participatory practices, it was important to explore what these are. Moreover, this study hopes to provide the opportunity for NGOs to re-examine their role and the way they implement their work, in order to help them be more consistent with the values they propound.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the definitions and conceptualization of the term “beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects” as perceived and conceptualized by project officers of Western donor NGOs who sponsor or administrate social development projects, and by those actually carrying out the actual social development projects in the Palestinian areas.

The study consisted of two phases; the first being a two-stage Delphi process conducted in the spirit of Participatory Action Research (PAR). The aim of this first phase was to obtain the input of project officers in Western non-governmental organizations that fund or administrate development projects in developing countries regarding the way beneficiaries’ participation is conceptualized and defined. These results of this phase were expected to direct the research in the second phase of the study, as well as to contribute to the future research agenda on participatory development.

The Delphi process is a way of structuring communication among a group of people in order to obtain their opinions, feedback, and insights on a course of action. It is not an opinion poll as it involves multiple rounds of communication in which the results of the first survey are fed back to the respondents, who can then change their minds (or not) in the next round. To capture the collective knowledge and experience of project officers from donor NGOs on how they
conceptualize and define “beneficiary participation” is seen as a valid way to improve our understanding of the specific ways that beneficiaries’ participation is conceptualized and practiced in the actual field of social development.

The second phase of this study was to examine and explore the ways beneficiaries’ participation is conceptualized, perceived and practiced by staff members who work in the front line with beneficiaries in social development projects in West Bank and Gaza Strip which are sponsored and/or administrated by donor western NGOs.

The presentation of the study’s data analysis is organized into two sections: the first section includes a presentation of the responses to the first phase, the two-round Delphi technique; the second section presents the descriptive data and the factor analyses of the scales, which were used in the second phase.

4.1 Presentation of the Responses to the First Phase –the Two-Round Delphi Technique

Thirteen respondents from different Western NGOs responded to the first round of Delphi, by completing the open-ended questionnaire. The respondents to the open-ended questions have hand on experience in social development projects and provided different dimensions of the term “People’s participation”. Most of the respondents reported to have positions as directors and officers in the regional offices of the Northern NGOs, where they carry direct responsibility for the projects that are implemented in the Middle East. Many of the respondents reported to have used their organizations’ documents extensively to respond to some of the questions, particularly with regard to the question requiring a definition of People’s participation. Most respondents with the exception of two reported to have filled the questionnaire alone; two reported to have completed the questionnaire with other colleagues or team members in their offices. In their answers, the respondents expressed what they thought participation should be and how it should be implemented. Some respondents made a clear distinction between what their visions as
employees in donor organizations are and what actually takes place on the ground, which could be different than what they represent. Because the respondents had direct experience with the projects in Palestine, they were able to explain the issues related to the context of Palestine, which hinder or facilitate participation.

Keeping with the anonymity of the organizations that participated in the study, names of the organizations will not be disclosed. Details on the characteristics of these organizations were described in chapter three in a sampling section. The Northern NGOs that participated in this study are spread across Western Europe, the USA, and Australia (see Table 4.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of the NGO</th>
<th>Number of NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Western NGOs characteristics: NGOs countries responded to round one (n=13)
Following the procedures of analysis of qualitative data presented in Chapter 3, the following steps were performed to analyze the results of the open-ended questionnaire (the first round of Delphi):

- The responses to each question were reviewed separately and the results were organized into sets by question: There were 3 main areas to which the respondents were asked to reply: the first was related to definitions and conceptualizations of the concept of People’s participation in social development projects, the second was related to the application and evaluation of People’s participation, and the third was related to the Palestinian context. The viewpoints expressed in each respondent’s answer were aggregated together with those of all the other respondents. This process entailed the aggregation of the answers of different respondents to different questions under the same area. The aim was to find repeating patterns in the answers to the questions.

- There were many repeating patterns in the respondents’ answers to the open-ended questionnaire, and the analysis focused on outlining those repetitive thoughts and concepts across different answers. Moreover, the respondents used many concepts differently, yet when explaining their answers in a larger context, they described similar ideas. Nevertheless, the issues that did not have a clear reference to the concept were excluded, and the focus was on those issues and ideas that had a clear meaning and were related directly to the concept.

- There were variations in the answers yet, at the same time, the themes shared much in common. For example, regarding the question of definitions of participation, many ways were used to present the concepts. Words like ownership of the project, full involvement in the project cycle, consultation process, capacity building, and empowerment were consistent in many answers. When the answer included a clear link between two different concepts, these were considered as indications for participation. For example, ownership and full involvement were linked together and full involvement in the project’s cycle lead to
triggering the feeling of ownership toward the project. In the conceptualization question on
the potential benefits of People’s participation in social development projects, words like
accountability, sustainability, lasting impact, sense of ownership, and responsibility were
often repeated.

- After identifying different themes, clustering of similar thoughts and ideas helped to reduce
the amount of responses. Since the number of the respondents was small, the ideas repeated
by at least three respondents were considered to compose of clusters. As much as we were
concerned with shared ideas, we were also interested in the variations of ideas. Since the aim
is not only to reach a consensus, but also to explore the variations in the definition of the
concept in order to include these variations in the final questionnaire, variations were
important

- Naming clusters and providing key words as identifiers or short phrases per cluster was an
interrelated procedure.

- Writing a brief sentence describing the essential nature of each cluster was an integral part of
this latter process.

4.1.1 Reliability, validity, and objectivity of the categories and clusters

In Delphi studies, normally the reliability, validity, and objectivity of the clusters are
checked when the respondents are provided with the opportunity to examine their answers in
subsequent rounds. In a qualitative research study this technique is called member check, where
the data and interpretations obtained are verified by those persons who provided them (Padgett,
1998). Moreover, this process helps to establish reliability, which depends on replication, and
credibility where the respondents examine the attributed categories according to their own
answers. In round two of the study, respondents were asked to comment on the data provided to
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them and on its interpretations. Five responded to this second round and their assessment was incorporated into the final categories and clusters. This is considered a check for the credibility of the categories and clusters.

The volume of the data represented in the open-ended questions was obvious, and, since this research study is concerned with conceptualizations and definitions of the concept of People’s participation, all the ideas that were considered important are presented.

In a naturalistic study, detailed descriptions of data are considered to be a strategy to facilitate transferability (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993). According to Erlandson et al. (1993), effective thick description brings the reader vicariously into the context being described. Further credibility of the data could be achieved through additional rounds of the Delphi technique.

Since the second round of the study was used to present credibility for the first round, it is important to illustrate how the data from the second round of Delphi informed the clusters and categories.

In the second round of Delphi, five respondents out of 13 responded to the second questionnaire. The second round of Delphi took the form of an itemized questionnaire, Likert-type style (see Appendix E). The countries of organizations of the respondents who responded to the second questionnaire are presented in the following table (see Table 4.2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of NGO</th>
<th>Number of NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2  Western NGOs characteristics: NGOs countries responded to round two (n=5).

Respondents in this itemized questionnaire were asked to rate the level at which they agree with the different statements representing the different conceptualizations, definitions, potential problems, evaluation methods, perceived benefits, and the conditions in the Palestinian context that facilitate or hinder participation. The respondents were asked to clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. The responses of the 5 respondents were reviewed; the values of all the items considered to represent a specific cluster were added together for the 5 respondents. High score of these items, which represented a specific cluster, was considered to be a measure of credibility to the specific cluster. Any written comments by the 5 respondents were also incorporated to enhance the connection of the categories that composed the clusters. Nevertheless, these written comments were few. Moreover, since the number of the items in the questionnaire was large compared to the number of respondents, the only possibility to incorporate the answers of the second round was to consider an average of the items in validating the clusters that came up as the result of the first open-ended questions. Therefore, the clusters that are represented below are the final results of the analysis of the both rounds.
4.2 Presentation of Responses to the Two-Round Delphi

The presentation of the responses will focus on the themes, by which clusters will be presented in their relationship with the different themes that are thought to compose these clusters.

4.2.1 Conceptualization and definitions of People’s participation in social development projects

There were variations of definitions expressed by the respondents; the different themes extracted as a result of the analysis of definitions and conceptualizations are as follows:

\[
\text{Involvement} = \text{ownership} = \text{sustainability}
\]

Some respondents perceived participation as a process of involvement: “People’s full involvement in the development process”. Others linked beneficiaries’ involvement to the level of ownership that the beneficiaries feel toward the project, and to the increased degree of participation as a result of this feeling of ownership: “Through their involvement, beneficiaries claim a degree of ownership over the project; this has beneficial effects on levels of subsequent participation”.

The ownership dimension of participation was a repeated theme in their definitions: “Participation is people ownership of the development process”. This ownership of development, manifested as community self-reliance, is achieved through different ways: “Through greater community involvement, including the most marginalized members of the community and through promotion of a spirit of voluntarism and local fundraising”.

Moreover, ownership is best achieved “In participation in all stages of the project cycle.” Here, the link that exists between the feeling of ownership that people have toward a project and its sustainability was highlighted. As one respondent stated”…These ways of involvement increases the sustainability of the work”. In this same direction, another respondent argued “community participation is essential for sustainability of the programs at all stages”.
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In this sense the issue of ownership and sustainability was the most common theme maintained by almost all the respondents. The focus is that of People’s participation:

1. Ensures and facilitates long-term sustainability and lasting impact of the project.
2. Promotes the sense of ownership of and responsibility toward the project: People feel that they have a stake in the project and thus develop the necessary commitment to its continuation and development to last beyond the phase of donors’ support.

It was agreed by most of the respondents that participation is positively related to the sustainability of the project and is highly related to it through sense of ownership that is usually instilled as a result of participation.

There are some other themes related to this expressed relationship between sustainability and participation, these are:

1. Appropriateness/relevance and sensitivity of the project to the communities’ needs:
   Some respondents argued that participation assures the appropriateness, relevance and sensitivity of the project to the communities’ locally identified and real needs and assets. In this sense participation increases the possibility of gathering direct and first hand information on projects’ priorities, needs, and concerns from the beneficiaries, which insures that the project is adapted to ‘people’s’ needs and assets. Those who emphasized a relationship between participation and sensitivity of the projects to the communities also emphasized the importance of using participatory and democratic mechanisms at all levels of a social development project to ensure such sensitivity.

2. Improvement of the results and ensuring success of the project: Some respondents argued that participation enhances the achievement of the goals of the project and ensures its success. Moreover, respondents argued that participation facilities accessibility to the communities and ensure communities’ acceptance and support for the project during implementation, which in turn ensures better outcomes. As related
to management of the project, some argued that participation facilitates better time-
management, as one puts it “When people are involved from an early stage in the
lifetime of the project, little or no changes are required in the implementation phase, so
effectiveness in meeting the time frame, schedule and work plan is expected”. To some
respondents participation is considered as the “key to success” while others argued that
it only “improves results of the projects”. These relationships between participation,
success of the project, and better implementation techniques are expressed in answers
of the respondents. For example, one argued that: “Participation in social development
projects is essential and key to the success of any social or developmental project or
program”, other emphasized that it ensures the “success of the programs/projects”, or
“improves implementation mechanisms”.

3. Accountability and transparency: As some respondents emphasized, “Participation
increases trust in the projects and the work of the NGOs” and re-enforces concepts of
accountability and financial transparency”. For some of the respondents, the
accountability and transparency that tend to come with participation is not only good
for the project itself, but also for the local organization carrying it out. Some
respondents highlighted that they anticipate their partners’ organizations to
“demonstrate some work towards achieving internal transparency and democratic
practices within their organizations”. This is achieved by implementing democratic
practices in which beneficiaries’ involvement becomes a key issue.

Voluntary resource contribution by the beneficiaries

There was an emphasis by some respondents from the donor organizations on what
participation exactly entails. It was emphasized by some respondents that participation entails
voluntary involvement in the project and includes some type of resource contribution by the
beneficiaries to the project. Therefore, it is best manifested and expressed through “the voluntary
involvement of the beneficiaries in the projects”. For some, it meant “financial contributions from beneficiaries and local fundraising”. Another saw that contributing with their own resources to the project increases the community commitment to it: “When people voluntarily invest energy, time, and efforts in strengthening their community, in ways they themselves respectfully have created and adopted…”

*Participation for Empowerment*

Most respondents emphasized that participation empowers people and allows them to gain influence and control over their own social and economic development and over issues of their immediate concern. To those respondents participation entails not only including people in the different phases of the project but expanding it to encompass a: “Process of including and empowering beneficiaries to be a part of a given social development program or project that is to be implemented, studied or evaluated”.

This process of empowerment could be achieved through: “Incorporating beneficiaries’ feedback during the identification of needs or needs assessment and later in fine-tuning them into the (engineering designs, bidding documents, construction, take over, operations, and maintenance)”.

Some respondents went further and dealt with the issue of power attached to the process of participation. One argued that: “Participation should mean a comprehensive empowerment process (meaning political, economical, social, and cultural empowerment) of the people/beneficiaries concerned and involved in the development intervention”.

How that process should be achieved was also addressed and for some it is achieved through the: “Active role and full participation of the people/beneficiaries in all stages of a development project, such as problem identification, planning, decision making, implementing, monitoring,
and evaluation”. And through “People’s participation in decision-making, strategy, policy formulation, priority identification, needs assessment, identification of direction, implementation”.

Perceiving participation as an empowerment process was a very recurring theme. Nevertheless, the approach to it varied depending on the aspect that was emphasized. One of the respondents emphasized that:

People’s proactive involvement in identifying and prioritizing their needs, in making decisions about the best alternatives, in controlling, monitoring, and evaluating the effects of these decisions” could not be achieved, or empowerment is not complete, unless people or communities have the awareness “of their rights and what the process of development entails for them as human beings.

Recognizing the knowledge that people already have is also linked to their empowerment. Some respondents emphasized, “With the appropriate organizational and technical assistance, beneficiaries are the best source of the information necessary to identify their problems and the solutions that will suit and belong to them”.

Here the role of the organizations’ staff in the empowerment process is highlighted: “…. and it is the duty of the workers in the social and economic development field to help raise people’s awareness about those rights and responsibilities”.

Many respondents emphasized perceiving empowerment to be one of the most important results of the process of participation. Moreover, some respondents argued that participation increases awareness of diversity issues within the organization and its projects, and as a result, the marginalized sectors are not isolated from the development process. The respondents perceived that including the marginalized sectors of the society in the development process is strongly linked with participation. The respondents expressed these relations between participation, empowerment and integration of the marginalized sectors of the society in the development process as follows:
• People’s participation (ideally) leads to an empowerment process that allows them to gain influence and control over social and economic development issues of their immediate concern.

• People’s participation draws attention to internal societal structures of power and inequalities and offers a forum to negotiate and challenge these (status of marginalized groups, of women, children, other religious and/or ethnic groups, etc.).

• People’s participation facilitates the possibilities for the beneficiaries to know their rights and to learn how to claim them.

• People’s participation makes specific needs of weak social groups visible and supports their integration into the development process.

• Partners’ organizations should be community-centered and follow a community empowerment approach.

• Through participation the most marginalized and the vulnerable sectors of society are reached.

• If done correctly, participatory projects will often particularly benefit the most vulnerable in any community.

• Through participation, accessibility to the communities served is facilitated.

• An organization that uses lots of participatory mechanisms will in most cases be more “gender-sensitive” and more aware of diversity issues within the organization and its programs than those who use more “top-down” approaches.

• Partners’ organizations are expected to develop an awareness and understanding of the implications of gender for their work and begin to address gender issues in their organizations and programs.
Capacity building for beneficiaries, communities, and organization & training

The empowerment process that was presented above differs to some extent from the capacity-building approach, where participation entails the ability of the community in the building of its capacity to contribute to the process of development. Capacity-building on the other hand means that people learn for themselves (by being involved or through training) how to conduct their own projects, research or advocacy, or whatever their goal. As one respondent puts it, “participation could not be implemented unless people are equipped with the necessary skills to participate”. In a more clear reference to capacity-building, one respondent stated: “Our organization undertakes project identification and design using a collaborative and participatory approach with its partners, viewing the process as a means for capacity-building and exchange of ideas”.

In this regard two kinds of knowledge were emphasized -- the knowledge that the community possesses and the scientific knowledge that is possessed by the organizations’ staff, where results are better achieved through a process of the “integration of indigenous and scientific or professional knowledge”. What is crucial in this relationship is the consideration that participation values and integrates local knowledge and capacities.

To some respondents the issue of capacity building is a “training issue” where building the skills of the beneficiaries and the capacity of the communities are perceived to be an important consequence of participation. As one respondent saw it: “Through participation, the anticipated beneficiaries develop a claim-making capacity vis-à-vis NGOs and the governmental level”.

Some respondents emphasized that participation helps to build the community’s abilities to face obstacles and to increase their confidence in their abilities to come up with solutions to the problems, which their community faces. As one puts it “Participation in community micro-projects improves personal skills/ and makes a tangible contribution to their community’s development”.
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Thus, respondents argued that there is a strong positive relationship between a community’s increased abilities and participation, and this relationship is expressed by the respondents in the following statements:

People’s participation

- Increases future capacities: Participation might contribute in the long term to building awareness about democracy and participatory processes within the organization and/or the society.
- Increases the community capacity in a number of ways: 1) Participatory projects often build up the skills of the local community, and 2) Participatory projects increase the community’s confidence in their own ability to come up with creative solutions to their own problems.
- Increases awareness and knowledge of the communities in issues related to their concerns.
- Encourages new initiatives from the communities.

*Participation in the different stages of the project*

The recurring theme in the definitions on the part of many of the respondents entailed the practical implementation of participation in the different stages of the project. An issue which respondents did not clearly agreed concerned the specific stage at which participation should take place and to what level people could participate in any project. Some respondents emphasized that participation should take place in all stages of the project. As one respondent put it: “People’s participation is the involvement of the concerned parts in all phases of any intervention including needs assessment, project/intervention design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation”.
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Another respondent emphasized all the above phases of the project, yet focused on the way participation takes place in that it is best manifested through: “Their proactive involvement in identifying and prioritizing their needs, in making decisions about the best alternatives, controlling, monitoring, and evaluating the effects of these decisions”.

To some, real participation is restricted to include participation in the “identification of the needs as well as solutions to problems or needs identified”. The emphasis for many respondents was placed mainly on participation in the needs assessment. Other respondents expressed that “real participation of the beneficiaries takes place in planning and implementing of the projects”. Still, others placed more emphasis on project implementation, where “participation includes beneficiaries’ active involvement in project implementation and decisions related to project management”. There is a clear relationship in many of the responses in that participation mainly takes its best form when it is manifested in needs assessment and in implementation phases of the project. As one respondent perceived it “They (the beneficiaries) not only have the right to be involved, but they play a role in the project as a whole”. For example: “The community is involved in the assessment phase, in disseminating information, in discussions, in planning, in implementation, as well as in follow-up and ensuring sustainability”.

In this regard, focusing on the continuity aspect of participation was highlighted in some of the definitions of participation provided by the respondents: “We define People’s participation as an on-going process that allows local people to directly participate in the elaboration, implementation, and evaluation issues and steps of a development project”.

_Participation as Consultation_

To some, participation was perceived as consultation. This consultation was defined in different ways. It could be; “consultation process to incorporate feedback in the needs assessment and operations and maintenance of the project”. Or it could be referred to as one respondent puts it “…to the participatory mechanisms within an organization, to the way in which
members of the organization consult with the organization’s ‘target groups’ ‘beneficiaries’, ‘stakeholders’ or ‘respondents’’. This serves an aim, and this aim is seen in “…the way in which an organization’s constituency informs the organization’s policy and practice”. One respondent focused on the direction of this consultation: “In praxis, this consultation process is a one-way consultation process”. The direction of this consultation, as explained by this respondent, is toward the organization where beneficiaries are consulted in specific matters but without any feedback to them on the result of this consultation.

To summarize, the following table presents the numbers of respondents that addressed the different themes in their responses (see Table 4.3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Confirmed the Theme in their Responses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What is participation?</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement = ownership= sustainability</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Resource Contribution by the Beneficiaries</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation for Empowerment</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Building and Training</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in the Different Stages of the Project</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation as Consultation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3  Number of respondents confirming the different themes regarding definitions and conceptualization of participation.
4.2.2 Potential problems or liabilities of People’s participation in social Development projects and suggestions to overcome them to insure success of participation

There were different views among respondents on the issue of problems and liabilities of participation. On one hand, some respondents saw no potential problems or liabilities of involving people in the projects. Others argued, “Problems may only arise when the process is not managed properly”. On the other hand, there were group of respondents who considered that there are real problems and liabilities in participation. These liabilities or problems could be categorized according to the following themes:

Liabilities related to the respondents themselves and the communities:

Conditions that are related to people’s realities and reactions, or the conditions of the project and its impact on people were the most recurrent themes expressed as potential problems of participation. These conditions that could be classified under characteristics and conditions of the communities and people are:

- Participation might raise or create high expectations, which may not be feasible to satisfy. As a result, potential future participation could be obstructed as a result of expectations that have not been met, or frustration and losing interest.

- Political goals of the participants and power struggle in the communities would distort and affect the project negatively and would inhibit the community from reaching consensus regarding issues. It is argued that increased time and energy are believed to be required when a large range of people are given the possibility to analyze their own situation, express their wishes and needs, and agree on the types of action to be taken.

- Participation may produce conflicting relations among different beneficiary groups, which might create more divisions within the community.
• There are potential problems when repressive social structures are reproduced in the project, in this case participation may create a problem of representation (who participates in representing which group), and it might favor certain people who have the capacity to be involved. In addition, often little attempts are directed to overcome these structures to ensure the inclusion of certain groups/individuals. Moreover, some individuals/groups might believe that they gain power as a result of their participation and as a result attempt to influence, monopolize and dominate the discussions and the direction of the project to fit their own private interests, rather than that of the community.

Liabilities related to the implementing organizations and donors:

Some respondents stated that the characteristics of local organizations could be potential problems to participation. They considered that problems might arise when the organization’s administration is unable to follow through with the momentum generated as a result of participation process, or when the organization’s structure is not flexible enough in accommodating the implications of participation. These characteristics may be manifested when local organizations fear control over the decision-making process or fear unfavorable actions that could be taken in the project as a result of participation. The respondents highlighted some of the organization-associated conditions that might obstruct participation, these are:

• The process of participation may become a problem for the local organization if there are deadlines for getting funding for the project.

• The belief among local organizations that participation could be less ‘efficient’ regarding output per time and that time consumed might be increased in a participative process.

• The concern among local organizations that participation might reproduce the existing knowledge at the expense of the new or scientific knowledge.
• If the perception of professional staff regarding the needs contradict that of the community, the organization’s structure might be not flexible to allow for change in plans.

• The recommended project by the community might not fit very well within the strategic objectives of the country’s path of development: Sometimes the project could be problematic if local organizations don’t have proper coordination with the appropriate authorities and ministries.

• People might be incorporated onto the projects coordinated by professional NGOs, in such situation; staff members might influence people’s own initiatives and independence and control people’s decisions.

• When the roles of the different stakeholders are not clearly defined (organization and people), confusion and overlapping of responsibility are expected.

On the other hand some respondents considered that there are problems directly related to the staff of the organization. This is expressed when members of the staff give only ‘token’ acknowledgment to the importance of participation without having the appropriate methods to implement its requirements. Hence, staff members could lack the understanding of and the appropriate skills for implementing participatory approaches.

Based on this, many respondents emphasized that local organizations should attempt to facilitate participation in their projects. Respondents saw that there are expectations that local organizations need to fulfill in order to facilitate participation these are:

• Organizations should provide organizational and technical assistance to the communities to enhance their ability to participate. This could be achieved when projects are fully attuned (without compromise) to the desires wishes, interests, needs and capabilities of the target group where the projects become sustainable, when communities have the possibility to create and adopt the projects that meet their needs. So when people
voluntarily invest energy, time, and effort in the projects with the aim of strengthening their community, this in turn ensures and guarantees the success of projects.

- Staff’s attitude, awareness, and skills are very important qualities that should be considered. Some respondents addressed the issue of the quality of communication and the relationship between staff and the target group, which they considered to set the tone for and has an effect on the levels of participation. Therefore, providing staff with the required skills and capabilities is very crucial to participation, where, through the appropriate training and awareness, the staff would be skilled in:
  1. Avoiding open confrontations with the predominant traditional values, which might constrain participation.
  2. Openly discussing issues with members of the communities, in order to identify appropriate strategies and interventions to promote the acceptance and involvement of the whole community.
  3. Adequately raising people’s awareness about their rights and how to claim them, and their responsibilities.
  4. Better able to examine how the imbalances in social power between men and women affect relationships between the two sexes and influences women’s participation.

4.2.3 Evaluation criteria of activities of People’s participation

Many respondents stated that their organizations have not formulated any written criteria to evaluate People’s participation in the projects they fund or administrate. Nevertheless, some respondents, despite the lack of written criteria to evaluate activities of participation, maintained that they still monitor and evaluate People’s participation through different informal procedures. The most frequent informal procedures reported by the respondents to be used to evaluate participation in the projects are as follows
• Monitoring activities through sending monitoring missions from the staff of the donors to visit sites of projects and assess the practices of People’s participation in different activities: they assess the attendance of the target community both in terms of quality and quantity in the project activities.

• Another informal procedure reported by some respondents, is asking direct questions (in informal meeting settings with project’s staff) on the methodologies and participatory approaches deployed in project implementation and management.

Many respondents maintained that they don’t actually evaluate “the activities of People’s participation“as a separate activity but they expect their partner organizations to function according to “democratic principles and use participatory mechanisms” throughout all stages of their projects. In this regard, the participatory methodologies reported to be assessed and evaluated is one dimension in the formal projects’ evaluations. Thus, they emphasized that monitoring and assessing interventions of the projects allows the donor organization to monitor the way these democratic values are embedded in the organizations’ internal practices and strategies. In this regard, some respondents reported that as donor organizations they attempt to assess participatory activities in the projects as one dimension of a general specialized evaluation usually performed by either monitoring/evaluation missions of foreign experts with technical expertise or local experts. The dimensions that are considered in these evaluations are as follows:

• Assessing the representation of the target group in councils, boards, and committees’ or/and members’ organizations.

• Evaluating the representation of the different groups (less advantaged, such as women, specific disadvantaged groups etc.) in the organization’ target group.

• Monitoring membership in membership organizations to assess the degree to which a transparent and democratic general assembly exists, and how members are chosen to become a member of the board, council, or committees.
• Assessing the level of contribution (cash, efforts labor, land, and/or time sheets) of the community to the project.

• Field visits to the beneficiaries that provide constant and open communication with various beneficiary groups.

A few respondents reported to have formulated specific written criteria for evaluating participation in the project. While those respondents maintained that they use systematic procedures in evaluating the level and type of People’s participation in their partners’ organizations’ projects, they were not clear on what those criteria are. Actually they reported procedures or methods of evaluation and assessment of participation in the projects, those methods are:

• Regular quarterly or/and annual reports of local partners about the projects: Participation is evaluated and assessed based on the partner organization’s description of participation of beneficiaries. This is manifested in the way People’s participation is described in the planning, monitoring and evaluation stages of the projects in official documents and reports.

• Field visits: Participation is evaluated and assessed through organized field visits to and meetings with the beneficiaries aimed at assessing the level of their participation of the projects.

• Beneficiaries’ satisfaction surveys: Participation is evaluated and assessed through conducting surveys that measure beneficiaries’ satisfaction with the project. The community or beneficiaries’ satisfaction surveys aim to measure the level of satisfaction of people with regard to their participation.

• Studies and analysis of the participatory methods in the project’s activities (planning, implementation and evaluation of the project (both qualitative and quantitative).
• Analysis of surveys that are completed by a random sample of beneficiaries from the community.
• Monitoring and technical committees that assess the degree that the organization considers gender aspects in its projects.
• Checks and balances within the organization: The degree to which the organization follows its own guidelines; the way in which the organization organizes its planning, monitoring and evaluation phases; the way ‘beneficiaries’ participate in each of these phases; and the internal structures of democracy and participative process within the organization.

4.2.4 Contextualizing Participation

Respondents realize the importance of the context they are working in facilitating and/or hindering participatory activities in the local projects. To many respondents, the history of both international and local NGOs in Palestine is considered a unique one; where proliferation of a large number of local and international NGOs and other interest groups could be considered as a clear manifestation of their importance in the area of social development. Some respondents considered that international NGOs, who have a history of encouraging and fostering participatory techniques, also have a tradition in Palestine of asking the communities about their needs. Some respondents argued that there are many international donor NGOs in Palestine who are very well grounded in the Palestinian society and who have respect for and sensitivity toward the cultural issues and traditions, which are considered when planning for the projects. At the other end, many respondents considered the existence of a large amount of local Palestinian NGOs as very impressive, where they considered that local NGOs are good partners in development with clear capacities and direction.
According to the respondents, there is a specific environment in the Palestinian context that would be considered on the one hand to facilitate participatory activities, but on the other hand also to obstruct them. The following section will be two-fold, where the conditions/characteristics that facilitate participation and how these same conditions/characteristics might hinder or obstruct participation will be presented in a table format to make comparisons possible.

While many respondents considered that conditions and characteristics related to the nature of local Palestinian organizations, Palestinian political conditions, social-cultural nature of Palestinian society might facilitate participation, they also simultaneously obstruct participation. The following table presents this relationship (see Table 4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Factors that are related to the nature of local Palestinian organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have substantial experience in organizing people at the grassroots level.</td>
<td>The withdrawal and weakening of political parties and NGOs associated with them since OSLO: After 1993, there was a general withdrawal from political activism, thus political parties and the NGOs associated with them were not able to sustain the previous levels of popular engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are deeply rooted in the Palestinian community.</td>
<td>Specific interest organizations and different NGOs with weak links to the grassroots were developed after Oslo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have experiences in rights-based approaches in development / Aware of the importance of beneficiaries’ participation in the projects.</td>
<td>Politicization of aid, which imposes conditions on the projects and limits wider participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The professionalism of NGOs: NGOs have become more dominated by well-educated middle class professionals, and have come to be perceived as part of a privileged employment sector which has led to a kind of alienation of the NGOs from their constituencies at the grassroots level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based initiatives and interests were taken over by professional NGOs, and people have become more dependent on them.</td>
<td>Community-based initiatives and interests were taken over by professional NGOs, and people have become more dependent on them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of membership organizations in which people can participate widely.</td>
<td>Lack of membership organizations in which people can participate widely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grassroots and (relatively) small initiatives 'owned' by the community are often lost in competition for funds with the larger NGOs.</td>
<td>Grassroots and (relatively) small initiatives 'owned' by the community are often lost in competition for funds with the larger NGOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4 Conditions and characteristics related to the nature of local Palestinian organizations, Palestinian political conditions, and social-cultural nature of Palestinian society that facilitate and/or obstruct participation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have long and consolidated experience in implementing social development projects.</td>
<td>Bad experiences with some NGOs who raise hopes and aspirations but fail to live up to expectation, which leads to mistrust in their work and hinders future participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Represent valuable and trust-worthy local partners</td>
<td>Some NGOs face a serious problem with core values such as accountability, transparency and democracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative organizational structures with top-down management and top-down leadership traditions.</td>
<td>Charismatic and known personalities, who lead and dominate organizations, usually do not open possibilities for participation within the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are strongly committed to the development of their community.</td>
<td>Paternalistic attitudes of some NGO towards the beneficiary groups may hinder participation of different societal groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paying lip service to participation and not taking it seriously.</td>
<td>The belief among some NGOs that participation of people is restricted to the material contribution of people to the projects, which allows no possibility for people to participate and influence decisions related to the projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have flexibility in undertaking participatory methods in designing and implementing development projects. Follow some participatory practices in their projects.</td>
<td>The belief among NGOs that participatory projects need more time and effort to reach goals, particularly a problem when there is a time limit on use of donor money.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Their constituencies are familiar with their work.</td>
<td>Lack of information from NGOs to people served by those NGOs: NGOs usually report to the donors and not to their consistencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their staff usually has the awareness and the understanding of the needs of the marginalized groups (such as women, handicapped...etc.), and the ways of promoting their involvement in the projects.</td>
<td>Unawareness and lack of proper training of the staff of the NGOs on participatory mechanisms and methods, in planning, monitoring and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Conditions that are related to the political situation of Palestine</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ongoing conflict and Israeli occupation of the Palestinian areas manifested in Israeli internal and intra-province closure policy of Palestinian cities, towns and villages, curfews and checkpoints, which result in immobility of the Palestinian people and lack of ability of physical access, increasing time of traveling or/and difficulties in being able to move from one area to another, poor personal security conditions in moving from one site to another, which might endanger life.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repressive occupation that made people active, as one put it “occupation of Palestine has made the situation in the Palestinian areas so intolerable which have instigated communities to be involved in doing whatever they could in order to help mitigate the effects of the occupation”.</td>
<td>Limited and restricted mobility (even within the same area) of both the staff and the target groups: 1) restricts and prevent implementing different project’s activities in the communities; 2) increases the time for the project staff to reach the beneficiaries; 3) reduces the number of follow-up visits and restricts reach-out activities where the proximity of the projects to conflict areas endangers the staff of the project who faces difficulties such as damages to the cars and sometimes the impossibility of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The nature of the political situation has driven people to be more outspoken and demanding to achieve their rights. | }
Table 4.4: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>returning to their homes due to the daily and often sudden change of checkpoints and roadblocks; and prevents the beneficiaries from reaching the project’s location and attending the activities where fear for their own safety when traveling from one place to another decreases the number of people who could participate in project’s activities.</td>
<td>The destruction of infra-structure, houses and property of the Palestinians which include damages to project sites and property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fear, despair, loss of security and hope and sense of lack of future that Palestinian people experience, instigate disempowerment.</td>
<td>The deteriorating political, socio-economic situation and the high rate of un-employment and poverty have resulted in a deteriorating humanitarian crisis in which the priorities of people are changed to those of more immediate day-to-day survival needs, where high percentages of Palestinian people have become ‘receivers’ of and dependent on humanitarian aid, thus limiting any possibilities to influence decisions or participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-existing or weak governmental structures due to the specific political context of Palestine has created a need among people to search for alternatives to meet their own needs</td>
<td>When people become preoccupied with the constant struggle for survival, to cover the basic immediate needs, and to face and cope with the escalation of violence, it is expected that people have no time, interest, and energy for participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TABLE CONTINUED)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High sense of pride and refusal to accept charity: Communities are still interested in solving their problems and are proud that they are able to find their own solutions.</td>
<td>As a result of increased focus on relief where people have expectations that aid will be provided, peoples’ participation becomes of no relevance to the local organization or to the people themselves, yet regarded a luxury.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestinian people have always ‘exercised’ a form of participation as a means of struggling for survival and against the occupation.</td>
<td>The difficult economic circumstances prevent local NGOs from developing strategies for communities’ self-financing of the projects, and make it unfeasible for them to raise the subject of financial contribution of the beneficiaries for services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the first ‘Intifada’, levels of popular participation in political and social action increased dramatically through the popular committee structures, which have comprised broader popular social movements.</td>
<td>Unilateral dependence on external support and donors has increased drastically; as a result, the attention of many NGOs has shifted from development to emergency-oriented activities, and while long-term development perspectives were relegated to a secondary level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existence of strong Palestinian civil society movement, which existed before Oslo, consisting of trade unions, political parties, and non-governmental organizations</td>
<td>Democratic principles and election of committees were widespread in the Palestinian society. The difficult, current political circumstances of the Palestinians impose obstacles in opening a dialogue among different actors in development or/and in conducting a critical reflection and discussion of the current attitudes and conceptualizations of the development concept and ‘peoples’ participation’ vis-à-vis the paternalistic ‘welfare attitude’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Factors related to the social-cultural nature of the Palestinian society</strong></td>
<td><strong>The on-going political oppression and discrimination that the Palestinian society faces as a whole may lead many to ignore internal social inequalities and hierarchies that are difficult to challenge under the given circumstances (i.e. gender relations, differences between the various religious groups and secular people, dominance of family structures in public and political life, and a social gap between (camp) refugees and non refugees.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High educational level and high percentage of the Palestinian people who are educated (high percentage of university educated people) provide high potential to facilitate the mobilization and integration of local resources and capacities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High levels of the peoples’ political awareness (awareness of problems, needs, and rights) due to their specific political experiences.</td>
<td>Fatalistic attitude: The feeling among communities that upper forces work to determine their lives, which they do not have any power to influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of flexibility and coping-mechanisms (how to deal with uncertainties and the permanent crisis without having to turn to the leadership): People have learned to manage to survive without a capable leadership and in many instances with the help of NGOs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The will of Palestinian people to be part of the decisions that affects their lives and their commitment to change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitate Participation</th>
<th>Hinder Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fair levels of women’s participation and presence of feminist organizations.</td>
<td>Social inequalities between men and women and patriarchy (male dominated society) where key decisions in the family are commonly made by men and the elderly, which imposes constraints on women’s participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The social and cultural norm that encourages women to bear many children, and to be responsible alone for household matters, allowing little time for activities outside of the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic physical and emotional violence against women in the family and in the society, which cause fear among women, preventing their participation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past experience with participation in decision-making through political committees</td>
<td>Some social, political and religious movements, which in order to get the wide support of their constituencies; promote a welfare orientation in their social services rather then participatory empowering approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growing sense of solidarity among the people against the external threat, due to the continuous political crisis.</td>
<td>Power structures in the communities where certain groups/individuals are excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interests in the projects and curiosity</td>
<td>Local groups and/or communities are controlled by local political fractions that influence and guide their decisions, which prevent wide participation by all people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Infrastructure availability</td>
<td>Good communication facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic proximity of sites, especially in Gaza Strip.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents from donor organizations were keenly aware of the difficulties faced by local NGOs and people in the implementation of participatory projects. Among the barriers faced, they pointed to the political condition that is felt to be very restrictive to participation. Although not directly mentioned by any respondents, we might add other factors related to the donor NGOs themselves: one issue being the policy of the donors themselves regarding funding and how it may restrict or facilitate participatory projects. Nevertheless, some respondents indirectly alluded this to be restrictive and not facilitative to participation.

The different concepts presented by the respondents were used extensively in designing the questionnaire for the second phase of the study, to which respondents that work on local Palestinian NGOs responded. The constructions of the items of this questionnaire were very much informed by the different ways and conceptualizations that existed in the answers of the respondents from donor organizations. An attempt was made to capture all the variations on conceptualization and to construct a questionnaire that would be able to answer how People’s participation is actually conceptualized, perceived, and practiced by staff in the local Palestinian organizations funded by the Northern NGOs. Moreover, the questionnaire that targeted the staff in the local organizations contained an open-ended question, asking respondents from local organization to define participation in their own words. The aim behind such question was to provide the respondents from local organizations the possibility to come up with other conceptualizations and definitions, which were not contained, in the itemized questionnaire. In fact this open-ended question added valuable information on the conceptualizations of participation by the respondents from local organizations, in that some dimensions not addressed in the responses of the respondents from donor organizations were added.
4.3 Results of the Second Phase of the Study

Introduction

Based on responses from the Delphi phase of the research project, a questionnaire was developed and sent to be filled out by social workers and supervisors employed at the Palestinian NGOs. The purpose of the second phase of the study was to examine and explore the ways beneficiaries’ participation is perceived, defined and practiced by social workers working in the front line with beneficiaries in social development projects in the Palestinian areas on projects or programs sponsored or administrated by donor Western NGOs. Therefore the aim was two-fold: 1) to explore the degree with which the definitions of participation expressed by the social workers parallel those concepts formulated by the respondents from donor organizations, and 2) to examine how participation is practiced by these social workers.

The presentation of the study’s data analysis in the second phase is organized into two sections: 1) descriptive data, and 2) multivariate analyses. The first section provides a descriptive overview of a) the respondents’ age, gender, education, area of study, years of experience, position and status in the organization, any training they received in the area of beneficiaries’ participation and the level at which this training was helpful and related to their work; b) their organizations’ characteristics with regard to the type of services provided, sources of funding, areas served by the organization, target groups, number of social workers in the organization, and any evaluation conducted by the donors; c) the results of the open-ended question addressing the definition of participation, included in the first section of the analysis, are presented in a qualitative format analysis; and d) the descriptive data of the items in the scales.

In the second section of the analysis, factor analysis for the various sub-scales and results of the specified analysis are presented. Factor analysis was performed on the different sub-scales to a) examine the level at which respondents from local organizations would or would not use the same definitions as the respondents from donor organizations by examining and interpreting the
different constructs regarding definitions; b) explore respondents’ attitudes regarding the concept “People’s participation” by examining and interpreting the different constructs regarding attitudes toward participation; and c) explore the types of participatory activities practiced by the respondents in the local projects by examining and interpreting the activities and practices of participation.

4.3.1 Descriptive Data

4.3.1.1 Characteristics of respondents and organizations

For descriptive purposes, the characteristics of NGOs and those of the social workers participating in the study are presented. The aim of presenting these characteristics is to understand both the characteristics of the organizations in which they work and those of the respondents as they are related to participation.

Sample characteristics of NGOs: Number of social workers employed, source of funding, type of services, target groups, area of work.

Fifty-five local Palestinian projects and programs were represented in this study, and 109 social workers from these organizations filled in the questionnaire. To avoid duplication of the information on the organizations, the information was included only once in the analysis when more than one respondent employed in the organization filled in the questionnaire.

Number of social workers employed in the organizations: The number of social workers employed at these organizations ranged from 1 to 36, with a mean number of 8.51 social workers and standard deviation of 9.01.

Source of funding: Palestinian NGOs rarely receive funding solely from Northern NGOs. Most local Palestinian NGOs have multiple sources of funding. As this research study is interested in local Palestinian NGOs funded by Northern NGOs, those organizations not funded by Northern NGOs were not included. However, NGOs funded by Northern NGOs as well as by
other sources were included in the study. Of the fifty-five NGOs participating in the study, forty-five of them are funded by European and Australian NGOs, and 16 by American NGOs. It is important to note that some stated they are funded jointly by European and American organizations. Fourteen of the NGOs have projects funded by official governments (American and/or European). The European Union funded 10 of those 55 NGOs’ projects, and the United Nations funded 8. Business, private donations and local resources funded respectively, 3, 11, and 11 of the local NGO projects (see Table 4.5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European NGOs</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American NGOs</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Government</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more European Countries</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or more Islamic Countries</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islamic Banks or Funds</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Donations</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Resources</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 Local NGOs’ Characteristics-Sources of funding for the organizations (n=55)

_Type of services provided by the organizations:_ Most NGOs in Palestine provide a variety of services to their target groups. The majority of services involve counseling services, where 38 out of 55 organizations reported that counseling is provided as part of their services. Thirty-eight of the organizations provide community intervention, 23 provide training, and 41 provide different rehabilitation services (rehabilitation here includes the rehabilitation of any affected
groups as a result of crisis and not only the rehabilitation of the handicapped, such as the rehabilitation of political prisoners and women in the rural areas). Twenty-three organizations reported to provide other kind of services including direct interventions. These direct interventions involved emergency-oriented interventions based on the arising needs resulting from the political situation in Palestine. Most organizations provided multiple services (see Table 4.6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Services</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community intervention</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6  Local NGOs’ Characteristics-Types of services provided by the organizations (n=55).

Target groups of services: Most NGOs in Palestine reported to have different target groups that they serve simultaneously. Of the fifty-five NGOs included in the study, 46 reported that they target women, 44 target children, and 42 youth groups. Thirty organizations reported that local communities are targets of their services, and 33 target families (see Table 4.7).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Groups Served</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Groups</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled people</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentally Handicapped</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Communities</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7  Local NGOs’ Characteristics-Target groups served by the organizations (n=55)

**Geographical area of services:** The majority of the organizations serve all areas in the West Bank. Although most of these organizations central offices are located in one geographical area, they also maintain branches and outreach staff who work in most parts of the West Bank (see Table 4.8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographical Area of Services</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All West Bank</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Gaza Strip</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genen Area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nablus Area</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramallah Area</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem Area</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem Area</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebrow Area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerico Area</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulkarm and Qalqilya</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8  Local NGOs' Characteristics- Geographical Areas Served by the Organizations (n=55)
Sample characteristics of respondents: Gender, education, and specialization, years of experience, position in the organization, and participation in training:

One hundred and nine respondents from different organizations participated in the study. The sample descriptives to be presented involve gender, education, specialization, years of experience at the organization, years of experience as a social worker, position in the organization and position enabling to influence rules and policies, participation in training related to the area of beneficiary participation, and any evaluation the respondents are aware evaluation conducted in the organization by the donors regarding participation.

Gender, education, and professional specialization: The majority of the sample was female (59%) with a Bachelor degree (78%), while 18% of the respondents held Master degrees. The remaining 4% received two-years of college education, which is considered diploma degree in Palestine. Forty-three percent of the respondents held degrees in social work, 22% in psychology, 11% in sociology, 9% in education and 8% in counseling. The remaining 7% held degrees in other areas, such as administration and business. These findings suggest that women social workers are a dominant group among those organizations participating in this study.

Years of experience at the organization, years of experience as social worker, position in the organization, and position to influence rules and policies in the organization: Respondents ranged in years of experience at the organization from 1 to 17 years, with a mean years of 4.51 (SD = 3.85 years). They ranged in years of experience as a social worker from 1 to 25 years with mean years of 6.21 (SD = 4.4 years).

The majority of the respondents (43%) held positions as social workers in their organization, 8% as supervisors, 18% as counselors and 4.6% as educational counselors. While 17.4% held administration positions in the organization, only 8.3% worked as community organizers or
workers. Nearly fifty-two percent reported that they do not have the position to influence rules and polices in their organization, while 45% reported that they do hold such a position to influence. Thirty-eight-and-a-half percent reported that they are responsible for other people in their organization, while 58.7% reported that they do not have such responsibility. Almost eighty percent reported that they were not members of any administrative committee in their organization, while only 17.4% were members of such committees.

Training in the issues related to beneficiary participation and evaluation of participation by the donors: Only thirty percent of the respondents reported to have taken part in training within their organization or outside it within the last year in the area of beneficiaries’ participation. That means that the majority of the respondents (70%) did not participate in such training last year. Fifty-eight-point-seven percent of the those who reported attendance of such training last year reported that they participated in such a training dealing with a specific topic, while 26.9% participated in such training dealing with two topics, and 15.4% participated in training involving three topics. Of those reporting that they participated in such training during the last year, the number of training sessions related to beneficiaries’ participation ranged in times from 1 to 4 sessions, with a mean session of 1.82 (SD = .945).

Of those who responded receiving training in beneficiaries’ participation, only 17.4% reported that this training was part of a continuous supervision in the organization.

Those who answered to have participated in any training related to beneficiaries’ participation (n=33) were asked to evaluate the frequency at which the training was helpful and related to their work. Subjects rated their response according to Likert-type items (ranging from 1 to 5), with 1 being never and 5 all the time. The mean for the frequency of training being helpful was 4.06 (SD = .96), indicating the subjects’ response average that the training was
helpful to their work most of the time. For the topic frequency of training being related to their work, respondents’ mean was 3.9 (SD = 1.05), which means that in average, the training was related to the respondents’ work most of the time.

Forty-three percent of the respondents reported that they are aware of evaluation conducted by the donors to evaluate beneficiaries’ participation in the project or program in which they work. Meanwhile, the same percent (43%) were not aware whether such evaluation took place in their organization or project.

4.3.1.2 Definition of participation as seen by the respondents in the open-ended questionnaire

One of the questions asked was to define participation. The researcher sought to ascertain how the respondents define the term “beneficiaries’ participation” in their own words. It is important to analyze the concept “beneficiaries’ participation” because the respondents are assumed to use words they are familiar with in their own practice. These definitions are categorized and clustered in a qualitative format analysis and could provide valuable information when compared with the responses from the donor organizations.

There were variations in the answers to the question asking the respondents to define, in their own words, the concept “People’s participation in social development projects”. The answers were categorized to reflect the variations in the answers; these categories were also clustered according to themes. In analyzing the respondents’ answers to this question it was possible to extract different themes, which were categorized into four major clusters as follows:

Cluster #1: Involvement of target groups is restricted to a specific phase of the project, usually to the phase representing the identification of problems and needs assessment

When asked to define participation, most of the respondents to this question saw that participation usually takes place in a specific project cycle. Of the 65 respondents who answered this question, 34 saw that participation mostly entails the involvement of the local community and
the target groups in the “needs identification and assessment phase of the project”. Many considered that the use of a focus group is an important method to manifest participation in the project. According to those who emphasized the importance of involvement of the beneficiaries in the needs assessment phase, participation in this phase becomes “a key to the success of the project”.

A second activity or project cycle in which respondents found participation to be important and which reflected a high agreement among respondents (17 respondents) is the “involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the services and the projects”. Few (4 respondents) saw participation as a possibility in all stages of the project, as one puts it “Beneficiaries’ participation is manifested in their real and actual involvement in the work of the project from the beginning till the end of the project, (in needs assessment in implementation in evaluation of the project)”.

Many respondents emphasized the importance of training local communities and target groups in order for them to be able to participate actively, as one put it “training of the local community is crucial to participation, without training people will not be able to participate in a meaningful way to the project”. As another respondent emphasized: “Participation of the beneficiaries depends on the clients’ abilities and beliefs, and the complete knowledge of their needs, therefore, they should be enabled to be efficient members in the society, and this could be achieved through providing them with the necessary skills”.

In addition, there were other activities in the project cycle in which a number of respondents suggested that beneficiaries’ participation would be appropriate, although these activities were mentioned less frequently than that of needs identification and assessment and evaluation. Below is a list of all activities mentioned, with the number of respondents who mentioned them:

1. Needs identification and assessment (34 respondents mentioned) (10 mentioned the importance of the use of focus group).
2. Evaluation of services and projects and evaluation of the level of satisfaction from services (17)
3. Identification of the problem to be changed (4)
4. Implementation of the project and plans related to the needs (4)
5. Identification of the target groups (3).
6. Monitoring the project implementation as related to the needs (3).
7. Taking part in the project’s decision-making with regard to the organizations’ work (3).
8. Planning for the projects (2)
9. Identification of the priorities of needs of the people in the local community (2).
10. Implementing specific activities and programs (2).
11. Project follow-up (2).
12. Designing policies and strategies based on the needs and priorities (2).

Cluster #2: Advocacy and support for the work of the project

Many expressed that participation “plays an advocatory role in the project”, and this could be manifested when the beneficiaries “disseminate information to the community about the project and its services which facilitate reaching those in need of the services”. Also as another respondent puts it: “Support and advocacy of the work of the project through advocacy and support groups that support the work of the project”. As another respondent saw it, “people participate in the project and become a connecting point between the project and the local community”.

For many respondents, participation has a real function; the most recurrent functions were that participation:

1. Guarantees the continuity of the projects.
2. Facilitates the mission of the project.
3. Makes the community accessible more to the project.
4. Increases the influence of the project and ensures reaching best results.

5. Guarantees the development of new projects.

Cluster #4: Resource contribution

Some emphasized the theme of resource contribution. These respondents saw that the beneficiaries’ resource contribution to the project is a very crucial participation method, which is manifested, in the following forms:

1. Material contribution to the project through paying for the services provided to them (4 respondents).

2. Beneficiaries and local communities’ members contribute to specific activities of the project with voluntary work and efforts (5).

3. Community contributes to the project with resources (providing land, preparing places for the activities…etc.) (2).

4. Providing the project with continuous voluntary groups to participate in the training and awareness-raising activities of the project (2).

Cluster #5: Perceiving beneficiaries as “recipients of services” and their participation forms their right of self determination, which is mainly expressed in participating in decisions regarding their individual treatment plan

In this regard, the beneficiary has the possibility to participate in designing a work plan related to his/her needs, and within this framework his/her participation takes the form of identifying and determining his/her own need. The respondents saw this form of participation as giving the beneficiary a say in the specific services, which are to be provided to him/her, in this aspect they perceived that beneficiaries have the right to:

1. Define what is to be provided to them.

2. Participate in the services that they perceive helpful and needed.
3. Design the subsequent plans of work and their implementation based on their needs.
4. Identify the issues they are mostly interested in.
5. Determine the time of service and its place.
6. Identify the alternatives for solutions.
7. Identify how the problem to be solved.

According the respondents, this form of participation can only be achieved if the beneficiaries show their readiness to receive services, actively attend and are involved in the project’s activities and services provided to them through being interactive with the staff and being active and involved in their individual treatment plan to achieve a better environment in which their individual work plan can be achieved.

Many answers to this question contained general comments or statements such as “participation should be practical”, or “participation is minimal”. The context of these answers was not clear, nor what the respondents tried to convey. They were therefore excluded from the analysis.

4.3.1.3 Descriptive Data of the Items in the Scales:

Research Question # 1

To what extent do respondents from the Palestinian local NGOs view the importance of participation in the different cycle of the social development projects? As described in Chapter 3, twenty-three items in the survey required the respondents to estimate the level of importance of participation in the different stages of the project. The subjects rated their responses according to a Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 to 5). The range of the answers were 1) not important; 2) of little importance; 3) not sure; 4) important; and 5) very important. A high score on the item indicates high importance of participation in the specific activity listed. The subjects’ responses varied. The items’ means fell between 3.31 and 4.39 (see Table 4.9). A participation importance
score was calculated for the 23-item scale. The scale had a mean of 3.80 and a median of 3.90 (SD .65, n= 109). Reliability coefficient for this scale yielded a Cronbach Alpha of .92. In general, the respondents answers in all the 23 items fell between ‘not sure’ and ‘important’, with more leaning toward seeing participation in all phases of the project’s cycle as 'important'.

The descriptives for the specific items representing the different phases of the project cycle were also calculated in order to illustrate the statistical importance of participation in the different phases of the project, and not only its overall importance. Four items represented different aspects of the “problem identification and needs assessment phase” as follows:

1. Generating ideas for the project.
2. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.
3. Prioritizing the local needs.
4. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.

Items’ means fell between 3.97 and 4.26 (see Table 4.9). For all the four items, a score was calculated, yielding a mean of 4.19 and a median of 4.25 (SD .73, n= 109). The mean indicates that respondents’ feel that participation in needs assessment is important in all four items. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .81.

Six items representing the “project design phase” were as follows:

1. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.
2. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.
3. Selection of beneficiaries.
4. Project design: policy formulation for the project.
5. Project design: strategy formulation for the project.
6. Identification of the direction for the project.
The items’ means fell between 3.31 and 4.01 (see Table 4.9). The statistics for the 6-item scale had a mean of 3.56 and median of 3.83 (SD = .93, n=109). These results indicate that respondents’ answers in the four-item scale measuring the importance of participation in the project design phase fell between “not sure” and “low importance”. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .86. For some items the standard deviation was high for a five-point scale. The high standard deviation indicates some extreme differences and variability in responses to these six items.

Six items representing the ‘implementation phase’ were as follows:

1. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.
2. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.
3. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.
4. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.
5. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).
6. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects.

Items’ means fell between 3.22 and 4.39 (see Table 4.9). Statistics for the 6-item scale had a mean of 3.78 and a median of 4.00 (SD = .78, n = 109). The score of 3.78 for the implementation phase of the project indicates that the importance given to participation in implementation in the six items falls between ‘not sure’ and ‘important’. Alpha reliability
The seven items representing the ‘evaluation phase, follow up, and sustainability’ were:

1. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects
2. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.
3. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.
4. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.
5. Assessing the success of activities.
6. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.
7. Follow-up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.

Items’ means fell between 3.44 and 3.92 (see Table 4.9). Statistics for the 7-item scale had a mean of 3.79 and a median of 3.85 (SD=.75, n=109), which indicates that the respondents’ answers regarding the seven items of participation in the evaluation phase, follow up, and sustainability lie between ‘not sure’ and ‘important’. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .80. For some items the standard deviation was high for a five-point scale. The high standard deviation indicates some extreme differences and variability in responses to these six items (see Table 4.9).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design: policy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design: strategy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the direction for the project.</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the success of activities.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9 Descriptive data of the items in the scales- Importance of participation in the different phases of social development project, Likert response categories: 1=not important, 5= very important.
Research Question # 2

To what extent does beneficiaries’ participation take place in the different phases of the Palestinian local NGOs’ projects? As described in Chapter 3, there were twenty-three scale items in the survey requiring the respondents to indicate to what extent beneficiaries of their project/program have actually participated in the activities of the different stages of the project. Subjects rated their responses according to a Likert-type scale (ranging from 1 to 5). The ranges of the answers were 1) never; 2) some of the time; 3) not sure; 4) most of the time; and 5) all of the time. A high score on the items’ score indicates high frequency of participation in the specific activity listed. The subjects’ responses varied. The items’ means fell between 2.36 and 3.51 (see Table 4.10). The statistics for 23-item scale had a mean of 2.84 and a median of 2.65 (SD = .90, n = 108). Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is .96. In general, the respondents’ answers in all the 23 items fell between ‘some of the time’ and ‘not sure’. The responses demonstrate that respondents view beneficiaries’ participation in their projects to take place ‘some of the time’ in all phases of the project’s cycle.

The descriptives for the specific items representing the different phases of the project cycle were also calculated in order to illustrate the statistics of the frequency in which participation takes place in the different phases of the project, and not only the overall frequency.

Four items represented different aspects of the ‘problem identification and needs assessment phase’ as follows:

1. Generating ideas for the project.
2. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.
3. Prioritizing the local needs.
4. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.
The items’ means fell between 2.71 and 3.06 (see Table 4.10). The statistics for the 4-item scale had a mean of 2.89 and a median of 2.75 (SD 1.05, n = 109), reflecting the respondents’ answers in the four items that participation in needs assessment takes place ‘some of the time’. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .89.

Six items represented the ‘project design phase’ as follows:

1. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.
2. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.
3. Selection of beneficiaries.
4. Project design: policy formulation for the project.
5. Project design: strategy formulation for the project.
6. Identification of the direction for the project.

The items’ means fell between 2.47 and 3.02 (see Table 4.10). The statistics for the six-item scale had a mean of 2.70 and a median of 2.66 (SD = 1.09, n = 107), the respondents’ answers in the six items indicated that actual participation in project design fell between ‘some of the time’ and ‘not sure’. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .92. For some items the standard deviation was moderately high for a five-point scale. The high standard deviation indicates some extreme differences and variability in the responses to these six items.

Six items represented the ‘implementation phase’ as follows:

1. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.
2. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.
3. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.
4. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.

5. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).

6. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects.

The items’ means fell between 2.36 and 3.51 (see Table 4.10). The statistics for the six-item scale had a mean of 2.81 and a median of 2.66 (SD = .92, n = 109). This score of 2.81 indicates that respondents’ answers in the six items regarding the actual participation in implementation phase fell between ‘some of the time’ and ‘not sure’. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale was .85. For some items the standard deviation was high for a five-point scale. The high standard deviation indicates some extreme differences and variability in responses to these six items.

Seven items represented the ‘evaluation phase, follow up, and sustainability’ as follows:

1. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects

2. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.

3. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.

4. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.

5. Assessing the success of activities.

6. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.

7. Follow-up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.

The items’ means fell between 2.53 and 3.22 (see Table 4.10). The statistics for the seven-item scale had a mean of 2.98 and a median of 3.00 (SD = .97, n = 109). The scale score indicates that respondents’ answers in the seven items regarding the actual participation in the evaluation phase, follow up and sustainability fell between ‘some of the time’ and ‘not sure’. Alpha reliability coefficient for this scale is .89.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design: policy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design: strategy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the direction for the project.</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the success of activities.</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10 Descriptive data of the items in the scales- The extent to which participation takes place at the different phases of social development project, Likert response categories: 1=never, 5=all of the time.
Research Question #3

To what extent do respondents at the Palestinian local NGOs agree with the different definitions of participation provided by the respondents to the Delphi? Respondents were asked to indicate the extent of their agreement to different statements representing the different definitions of participation. Subjects rated their response on a five-item scale: 1) *strongly disagree*; 2) *disagree*; 3) *undecided or no opinion*; 4) *agree*; and 5) *strongly agree*. Reversed statements were used for the purpose of assuring reliable answers. The mean range of the items’ scores was 2.52 to 4.36 (see Table 4.11). The respondents mostly did not agree with the following: "People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries volunteer with labor to the project" (X = 2.52, SD = 1.03, n = 109). On the other hand they agreed with the following: People’s participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project” (X = 4.36, SD = .72, n= 109); ” People’s participation in the projects is a very important characteristic of the project that contributes to its success” (X = 4.36, SD = .77, n = 108); “People’s participation in its best form is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment” (X = 4.20, SD = .87, n= 109); “People’s participation in the life cycle of the project is an ongoing process” (X = 4.09, SD = .91, n = 109). The statistics for the sub-scales measuring the different definitions of participation will be presented in the second section of this chapter on factor analysis.
### Table 4.11
Descriptive data of the items in the scales—The degree of agreement with different statements representing the definitions of participation in social development projects, (how do the respondents define participation), Likert response categories: 1= *strongly disagree*, 5= *strongly agree.*

*Denotes items that were reverse scored, reverse score mean presented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in the life cycle of the project is an ongoing process.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is a short-term activity in the project that ends at some point while the project still goes on.</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is the voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in the projects is very important characteristic of the project that contributes to its success.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation of the project.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is collaborating between the beneficiaries and the staffs.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is making sure that during implementation of the project, the right decisions are being taken.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project.</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries volunteer with labor to the project.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no possibility that participation in a development project could lead to a comprehensive empowerment of the beneficiaries. *</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation. *</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project. *</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question # 4

To what extent do respondents at the Palestinian local NGOs hold a favorable view of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects? Twenty-six items were designated to measure social workers’ opinions toward participation. Subjects rated their response on a five-item scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) undecided or no opinion; 4) agree; and 5) strongly agree. Reversed statements were used. As depicted in Table 4.12, the mean range of the scores was 2.19 to 4.31 (see Table 4.12). A reliability analysis was calculated using Cronbach alpha coefficients to test the respondents’ opinion scale for internal consistency. The resulting reliability of the twenty-six items used was acceptable (coefficient alpha = .86). A respondents’ general opinion score on the scale was also calculated. The scale had a mean of 3.27 and a median of 3.28 (SD= .47, n = 109). The mean score indicates that, as a whole, respondents’ answers lay between ‘undecided’ and ‘agree’, neither highly favorable nor unfavorable of the concept. Generally, respondents working at the local Palestinian NGOs are unable to decide, or are not sure of, the value of People’s participation in social development projects. Nevertheless, the ranges of the means of the items show that they have favorable attitude toward the concept.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in identifying their needs.</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in implementation of the project.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in identifying their needs. *</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in implementation of the project. *</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries are usually unclear about what they need. *</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are more efficient in identifying the needs of the community than are members of the local community. *</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are more efficient in identifying the services needed then are members of the local community. *</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When community is asked about their needs, most likely we will end up with a wish list that is not possible to meet. *</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is usually disagreement within the community on their priorities. *</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ opinions are usually biased. *</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ opinions usually could not be taken seriously when evaluating the project. *</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning the project it is unrealistic to change the direction of the project based on the feedback from the local community or the target group. *</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not possible that the community members participate in equal partnership with the staff in setting the agenda for the project/program. *</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not see any importance in exchanging ideas with community members before designing a project. *</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not see any good argument behind the importance of the involvement of the beneficiaries in all stages of the project. *</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ participation is essential for the success of the project/program.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have clear ideas as professionals of the kind of projects to implement. *</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to decision-making, professional staff members make better decisions because of their experience and/or training. *</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not very effective in terms of cost to regularly ask beneficiaries for their opinions of the projects. *</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in defining their problems. *</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 Descriptive data of the items in the scales- Respondents’ attitudes toward peoples’ participation in social development project, Likert response categories: 1= strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree. *denotes items that were reverse scored, reverse score mean presented.
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Table 4.12: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in setting the agenda for the program. *</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in developing solutions to address the problems. *</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that the community participates in equal partnership with the professionals in evaluating the actions taken. *</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members or the target group should have the power to demand implementing change in the direction of the project.</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can demand change in the directions of their own choosing. *</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can implement change in the directions of their own choosing. *</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question # 5

To what extent does beneficiaries’ participation takes place in general in the Palestinian local NGOs’ projects? In addition to the question exploring the level at which participation takes place in the different phases in the projects’ actual, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which beneficiaries participate in social development projects. This scale contained 26 items, 13 reversed statements were used and 13 non-reversed, to insure the reliability of the scoring. The resulting reliability of the 26 items used in this study to explore the actual practice of participation, as perceived by the respondents, was considered acceptable (Coefficient alpha =. 79). Respondents rated their response on a five-item scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) undecided or no opinion; 4) agree; and 5) strongly agree. The mean range of the scores was 2.18 to 4.24 (see Table 4.13). A score was calculated for the scale. The scale had a mean of 3.37 and a median of 3.34 (SD = .41, n = 109). The mean score indicates that, as a whole, respondents answered between ‘undecided’ and ‘agree’. Generally, respondents employed at the local
Palestinian NGOs are unable to decide, or are not sure whether beneficiaries participate in the social development projects they work in. Nevertheless, the ranges of the means of the items indicate that respondents think that participation does not take place in their projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We make it a usual procedure to consult with our beneficiaries about what they think of the project.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the planning stage of the project we seek the community’s feedback and their opinions of the kind of services they need.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We consider the situation of the marginalized groups in our practice.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries are consulted in the planning phase of the project/program. *</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries inform decisions of the project/program. *</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries inform polices of the project/program. *</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries inform practices of the project/program. *</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of beneficiaries in the decision-making in our project/programs is minimal. *</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our funding source/s determines our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say. *</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We try to increase participation of the marginalized groups (such as women) in the project.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hold regular meetings with the community to discuss the implementation of the projects with them.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly change our practices based on beneficiaries’ feedback.</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take some responsibility in the project. *</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take part in the activities.</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We provide members of the community with information about the project at a late stage of planning for the projects. *</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we held public meetings, we listen to beneficiaries’ opinions, but usually our staffs are the ones who lead the meeting. *</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We invite clients’ opinion so as to consult with them, but staff usually makes the decisions regarding how to run the project. *</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We conduct beneficiaries’ attitude surveys to get opinions about the services we provide.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor.</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13  Descriptive data of the items in the scales- The extent to which beneficiaries in general participate in the social development projects of the Palestinian NGOs, Likert response categories: 1=strongly disagree, 5= strongly agree.

*denotes items that were reverse scored, reverse score mean presented.
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We differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social stratification, age, and ethnicity, to make sure that the marginalized are included.

We hold public hearings and community meetings.

We regularly hold focus group discussions to listen to the needs of community members/target groups.

The decisions in the project are a result of negotiation between community members and professionals in the organization.

We are not trained enough to conduct participatory activities.

The administration in our organization does not put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services.

The donor organizations don’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services.

### Factor Analysis

As a result of the first phase of the research study, in which respondents from Northern donors’ NGOs participated by presenting their conceptionalizations and definitions of People’s participation in social development projects, different dimensions of participation were identified. Respondents from the Northern donor NGOs identified different dimensions of participation, which they believe, should be implemented in their partners’ NGOs. In the second phase of the research, the researcher aimed at understanding how respondents in the local Palestinian NGOs, funded by Northern donor NGOs, perceive the different dimensions of People’s participation in social development projects in their actual practice, what their attitudes and values toward participation are, and what the practices and activities of People’s participation in their social
development projects are. The overarching aim is to look for an answer to the hypothesis whether the respondents in the Palestinian NGOs would or would not agree with the same definitions of participation as their Northern donor organizations.

Exploratory factor analysis is used as a data reduction method to examine the level at which items in an instrument ‘hang together’, or tap the same dimension (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). Its use in this specific research study guides the exploration of the underlying different constructs of the definitions, practices, and activities of participation, and attitudes toward participation. The instrument completed by the respondents in this second phase contained items that are a facet of the different broader definitions, practices and activities, and attitudes and values of participation. Respondents who work in the Palestinian social development projects provided their evaluations on these dimensions. The goal of the analysis was to tap those specific items in the questionnaire which correlate highly, which are assumed to be ‘members of broader dimensions’ (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). These dimensions become composites of specific variables, which in turn allow the dimensions to be interpreted and described.

More specifically, factor analysis was used for the following reasons: 1) to identify the underlying evaluative dimensions of the concept beneficiaries’ participation, its practice and observed activities at the project level, and the attitudes toward it; 2) to classify and categorize the different definitions, practices and activities, and attitudes in order to find clusters that are composed of shared themes of these different definitions, practices and activities, and attitudes; 3) to create participation sub-scales using the different definitions and practice activities, and 4) to test if items reflecting the different definitions (dimensions) and the different practices of the concept hang together as a distinctive concept of definitions, practices and activities and attitudes.

The following section presents an exploratory factor analysis of the definitions, practices and activities, and attitudes of beneficiaries’ participation in the local Palestinian NGOs and thus examines data that are relevant to the following specific research questions:
1. Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the importance of the different activities of beneficiaries’ participation in the different stages of the social development project to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?

2. Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the frequency of the activities of beneficiaries’ participation in the different stages of the social development projects to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?

3. Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the definitions of beneficiaries’ participation to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound? The researcher is concerned with examining whether the definitions of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects cluster in different dimensions in such a way as to reveal some shared themes that are meaningful and interpretable? This is to address the question whether these dimensions of the definition of beneficiaries’ participation separate in their composition or do they ‘group’ into some more general areas that underlie the overall definition.

4. Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the attitudes toward beneficiaries’ participation to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? The question that is to be answered here, whether
these attitudes are grouped in a specific way. Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?

5. Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the practices of beneficiaries’ participation to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound? The question here attempts to answer whether the general practices of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects cluster in different dimensions in such a way as to reveal some shared themes that are meaningful and interpretable? This is to examine the different participatory practices of participation in social development and social work projects as it is practiced by the social workers and development workers who work in the local Palestinian NGOs.

6. If interpretable dimensions ‘components’, ‘factors’ are derived in all the above questions, the following question is to be investigated: Can factor-based scores guide more interpretations of the factors and comparisons between them?

Research Question # 1

Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the importance of the different activities of beneficiaries’ participation in the different stages of the social development project to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?
This question is concerned with the idea whether there are underlying structures or constructs to the 23 items representing the importance of different activities of participation that are conducted at the different stages of the project cycle. The section of the instrument that contained items between 1-23 reflects the importance of participation in different stages of the project in all participation items (see Appendix F). Respondents, who responded to the Likert-type five-item scale, were asked to indicate the extent to which they believe that each of the listed project/program activities is an important form of beneficiary participation in social development projects. The ranges of the answers were 1) not important; 2) of little importance; 3) not sure; 4) important; and 5) very important.

**Appropriateness of factor analysis for the data:** In order to determine the extent to which factor analysis is appropriate for the data, the following statistics should be considered: correlation matrix, Bartlett’s test of sphericity, measures of sampling adequacy for the matrix and for individual variables, and initial estimates of communality for each variable in the observed variable set. The consideration of these statistics could support or not support the feasibility of performing a factor analysis.

The factor analysis model is appropriate if the variables in the observed variable set are related to each other. In examining the correlation matrix the researcher found that the variables in the observed variable set are related to each other. Several of the correlations have $r = .3$ and above, some correlations reached .8. Therefore the factor analysis model is appropriate because of the correlations of the variables to each other, which we see in this case.

Bartlett’s test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. $H_0$: the null hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix can be rejected ($p < .000$) because the significance is less than alpha .05. All diagonal terms are 1.0 and all off-diagonal terms are zero. Factor analysis for this data appears tenable.
Measures of sampling adequacy for the matrix: KMO = .828 is meritorious (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998); hence this KMO value validates the use of common factor analysis. The MSA for each individual variable ranged from .729-.923 with fifteen of the 23 items measuring at .80 or higher. All of them are reasonably large which is needed for good factor analysis. Given these statistics, factor analysis would be appropriate.

The initial estimates of communality for each variable, is the indication of the strength of the association among the variables in the observed variable set. It is recommended that these be around .40 or higher since high communalities are desirable for factor analysis. Most of the initial communalities ranged between .513 and .873 (see Table 4.14). So these high initial communalities estimates indicate how much variance each observed variable is in common with the other variables, and it suggest that variables will load high on factors.

All the above considerations support the feasibility of performing factor analysis. Hence, factor analysis is empirically feasible and conceptually sound. Therefore, to interpret the exploratory factor analysis for the purpose of identifying the underlying constructs (dimensions) of the 23-item scale representing the importance of participation at the different stages of the project; factor analysis was performed.

*Extraction:* The objective of the extraction step is to determine the maximum number of common factors that would satisfactorily produce the correlation among the observed variables. With any extraction method, the two questions that a good solution should try to answer are "How many components (factors) are needed to represent the variables?" and "What do these components represent?" (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998). Several guidelines can be used in this decision making process:
Eigenvalues: The Kaiser (latent root) criterion to extract components with eigenvalues equal
to or greater than 1.0 indicates a 6-factor model, where factor 1 had an eigenvalue = 8.151, factor
2 eigenvalue = 2.252, factor 3 eigenvalue = 1.788, factor 4 eigenvalue = 1.324, factor 5
eigenvalue = 1.252, and factor 6 eigenvalue =1.126 (see Table 4.14).

Examination of the Scree plot supports a 6-factor model. A sharp drop after factor one and
leveling of the curve after factor 6 supporting the 6-factor model.

Computing the total variance explained showed:

1. The total variance in the observed variable set = 23, which is equal to the number of
variables in the observed variable set.

2. The amount and percent of total variance extracted by; each of the six factors are:

   Factor 1: eigenvalue = 8.151, % of total variance = 35.439
   Factor 2: eigenvalue = 2.252, % of total variance = 9.792
   Factor 3: eigenvalue = 1.788, % of total variance = 7.772
   Factor 4: eigenvalue = 1.324, % of total variance = 5.756
   Factor 5: eigenvalue = 1.252, % of total variance = 5.442
   Factor 6: eigenvalue = 1.126, % of total variance = 4.894

3. The amount of total variance extracted by the 6 factor model is 15.893, which is
   69.095% of the total variance closely meets the guidelines that the number of
   components to extract should account to approximately 70% of the total variance in the
   observed variable set.

The guidelines above support a six-model structure. This 6 model structure is most
conceptually sound and provides a simple and interpretable structure which also meets the
parsimonious goal (see Table 4.14).
Stability and reliability of the model: The question is not only whether the structure is meaningful or not, but also how much this structure is stable and reliable. This is tested through performing different extracting methods, and by comparing the factor analysis solutions with each other in order to examine if the loadings group in the same manner (Johnson & Wichern, 1998). Johnson & Wichern, (1998) suggest performing a principal component factor analysis with an orthogonal varimax rotation, then performing a maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation, and then comparing the factor analysis solutions. In comparing both solutions, the two solutions provide the same structures with a slight difference in the loading for some of the variables and difference in the number of the factors (see Table 4.14 and Appendix J for comparisons of solutions). Since the interpretations of the solutions led to the same component structure, this emphasizes the reliability and stability of the factors-structure.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation, Follow up</th>
<th>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Administration and Coordination</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project design: policy formulation for the project</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design: strategy formulation for the project</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the direction for the project</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring that the project is following the planned design</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.606</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect</td>
<td>.541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the success of activities</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.14  Factor Analysis for the importance of activities of participation- Factor Loadings- Principal component extraction-orthogonal rotation: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (n = 109).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation, Follow up</th>
<th>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Administration and Coordination</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.699 .741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.636 .516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.799 .757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.760 .821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalues | 8.151 | 2.252 | 1.788 | 1.324 | 1.252 | 1.126 | 15.893 |
| Percent of total variance | 35.439 | 9.792 | 7.772 | 5.756 | 5.442 | 4.894 | 69.095 |
Rotation: Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, (1998) suggest that when the goal of the research is to reduce the number of original variables to a smaller set of un-correlated variables, an orthogonal solution is the best. Meanwhile, when the goal of factor analysis is to obtain several theoretically meaningful factors or constructs, an oblique solution of rotation is appropriate. In oblique rotation the rule of correlations among factors are relaxed to assume that there are correlations among the extracted factors while orthogonal rotation assumes that the rotated factors remain un-correlated, as were the original factors that were extracted. With varimax rotation (the most used orthogonal rotation), each factor tends to load high on a lesser number of variables and load low or very low on the other variables. If it is assumed that the 23 items in this analysis are not correlated, an orthogonal rotation is sounder to perform. Nevertheless, it is argued that the decision whether to rotate obliquely or orthogonally should be made after interpreting the two rotations, as Stevens (1996) states: “The preferred course of action is…. to rotate both orthogonally and obliquely. When on the basis of the latter it is concluded that the correlations among the factors are negligible, the interpretation of the simpler orthogonal solution becomes tenable” (p. 369). Therefore both rotations were conducted; the following is the presentation of the results:

Orthogonal Rotation:

Examining the rotated component matrix the following factors were extracted (see Table 4.14):

Factor One: The following items loaded on factor one:

1. Project design: policy formulation for the project (Loaded at .892)
2. Project design: strategy formulation for the project. (Loaded at .876)
3. Identification of the direction for the project. (Loaded at .829)
4. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community (Loaded at .601).
5. Selection of beneficiaries (loaded at .549).
This component has 3 loadings that are .80 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least three loadings equal to or greater than .80 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

**Factor Two:** The following items loaded on factor two:

1. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects (Loaded at .820)
2. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects (Loaded at .756)
3. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design (Loaded at .662)
4. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects (Loaded at .606)

This component has 4 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least 4 loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

**Factor Three:** The following items loaded on factor three:

1. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives (Loaded at .815)
2. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow (Loaded at .696)
3. Generating ideas for the project (Loaded at .693).
4. Prioritizing the local needs (Loaded at .655).
5. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect (Loaded at .541).

This component has 4 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996) any component with at least four loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.
Factor Four: The following items loaded on factor four

1. Assessing the success of activities (Loaded at .797).
2. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project (Loaded at .755).
3. Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project (Loaded at .685).
4. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community (Loaded at .642).

This component has 4 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least four loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

Factor Five: The following items loaded on factor five

1. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached (Loaded at .741).
2. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project (Loaded at .699).
3. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information) (Loaded at .636).

The loadings in this component ranged between .636 and .741, which is considered significant according to Stevens’ criteria (1996) which recommends, “loadings which are .40 (absolute) or higher be used for identifying variables that load on a particular factor is considered practically significant” (p.371).
**Factor Six:** The following items loaded on factor six:

1. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards. (Loaded at .799).
2. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards. (Loaded at .760).

The loadings in this component .760 and .799, meet the above-mentioned Stevens’ criteria (1996), which considers loadings .40 (absolute) or higher as practically significant.

Overall, having a small ratio between variables and sample size (5:1) could be problematic in this case to the stability of the structure. Nevertheless, the number and magnitude of variables loading in the most of the factors compensate for the small sample size.

**Oblique Rotation:**

An oblique rotation was conducted to examine the assumption of correlations among factors. When the factor pattern matrix in oblique rotation is examined (see Appendix K), the same six factors were extracted. Despite slight differences in the loadings (see Table 4.14 and Appendix K for comparisons); the factor structures for both rotations were similar. The factor pattern matrix in oblique rotation showed that most of the loadings were above .3, which means that the variables are significantly correlated with the factors. In choosing which rotation is preferable, examination of the intercorrelations between the obliquely rotated components is important. For all practical purposes the six obliquely rotated components are not correlated. An examination of the size correlation coefficients in the Component Correlation Matrix (see Table 4.15) indicated that 6 of 7 coefficients ranged from .106 to .299. There are low correlations (r = -.39) between only one pair of the components (Components 1 and 2) (see Table 4.15).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.390</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>0.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.390</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.15  Factor Analysis for importance of activities of participation-Component Correlation Matrix for Principal Component Extraction:  Oblique Rotation with Kaiser Normalization.

Which rotation suggests a more simple and meaningful structure? In this case, both rotations result in comparable interpretations – the same observed variables load on each of the four components. In other words, the interpretations of both orthogonal and oblique rotations led to the same underlying component structure, including the names for the 6 components structure (except for differences in the number of factors). Moreover, the absence of substantial correlations between pairs of components supports a decision to interpret the orthogonal rotation.

The principal component analysis is recommended to appraise the stability and reliability of the common structure, so in conclusion to all of the above statistics, the question to be answered is whether there is underlying structure for these constructs. The rotated (orthogonal) component matrix indicated a simple structure (each observed variable loads high on one factor and low on all the others). The information about the types of activities carried by each factor is also meaningful and conceptually sound. Thus, principal component extraction with orthogonal rotation will be interpreted. Moreover, the data showed that the structure is not only meaningful but also reliable and makes sense. Thus, in the next step of naming the factors, it is conceptually
sound to rely on the variables consisting of these factors to guide the naming process; primarily, the variables with higher loadings should influence to a greater extent the name or label selected to represent a factor or a component.

_Naming and interpreting the factors:_ Using .40 as the salient loading, five observed variables loaded on factor 1; four observed variables loaded on factor 2; five observed variables loaded on factor 3; four observed variables loaded on factor 4; three observed variables loaded on factor 5; and two observed variables loaded on factor 6. With only two exceptions the loadings for each of the 23 observed variables is .60 or higher on its respective factor. The exceptions are the .549 loading for “selection of beneficiaries” on factor 1 and the .541 loading for “formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect” on factor 3. These loadings are considered high. Also with one exception, each observed variable loaded high on only one factor and loaded low (loadings range from .000 to .350) on the other five factors. The exception was “identification of target group mostly in need”, which loaded higher (.601) in factor 1 but had a loading of .455 (slightly higher than the salient loading of .40) on factor 2. For each of the 6 factors (except for factor 2) all loadings were positive, which considerably simplifies the interpretation of the factor-based scores (derived variables). High values for each observed variable (high importance for the beneficiaries’ participation in the specific activity of the project) correspond to high values for the factor-based scores. Meanwhile, negative loadings indicate that high values (high importance for each observed variables in the “implementation phase” factor correspond with low values for the factor-based scores.

The following names are proposed for the six factors:

_Factor 1: “Project design”:_ The most highly loaded items in factor 1 are related to the design phase of the project (ex. the item: “project design: project policy formulation” had loadings of .892 and the item “project design: project strategy formulation” had a loading of .876).
Factor 2: “Implementation”: The items of factor 2 are mostly related to activities taking place in the implementation phase of the project (ex: the item “monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects” had the highest loading, which was .820, while the second highest loading was the item “controlling the implementation of the project and its effects” with a loading of .756.

Factor 3: “Needs assessment”: The items in factor 3 are related to activities taking place during the problem identification and needs assessment phase of the project. The highest loading on this item was for the item “identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives” with a loading of .815, the second highest loading was for the item “making decisions about the best alternatives to follow” with a loading of .696, the third highest loading was “generating ideas for the project” with a loading of .693.

Factor 4: “Evaluation and follow-up”: The variables for factor 4 contained items related to the evaluation and follow-up, as well as sustainability phase of the project cycle. The item “assessing the success of activities” had a loading of .797, and the item “evaluation: the involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project” had a loading of .755.

Factor 5: “Beneficiaries’ contribution of resources and information to the project”. The highest loading of .741 in factor 5 was for the item “disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached”, the second highest was the item “providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project” with a loading of .699

Factor 6: “Administration and coordination”: The items in factor 6 contained two items related to the administration and coordination of the project as members of various advisory boards with loadings of .799 and .760.
For the oblique rotation, an equally simple and meaningful factor structure was indicated. Each observed variable loaded high on one factor and low on all other factors. The names of the factors are the same as for orthogonal rotation; however, the factor numbers are different.

In conclusion, 6 factors were identified as a result of factor analysis using principal components, orthogonal rotation. The interpretation of these different factors are based on the variables related to each factor, there was a unique set of variables loading high on one factor and low on the others, which provided the basis for interpreting and naming the factors. As noted earlier, with one exception, the factors are for all practical purposes not correlated. The exception concerns the relationship between the importance of “needs assessment” (factor 3) and “project design” (factor 1) r = -.390. Since the loadings for factor 1 and factor 3 are both positive, the negative correlation coefficient indicates that high values for factor 1 scores (high importance) correspond to high values for factor 3 scores. Likewise, low values for factor 1 scores (low importance) correspond to low values for factor 3 scores.

The interpretation of factor scores requires attention on two points: how the observed variables are measured (scaled) and the signs of the factor loadings for the observed variables that load on each factor. In this case, the observed variables (importance of participation in social development project) are measured on a five-point scale where 1 = not important and 5 = very important. For orthogonal rotation all factor loadings for the observed variables were positive; consequently, for project design high values for factor scores indicate that social workers perceive the design phase of the project participation has having “high importance”, whereas low values indicate “low importance” for the participation in this phase. The factor scores for “project design” (factor 1) range from –2.44-2.17 (see Table 4.16), which means that the degree to which respondents saw high importance or low importance ranges from 2.44 standard deviations below the mean to 2.17 standards deviations above the mean. The higher the factor score, the more
respondents see the importance of “beneficiaries’ participation” in the “project design phase”.

The lower the factor score, the less respondents see “beneficiaries’ participation” in this phase of the project as important. Similar interpretations can be made for the other five factor scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>-2.44</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>-2.77</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation, Follow up</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ Resources and information Contribution</td>
<td>-2.94</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; Coordination</td>
<td>-2.62</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16  Factor analysis for importance of activities of participation: Factor scores for principal component analysis-orthogonal rotation: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

The factor-based scores further guide the interpretation of the factors. Therefore, factor-based scores were calculated assuming that the underlying constructs of the 23 items measuring the importance of participation in the different stages of the social development projects were identified, where each factor is distinctive and means that respondents’ perception of the importance of participation clustered to compose the specific stages of the project in which participation takes place. The calculated correlations among the factors were expected not to equal zero, which was the case when the factor scores were correlated. The reason is that factor
scores for each factor are based on all items in the instrument, while factor-based scores for each factor are based only on the items in the original instrument, which load on each factor. The factor-based scales could be used in further analysis in future research projects. Nevertheless, the researcher could interpret what these factor-based scores mean, where the high factor-based scores indicate great agreement on the importance of factor concept, while low values indicate strong disagreement with the importance of factor concept. In comparison between the 6 factor scores, the most important participation according to social workers was perceived to take place when beneficiaries provide their resources to the project (see Table 4.17). Respondents saw that beneficiaries’ participation in providing resources and information to the project is the most important form of participation, which had a mean of 4.15 and a median of 4.33 (SD = .73, n = 108). The second in importance was participation in the needs assessment phase of the project, which had a mean of 4.08 and a median of 4.20 (SD = .71, n = 108), and which differed slightly from the mean for the factor ‘beneficiaries’ resource contribution’, which had mean of 4.15 and a median of 4.33 (SD = .73, n = 108). Three factors had very close means. According to the respondents, the least important participation’ form takes place during administration and coordination of the project, with a mean of 3.54 and a median of 3.75 (SD = 1.10, n = 106); implementation had a close mean of 3.58 and a median of 3.75; and project design had a mean of 3.55 and a median of 3.90 (see Table 4.17).
Table 4.17  Factor analysis for importance of activities of participation--Factor-based scores descriptives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation and Follow up</th>
<th>Administration and Coordination</th>
<th>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Question # 2

Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables describing the frequency of the activities of beneficiaries’ participation in the different stages of the social development projects to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?

This question is concerned with whether there is an underlying structure or construct to the 23 items representing the activities of the specific stages of the project where participation actually takes place. The section of the instrument containing the items between 24-46 (see Appendix F) had all the participation items reflecting the level at which participation actually takes place at different stages of the project. Respondents, who responded to the Likert-type
five-item scale, were asked to indicate to what extent beneficiaries in their project/program have actually participated in each of the listed activities. The ranges of the answers were 1) *never*; 2) *some of the time*; 3) *not sure*; 4) *most of the time*; and 5) *all of the time*.

**Appropriateness of factor analysis for the data:** The consideration of the following statistics could support or not support the feasibility of performing a factor analysis.

- In examining the correlation matrix, it is obvious that there are significant correlations in the observed variable set with each other. Several of the correlations have $r = .5$ and more, some correlations reached .8. Hence, the factor analysis model is appropriate because, in this case, there are correlations between the variables.

- Bartlett’s test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. $H_0$: the null hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix can be rejected ($p < .000$) because the significance is less than alpha .05. All diagonal terms are 1.0 and all off-diagonal terms are zero. Factor analysis for this data appears tenable.

- Measures of sampling adequacy for the matrix: KMO = .913 is meritorious (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998); therefore the KMO value validates the use of common factor analysis. The MSA for each individual variable ranged from .813-.960 with 16 of the 23 items measuring .90 and 7, measuring .813 or higher. All of them are reasonably large, which is needed for good factor analysis. Given these statistics, factor analysis would be appropriate (see Table 4.18).

- The initial estimate of communality for each variable indicates the strength of the association among the variables in the observed variable set. It is recommended that these be around .40 or higher, since high communalities are desirable for factor analysis. Most of the initial communalities ranged between .598 and .781 (See table 4.18).
these high initial communalities estimates indicate how much variance each observed variable is in common with the other variables, and it suggests that variables will load high on factors.

All the above considerations support the feasibility of performing factor analysis. Hence, factor analysis is empirically feasible and conceptually sound. In order to identify the underlying constructs (dimensions) of the second 23-item scale representing the extent to which participation takes place at the different stages of the project, factor analysis was conducted.

*Extraction:* To answer the question "How many components (factors) are needed to represent the variables?" and "What do these components represent?" the following guidelines were examined:

- **Eigenvalues:** The Kaiser (latent root) criterion to extract components with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates a 4-factor model, where factor 1 had an eigenvalue = 12.202, factor 2 eigenvalue = 1.764, factor 3 eigenvalue = 1.265, factor 4 eigenvalue = 1.105 (See Table 4.18).

- Examination of the scree plot supports a 4-factor model. A sharp drop after factor one and leveling of the curve after factor 4 supporting the 4-factor model.

- **Computing the total variance explained showed:**
  1. The total variance in the observed variable set = 23, which is equal to the number of variables in the observed variable set.
  2. The amount and percent of total variance extracted by each of the four factors are:

    Factor 1: eigenvalue = 12.202, % of total variance = 53.054
    Factor 2: eigenvalue = 1.764, % of total variance = 7.668
    Factor 3: eigenvalue = 1.265, % of total variance = 5.500
    Factor 4: eigenvalue = 1.105, % of total variance = 4.804
3. The amount of total variance extracted by the 4 factor model is


that is 71.025% of the total variance, which meets the guidelines that the number of components to extract should account for approximately 70% of the total variance in the observed variable set.

The guidelines above support a four-model structure. This 4 model structure is most conceptually sound and provides a simple and interpretable structure which also meets the parsimonious goal (see Table 4.18).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design and coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation and Monitoring</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project design: policy formulation for the project</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in co-ordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of direction for the project</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project design: strategy formulation for the project</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>.467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the success of activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring that the project is following the planned design</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritizing the local needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generating ideas for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.18  Factor Analysis for actual activities of participation-factor loadings-principal component extraction-orthogonal rotation: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (n = 109)

(TABLE CONTINUED)
Table 4.18: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design and coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation and Monitoring</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Beneficiaries’ Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Percent of total variance | 53.054 | 7.668 | 5.500 | 4.804 | 71.025 |

*Stability and reliability of the model:* To test the stability and reliability of the model structure, a maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed to compare its produced solution with that of the principal component factor analysis’ solution. In comparing both solutions, the two solutions did not provide the same exact structures as in the previous analysis. Nevertheless, there were some great similarities in the variables that loaded on the factors (see Table 4.18 and Appendix L for comparisons). For factor 2 in principal component extraction, seven variables loaded high in this factor, five of these factors also loaded high in maximum likelihood extraction in factor 1, likewise in factor 3. For the principal
component 5 variables loaded high in this factor, while the same 5 factors loaded high in the maximum likelihood extraction in factor 2. Also, the 3 variables that loaded high in factor 4 in the principal component loaded high in factor 1 in maximum likelihood. Despite these similarities, some variables loaded differently in the factors in the both solutions. As a result, the comparison has not confirmed the stability of the structure.

Rotation: In order to decide how to rotate obliquely or orthogonally, the two rotations were performed:

Orthogonal Rotation:

Examining the rotated component matrix the following factors were extracted (see Table 4.18):

Factor One: The following items loaded on factor one:

1. Project design: project policy formulation (Loaded at .714).
2. Identification of target group mostly in need in community (Loaded at .711)
3. Involvement In coordination of project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards (Loaded at .707).
4. Identification of direction for project (Loaded at .698).
5. Project design: project strategy formulation (Loaded at .686)
6. Involvement in administration of project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards (Loaded at .667).
7. Selection of beneficiaries (Loaded at .646).

This component had 7 loadings that are .60 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least 4 loadings equal to or greater than .60 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.
**Factor Two:** The following items loaded on factor two:

1. Assessing activities success (Loaded at .774).
2. Evaluating implementation of project and its effects (Loaded at .740).
3. Monitoring the evaluation of the project impact on community (Loaded at .729).
4. Beneficiaries’ involvement in project evaluation (Loaded at .687).
5. Monitoring project follows planned design (Loaded at .680).
6. Controlling implementation of project and its effects (Loaded at .663).
7. Beneficiaries’ involvement in follow-up and ensuring project sustainability (Loaded at .596).
8. Monitoring implementation of project and its effects (Loaded at .595).

This component had 6 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least four loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

**Factor Three:** The following items loaded on factor three:

1. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives (Loaded at .774).
2. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow (Loaded at .706).
3. Prioritizing local needs (Loaded at .698).
4. Generating ideas for the project (Loaded at .681).
5. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect (Loaded at .551).

This component had 4 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least four loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.
Factor Four: The following items loaded on factor four

1. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached (Loaded at .756).
2. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information) (Loaded at .747).
3. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project (Loaded at .659).

The loadings in this component ranged between .659 and .756, which is considered significant according to Stevens’ criteria (1996) that recommends, “loadings which are .40 (absolute) or higher are used for identifying variables that load on a particular factor is considered practically significant” (p.371).

While a conservative rule of thumb considers at least five cases for each observed variable as minimum, others consider about 10:1. In this case, the sample size ratio to variables (5:1) was relatively small and could be accepted conservatively. Therefore, the aforementioned Stevens’ criteria gives more validation to the use of principal component analysis with orthogonal rotation, since the loadings were high in this solution. In this case, the number and magnitude of variables loading in most of the factors compensate for the small sample size.

Oblique Rotation:

Principal component extraction with an oblique rotation has failed to converge in iterations (convergence = .001). This could be due to the fact that the sample size is too small to detect significant relations among the factors in oblique rotation. Instead, a maximum likelihood extraction with oblique rotation was conducted and compared with maximum likelihood orthogonal structure (see Appendix M). The produced structures of both of rotations were not completely identical. Some variables in both structures had low factor loadings as of .3. Nevertheless, similarities were detected in the two solutions. Seven variables loaded high in
factor 2 in orthogonal maximum likelihood, six of them had also high loadings in factor 1, four variables loaded high in factor 4 in orthogonal, three of them loaded high in factor 3 in oblique maximum likelihood. Moreover, correlations between the oblique rotated factors were detected; the highest correlation coefficients were between factor 1 and 3 ($r = -.681$), factor 1 and factor 2 ($r = .596$), and factor 2 and 3 ($r = -.550$).

To conclude, both orthogonal and oblique rotations resulted in incomparable interpretations, where they did not produce the same underlying structure. Where correlations between the produced factors were detected they do not support the stability and reliability of the produced factor structure. Thus, since principal component analysis is recommended to appraise the stability and reliability of the common structure (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1998), principal component extraction with orthogonal rotation will be the method interpreted. Moreover, in this case the principal component solution in this analysis suggests a more simple and meaningful structure than the other solutions; it is also the most conceptually sound.

In conclusion to the above statistics, the question to be answered is whether there is underlying structure for these constructs. The analysis showed that there is a structure and that this structure is not completely stable, yet it makes sense and is on the whole conceptually sound.

**Naming and interpreting the factors:** Using $.40$ as the salient loading, eight observed variables loaded on factor 1; seven observed variables loaded on factor 2; five observed variables loaded on factor 3; and three observed variables loaded on factor 4. With only three exceptions the loadings for each of the 23 observed variables on its respective factor was $.60$ or higher. The exceptions were the $.569$ loading for the variable “Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects” on factor 1; $.596$ loading for the variable “Follow-up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project” on factor 2; and $.551$ loading for “Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect” on factor 3. These loadings were considered high. Also with 3 exceptions, each observed variable loaded high on
only one factor and loaded low (loadings range from .000 to .399) on the other factors. It is worth to note that the exception concerned the variable “Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects.” which loaded closely in both factors 1 and 2, with respective loadings of .596 and .595. Since this variable is more conceptually related to the items in factor 2 than the items in factor 1, and since the difference in both loadings are negligible, so it was moved to factor 2. For each of the 4 factors all loadings were positive, which considerably simplifies the interpretation of the factor-based scores (derived variables). High values for each observed variable (more frequent participation takes place in the project) correspond to high values for the factor-based scores.

Since the rotated (orthogonal) component matrix indicated a simple structure (each observed variable loads high on one factor and loads low on all others) and the information about the types of activities carried by each factor is also meaningful, the following names are proposed for the four factors:

*Factor 1: “Project design and coordination”:* The variables that loaded in factor 1 contained items related to the “project design and coordination of the project (ex: the item “Project design: policy formulation for the project” had the highest loading in this factor, which was .714, the second highest in the loadings was for the item “Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community” with a loading of .711.)

*Factor 2: “Evaluation and monitoring”:* The variables that loaded in factor 2 were related to monitoring and evaluations activities. The item “Assessing the success of activities” had a loading of .774, and the item “Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects” had a loading of .740.
Factor 3: “Needs assessment”: The variables that loaded in factor 3 were related to activities of problem identification and needs assessment. The item “Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives” had loading of .774, and the item “Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow” had a loading of .706.

Factor 4: “Beneficiaries’ resource contribution”: The variables that loaded in factor 4 contained items related to the beneficiaries’ contribution of information and resources to the project. The item “Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached” had a loading of .756, and the item “Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information)” had a loading of .747.

In conclusion, four constructs were identified as a result of factor analysis using principal components, orthogonal rotation. The interpretation of these different factors was based on the variables related to each factor. There was a unique set of variables loading high on one factor and loading low on the others, which provided the basis for interpreting the factor. Thus, factor-based scores were calculated assuming that the underlying constructs of the 23 items measuring the frequency of participation in the different stages of the social development projects were identified. Social workers perceived that frequency of participation activities in the project depends on the stage of the project cycle. High factor-based scores indicated that participation takes place more frequently in this specific stage, while low values indicate low frequency of participation at the specific factor (see Table 4.19). These factor-based scales could be used in further analysis in future research projects. Nevertheless, the researcher was able to interpret here what these factor-based scores mean.

In comparing the four factor-based scores, according to the respondents the most frequent participation takes place at their projects when beneficiaries’ contribute with information or resources to the projects. The statistics showed that respondents saw that beneficiaries’
participation in providing resources and information to the project is more frequent in their projects, which had the highest mean of 3.30 and a median of 3.33 (SD = .93, n = 109). The second frequent occurrence of participation in the projects is in the needs assessment phase of the project, which had a mean of 2.87 and a median of 2.80 (SD = 1.04, n = 108). The frequent activities of participation were seen to take place during project design and coordination, with a mean of 2.58 and a median of 2.42 (see Table 4.19). It is worth noting that all the means fell under 3.30, which means that generally considering the 5-point scale that these items were scaled, all activities of participation have a low occurrence in the different project cycle according to the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design and Coordination</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation and Monitoring</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.19  Factor analysis for actual activities of participation -Factor-based scores’ descriptives.
Research Question # 3

Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the different definitions of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound? The researcher is concerned here to examine whether the definitions of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects cluster in different dimensions in a way that these dimensions show some shared themes within these different definitions that are meaningful and interpretable? This concerns the question whether these dimensions of the definition of beneficiaries’ participation separate in their composition or whether they ‘group’ into some more general areas which underlie the overall definition.

This question is whether there are underlying structures (constructs or dimensions) to the 14 items that represent different definitions of participation. Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure?

The 14 items in this instrument are statements about how respondents define people’s participation in social development projects; these are represented in the items 47-55, 102-103, 108-110 (see Appendix F). Respondents were asked to rate their degree of agreement on a five-item scale: 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) undecided or no opinion; 4) agree; 5) strongly agree. Reverse scoring was used. The aim is to identify constructs or dimensions of definitions that could be extracted. A reliability analysis was calculated for the 14-item scale, using Cronbach alpha coefficients to test these items on definitions for internal consistency. The resulting reliability of the 14 items was very low (Coefficient alpha = .5648); therefore, factor analysis of the 14 items on definitions was conducted to extract the items that have higher internal consistency and together best represents the different constructs.
Appropriateness of factor analysis for the data: The consideration of the following statistics could support or not support the feasibility of performing a factor analysis.

- In examining the correlation matrix, it is obvious that there are practical and significant correlations in the observed variable set with each other. Several of the correlations had $r = .3$ and more. The correlations did not seem to be strong overall, but there are correlations at .3 and above. Nevertheless, the factor analysis model is appropriate because in this case there are some appeared correlations between the variables.

- Bartlett’s test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. H0: the null hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix can be rejected ($p < .000$) because the significance is less than alpha .05. All diagonal terms are 1.0 and all off-diagonal terms are zero. Factor analysis for this data appears tenable.

- Measures of sampling adequacy for the matrix: KMO = .632 is mediocre (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998), so this KMO value validates the use of common factor analysis. The MSA for each individual variable ranged from .421-.722 with 10 of the 14 items measuring .60 and above. All of them are reasonably acceptable, which is needed for good factor analysis. Given these statistics, factor analysis would be appropriate (see Table 4.20).

- The initial estimate of communality for each variable is the indication of the strength of the association among the variables in the observed variable set. It is recommended that these be around .40 or higher since high communalities are desirable for factor analysis. Most of the initial communalities ranged between .470 and .772 (See Table 4.20). Hence, these medium to high initial communalities estimates indicate how much variance each observed variable is in common with the other variables, and it suggests that variables will load high on factors.
All the above considerations support the feasibility of performing factor analysis. Common factor analysis is a consequence empirically feasible and conceptually sound. Therefore, to interpret the exploratory factor analysis for the purpose of identifying the underlying constructs (dimensions) of the 14-item scale representing different definitions of participation, factors were extracted using principal component analysis.

**Extraction:** To answer the question "How many components (factors) are needed to represent the variables?" and "What do these components represent?" the following guidelines were examined:

- **Eigenvalues:** The Kaiser (latent root) criterion to extract components with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates a 5-factor model, where factor 1 had an eigenvalue = 2.611, factor 2 eigenvalue = 2.203, factor 3 eigenvalue = 1.411, factor 4 eigenvalue = 1.341, and factor 5 eigenvalue = 1.069 (See Table 4.20).

- **Examination of the scree plot supports a 5-factor model.** A sharp drop after factor one and leveling of the curve after factor 5 supporting the 5-factor model.

- **Computing the percentage of variance extracted showed the total variance in the observed variance set as 14, which is the number of the items or variables, the amount of total variance extracted is** $2.611 + 2.203 + 1.411 + 1.341 + 1.069 = 8.635$

- **The total common variance extracted by the 5 factor model is 61.672% of the total variance, which is a little bit behind the guidelines requiring that the number of components to extract should account for approximately 70% of the total variance in the observed variable set.**

The guidelines above support a five-model structure with caution. This 5-model structure appears to be conceptually sound and provides a simple and interpretable structure, which also meets the parsimous goal (see table 4.20).
Stability and reliability of the model: To test the stability and reliability of the model structure a maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed to compare its produced solution with that of the principal component factor analysis’ solution. In comparing both solutions, the two solutions did not provide exactly the same structures; nevertheless, there were some similarities between the two solutions (See Table 4.20 and Appendix N for comparisons). For example in factor one the same variables loaded high on this factor; in comparison, the item ”It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project” had a loading of .847 in principal component extraction, compared to a loading of .884 with the maximum likelihood. Another item that loaded high in this factor is “It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation”, which had a loading of .773 with principal component and .742 with maximum likelihood.

Despite these similarities, the structure of maximum likelihood extraction was not completely identical with that of principal component extraction. In this regard the result should be interpreted with caution, as the stability of the structure was not assured.

Rotation: The 14 items in this analysis are assumed not to be correlated; therefore, an orthogonal rotation is sounder to perform. Nevertheless, in order to decide how to rotate obliquely or orthogonally, the two rotations were performed:

*Orthogonal Rotation:*

Examining the rotated component matrix, the following factors were extracted (see Table 4.20).

*Factor One:* The following items loaded on factor one:

1. It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project. (Loading at .847)
2. It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation. (Loading at .778)
3. There is no possibility that participation in a development project could lead to a comprehensive empowerment of the beneficiaries. (Loading at .663)

4. People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project. (Loading at -.630).

This component had 4 loadings .60 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least 4 loadings equal to or greater than .60 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

Factor Two: The following items loaded on factor two:

1. People’s participation in the life cycle of the project is an ongoing process (loading at .772).

2. People’s participation in its best form is making sure that during implementation of the project, the right decisions are being taken (loading at .698).

3. People’s participation in the projects is very important characteristic of the project that contributes to its success (loading at .483).

Using Stevens criteria (1996) recommending the use of loadings .40 (absolute) or higher for identifying variables that load on a particular factor considered practically significant, these loadings are considered significant.

Factor Three: The following items loaded on factor three:

1. People’s participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project (loading at .811).

2. People’s participation in its best form is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment (loading at .780).
Using Stevens criteria (1996) recommending the use of loadings .40 (absolute) or higher for identifying variables that load on a particular factor considered practically significant, these loadings are considered significant.

**Factor Four:** The following items loaded on factor four

1. People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries volunteer with labor to the project (Loading at .710).
2. People’s participation in its best form is collaborating between the beneficiaries and the staff (Loading at .654).
3. People’s participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation of the project (Loading at .517).

This component had 2 loadings that are .6 and above and 1 loading that are .517. These loadings are considered high; using Stevens’s criteria (1996) these loadings are considered practically significant.

**Factor Five:** The following items loaded on factor five:

1. People’s participation is a short-term activity in the project that ends at some point while the project still goes on (loading at .870).
2. People’s participation is voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program (Loading at .508).

This component has 2 loadings .4 and above. These loadings are considered high; using Stevens’s criteria these loadings are considered practically significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Ongoing process</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Practical and Voluntary Contribution</th>
<th>Short Term in the Project and Voluntary Contribution</th>
<th>CommunalitY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intendeD specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project.</td>
<td>.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intendeD specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation.</td>
<td>.773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no possibility that participation in a development project could lead to a comprehensive empowerment of the beneficiaries.</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project.</td>
<td>- .630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in the life cycle of the project is an ongoing process.</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is making sure that during implementation of the project, the right decisions are being taken.</td>
<td>.698</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in the projects is very important characteristic of the project that contributes to its success.</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project.</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment.</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries volunteer with labor to the project.</td>
<td>.710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation in its best form is collaborating between the beneficiaries and the staff.</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.20  Factor analysis for definitions of participation-factor loadings—principal component extraction—orthogonal rotation: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (n = 109)
Table 4.20: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Ongoing process</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Practical and Voluntary Contribution</th>
<th>Short Term in the Project and Voluntary Contribution</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation of the project.</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is a short-term activity in the project that ends at some point while the project still goes on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>.766</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s participation is voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program.</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td></td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalues | 2.611 | 2.203 | 1.411 | 1.341 | 1.069 | 8.635 |
| Percent of total variance | 18.651 | 15.733 | 10.078 | 9.575 | 7.635 | 61.672 |

Oblique Rotation:

Principal component extraction with an oblique rotation resulted in the same solutions as the orthogonal rotation. Both structures were the same except for some slight differences in the loadings. The resulting structures are therefore the same whether they were rotated orthogonally or obliquely. Interpretations of both rotations producing similar structures make it more reasonable to consider the produced factors as stable and reliable. The produced solutions
suggest a simple and meaningful structure. Moreover, the factors were not correlated, most of the
correlations among factors were .1 and under; therefore principal component extraction with
orthogonal rotation will be analyzed here for its function in appraising the stability and reliability
of the common structure. The ratio between variables and sample size (8:1) were acceptable,
moreover, Stevens’ criteria of salient loading equal to or greater than .4 (absolute) was used to
detect reliable loadings.

In conclusion to the above statistics, the question to be answered is whether there is an
underlying structure for these constructs. The data showed that there is a structure and that this
structure is partially stable; on the other hand, it also makes sense and is conceptually sound.

**Naming and interpreting the factors:** Using .40 as the salient loading, four observed
variables loaded on factor 1; three observed variables loaded on factor 2; two observed variables
loaded on factor 3; and three observed variables loaded on factor 4, and 2 observed variables
loaded on factor 5. With only two exceptions the loadings for each of the 14 observed variables
on its respective factor was .60 or higher. The exceptions were a .484 loading for the variable
"People’s participation in the projects is a very important characteristic of the project that
contributes to its success” on factor 1; .508 loading for the variable "People’s participation is the
voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program” on factor 5; and .517 loading
for the variable ”People’s participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide
practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation
of the project” in factor 4. In general these loadings are considered high. With one exception,
each observed variable loaded high on only one factor and loaded low (loadings range from .000
to .399) on the others. The exception was the variable “People’s participation is manifested in its
better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and
money/property during the implementation of the project”, which had a loading of .504 on factor
2 and a loading of .517 on factor 4. For each of the 5 factors all loadings are positive, which
considerably simplifies the interpretation of the factor-based scores (derived variables). High values for each observed variable (more agreement with the definition of participation) correspond to high values for the factor-based scores.

The rotated (orthogonal) component matrix indicated a simple structure (each observed variables loads high on one factor and load low on all the other factors). Except for one variable, the observed variables representing the different dimensions of the definition of the concept “beneficiaries’ participation” clustered in a meaningful way in the different factors. The exception was the item “People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project”, which loaded in factor 1 with other items that do not appear to fit with them. The other 3 items that loaded high in this factor all related to the empowerment aspect of participation, while this fourth item is related to financial contribution to the project, which would fit in factor 4 better.

The following names are proposed for the five factors:

**Factor 1: "Participation as empowerment":** The variables that loaded in factor 1 contained items that perceive an empowerment function for participation (ex: “It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project” had the highest loading in this factor, which was .847; the second highest in the loadings was for the item “It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation” with a loading of .773.) As mentioned earlier, this item loaded high on this factor, which does not fit with the other variables. There was also a minus loading for the item “People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project” with a loading of -.630.

**Factor 2: "Participation as ongoing process and as important to success":** The variables that loaded in “factor 2” were items that perceived participation as ongoing process and as essential to the projects’ success. The item "People’s participation in the life cycle of the project
is an ongoing process” had a loading of .761, and the item ”People’s participation in its best form is making sure that during implementation of the project, the right decisions are being taken” had a loadings of .704.

**Factor 3: “Participation taking place in needs assessment”**: The variables that loaded in factor 3 were items that perceived participation as something occurring mainly in the needs assessment phase of the project. The item ”People’s participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project” had a loading of .811, and the item ”People’s participation in its best form is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment” had a loading of .780.

**Factor 4: “Participation as being beneficiaries’ practical and voluntary contribution”**: The variables that loaded in factor 4 were items that perceived participation as restricted to the beneficiaries’ voluntary practical contribution to the project depending solely on the beneficiaries. The item ”People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries volunteer with labor to the project” had a loading of .710; the item ”People’s participation in its best form is collaborating between the beneficiaries and the staff” had loading of .654; and the item ”People’s participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation of the project” had loading of .517.

**Factor 5: “Participation as being short term in the project and voluntary”**: The variables that loaded in “factor 5” were items that perceived participation as a short-term activity and depends on voluntary action of the beneficiaries. The item “People’s participation is a short-term activity in the project that ends at some point while the project still goes on” had a loading of .870, and the item ”People’s participation is voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program” had loading of .508.

In conclusion, 5 constructs were identified as a result of factor analysis using principal components, orthogonal rotation. The interpretation of these different factors is based on the
variables related to each factor. There was a unique set of variables loading high on one factor and loading low on the other factors, which provided the basis for interpreting the factor. Thus, factor-based scores were calculated assuming that the underlying constructs of the 14 items measuring the level of agreement of the respondents on the different dimensions of participation were identified. High factor-based scores indicate that there is more agreement with the specific dimension of participation, while low values indicate low agreement with the dimension of participation (see Table 4.21). The respondents saw that the needs assessment is the most favorable dimension of participation, which had the highest mean of 4.28 and a median of 4.50 (SD = .68, n= 108). The second dimension with a considerably high agreement as well was the one perceiving participation as an ongoing process and as important to success of the project, which had a mean of 4.00 and a median of also 4.00 (SD = .61, n = 107). The least agreeable dimension of participation was viewing participation as leading to empowerment of the beneficiaries, which had a mean of 3.37 and a median of 3.51 (SD = .54, n= 107). In general, participation respondents favored the view that participation is mostly a function of the need assessment phase of the project and least as a function for empowerment of the beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>On going Process and Important to Success</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Practical Contribution and volunteer</th>
<th>Short Term and Voluntary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.21  Factor analysis for definitions of participation-Factor-based scores’ Descriptives
Research Question # 4

Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the attitudes toward beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? The question to be answered here is whether these attitudes can be grouped in a specific way. Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?

This question is concerned with whether there is an underlying structure to the 26 items in the instrument representing the attitudes toward people’s participation in social development projects? The section on the instrument contained the items 56-57, 59-69, 72, 78-79, 81-82, 86, 90-93, 104, and 111-112 (see Appendix F). 22 Reversed statements were used and 4 non-reversed to ensure reliability of the scoring. These 26 items reflect the general opinion of the respondents as a whole toward participation in social development projects, which represents the overall respondents’ attitude toward people’s participation in social development projects. Respondents, who responded to a Likert-type five-item scale, were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree with different statements representing the attitudes of the respondents toward beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects or “the value of people’s participation to the respondents”. The ranges of the answers were 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) not sure; 4) agree; and 5) strongly disagree. The resulting reliability of the 26 items used in this study to explore opinions toward participation as it is perceived by the social workers was acceptable (coefficient alpha = .8649); nevertheless, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the 26 items on attitudes was conducted to extract the items which have higher internal consistency, and which together best represents the construct.
Appropriateness of factor analysis for the data: The consideration of the following statistics could support or not support the feasibility of performing factor analysis.

- In visual examination of the correlation matrix the researcher found that the variables in the observed variable set are related to each other. Several of the correlations have \( r = .3 \) and more, some correlations reached \( .7 \) and above. Hence, the factor analysis model is appropriate because of the correlations of the variables to each other, which is evident in this case.

- Bartlett’s test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. \( H_0: \) the null hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix can be rejected (\( p < .000 \)) because the significance is less than alpha .05. All diagonal terms are 1.0 and all off-diagonal terms are zero. Factor analysis for this data appears tenable.

- Measures of sampling adequacy for the matrix: KMO = .828 is meritorious (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998); hence this KMO value validates the use of factor analysis. The majority of the MSA for variables ranged from .600-.832 with 13 of the 26 items measuring at .70 or higher. The majority of them were reasonably large which is needed for good factor analysis. Given these statistics, factor analysis would be appropriate. One exception is one variable, which had a MSA of .220.

- Using .40 as salient criteria, most of the initial communalities except one were above .4. (see Table 4.22). The majority of communalities were above .6, which suggests that variables will load high on factors.

All the above considerations support the feasibility of performing factor analysis. Hence, factor analysis is empirically feasible and conceptually sound. Therefore, to interpret the exploratory factor analysis for the purpose of identifying the underlying constructs (dimensions) of the 26-item scale on attitudes toward participation, factor analysis was extracted using principal component analysis with orthogonal rotation.
**Extraction:** Several guidelines can be used in this decision-making process:

- **Eigenvalues:** The Kaiser (latent root) criterion to extract components with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates a 7-factor model, where factor 1 had an eigenvalue = 6.139, factor 2 eigenvalue = 2.448, factor 3 eigenvalue = 2.156, factor 4 eigenvalue = 1.870, factor 5 eigenvalue = 1.680, factor 6 eigenvalue = 1.606 and factor 7 eigenvalue = 1.243 (see Table 4.22).

- Examination of the scree plot supports a 6-factor model. A sharp drop after factor one and leveling of the curve after factor 7 supporting the 7-factor model.

- Computing the total variance showed:
  1. The total variance in the observed variable set is 26, which is the number of the items or variables.
  2. The amount of total variance extracted is:
     
     \[ 6.139 + 2.448 + 2.156 + 1.870 + 1.680 + 1.606 + 1.243 = 17.142 \]

  3. The percentage of total variance extracted by the 7 factor model is 65.938% of the total variance, which closely meets the guidelines that the number of components to extract should account for approximately 70% of the total variance in the observed variable set.

The guidelines above support a seven-model structure. This 7 model structure is most conceptually sound and provides a simple and interpretable structure, which also meets the parsimonious goal (see Table 4.22).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Time requirement</th>
<th>Equal Partnership</th>
<th>Level of Agreement among Beneficiaries and community members</th>
<th>Cost &amp; changing direction of the project</th>
<th>Professionals are better because of experience</th>
<th>Leads to success &amp; time effective</th>
<th>Community should have power in the project</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in implementation of the project</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are more efficient in identifying the needs of the community than are members of the local community.</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in identifying their needs.</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members are more efficient in identifying the services needed then are members of the local community</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries are usually unclear about what they need</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in developing solutions to address the problems.</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that the community participate in equal partnership with the professionals in evaluating the actions taken</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.22  Factor analysis for attitudes toward participation-Factor loadings-Principal component extraction-orthogonal rotation: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization (n = 109).
### Table 4.22: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Time requirement</th>
<th>Equal Partnership</th>
<th>Level of Agreement among Beneficiaries and community members</th>
<th>Cost &amp; changing direction of the project</th>
<th>Professionals are better because of experience</th>
<th>Leads to success &amp; time effective</th>
<th>Community should have power in the project</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in setting the agenda for the program</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no ways to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in defining their problems</td>
<td>.678</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t see any good argument behind the importance of the involvement of the beneficiaries in all stages of the project</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is usually disagreement within the community on their priorities</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ opinions are usually biased.</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When community is asked about their needs, most likely we will end up with a wish list that is not possible to meet.</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When planning for the project it is unrealistic to change the direction of the project based on the feedback from the local community or the target group</td>
<td>.633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TABLE CONTINUED)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Time requirement</th>
<th>Equal Partnership</th>
<th>Level of Agreement among Beneficiaries and community members</th>
<th>Cost &amp; changing direction of the project</th>
<th>Professionals are better because of experience</th>
<th>Leads to success &amp; time effective</th>
<th>Community should have power in the project</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is not possible that the community members participate in equal partnership with the staff in setting the agenda for the project/program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can demand change in the directions of their own choosing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.888</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can implement change in the directions of their own choosing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not very effective in terms of cost to regularly ask beneficiaries for their opinions of the projects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When it comes to decision-making, professional staff members make better decisions because of their experience and/or training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.683</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have clear ideas as professional of what kind of projects to implement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in identifying their needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in implementation of the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TABLE CONTINUED)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Time requirement</th>
<th>Equal Partnership</th>
<th>Level of Agreement among Beneficiaries and community members</th>
<th>Cost &amp; changing direction of the project</th>
<th>Professionals are better because of experience</th>
<th>Leads to success &amp; time effective</th>
<th>Community should have power in the project</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ participation is Essential For success of project/program.</td>
<td>.395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community members or the target group should have the power to demand implementing change in the direction of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.777</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries’ opinions usually could not be taken seriously when evaluating the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t see any importance in exchanging ideas with community members before designing a project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Eigenvalues | 6.139 | 2.448 | 2.156 | 1.870 | 1.680 | 1.606 | 1.243 | 17.14 |
Stability and reliability of the model: In comparing the principal component orthogonal varimax rotation, with the maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation, the researcher found that the two solutions provided the same structures with a slight difference in the loading for some of the variables and difference in the number of the factors.

Rotation: orthogonal and oblique rotations’ solutions were similar, correlations among the factors were negligibly all under .2; therefore, the interpretation of the orthogonal solution becomes tenable.

The following factors were extracted from examining the rotated component matrix (see Table 4.22):

Factor One: The following items loaded on factor one:

1. A great deal of time is lost when a community is involved in implementation of the project (Loaded at -.802).
2. Staff members are more efficient in identifying the needs of the community than are members of the local community (Loaded at -.738).
3. A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in identifying their needs (Loaded at -.732).
4. Staff members are more efficient in identifying the services needed than are members of the local community (Loaded at -.679).
5. Beneficiaries are usually unclear about what they need (Loaded at -.671).

This component had 5 loadings that are .60 and above. According to Stevens (1996) any component with at least four loadings equal to or greater than .60 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

Factor Two: The following items loaded on factor two:

1. There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in developing solutions to address the problems (Loaded at .849).
2. There is no way to make sure that the community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in evaluating the actions taken (Loaded at .840).

3. There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in setting the agenda for the program (Loaded at .743).

4. There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in defining their problems (Loaded at .678).

5. I do not see any good argument behind the importance of the involvement of the beneficiaries in all stages of the project (Loaded at .505).

This component had 4 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least 4 loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

*Factor Three:* The following items loaded on factor three:

1. There is usually disagreement within the community on their priorities (Loaded at .762)

2. Beneficiaries’ opinions are usually biased (Loaded at .678).

3. When community is asked about their needs, most likely we will end up with a wish list that is not possible to meet (Loaded at .664)

4. When planning for the project it is unrealistic to change the direction of the project based on the feedback from the local community or the target group (Loaded at .633).

5. It is not possible that the community members participate in equal partnership with the staff in setting the agenda for the project/program (Loaded at .616).

This component had 5 loadings that are .6 and above. According to Stevens (1996), any component with at least four loadings equal to or greater than .6 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.
Factor Four: The following items loaded on factor four

1. It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can demand change in the direction of their own choosing (Loaded at .888).
2. It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can implement change in the direction of their own choosing (Loaded at .879).
3. It is not very effective in terms of cost to regularly ask beneficiaries for their opinions of the projects (Loaded at .460).

This component had 2 loadings that are .8 and above and one loading at .460. Using Stevens criteria of .40 (absolute) or higher for identifying variables that load on a particular factor, these loadings are considered practically significant.

Factor Five: The following items loaded on factor five

1. When it comes to decision-making, professional staff members make better decisions because of their experience and/or training (Loaded at .683)
2. We have clear ideas as professionals of what kind of projects to implement (Loaded at .645).

The loadings in this component were both above .4, which are considered high and according to Stevens’ criteria (1996) practically significant.

Factor Six: The following items loaded on factor six

1. Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in identifying their needs (Loaded at .886).
2. Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in implementation of the project (Loaded at .846)
3. Beneficiaries’ participation is essential for success of project/program. (Loaded at .395).
The loadings in this component -.886 and .846 - which are considered high, meet Stevens’ criteria; meanwhile one item had a loading of .395, which is close to .4. In this regard, Tabachnick & Fidell (1996) proposed a rule of thumb that “loadings of .32 (absolute value) or above be used to identify variables that load on what factor” (p. 677).

**Factor Seven:** The following items loaded on factor six

1. Community members or the target groups should have the power to demand implementing change in the direction of the project (Loaded at -.777).

2. Beneficiaries’ opinions usually could not be taken seriously when evaluating the project (Loaded at .576).

3. I do not see any importance in exchanging ideas with community members before designing a project (Loaded at .570).

The loadings in this component were above .4, which meet Stevens’ criteria (1996) for significant loadings.

**Naming and interpreting the factors:** Using .40 as the salient loading, five observed variables loaded on factor 1; five observed variables loaded on factor 1, 2 and 3 each; three observed variables loaded on factor 4; two observed variables loaded on factor 5; and three observed variables loaded on factor 6 and 7 each. With only one exception, the loadings for each of the 26 observed variables on its respective factor was .40 and above, more were .6 and above. The exception was the .395 loading for the item “Beneficiaries participation is essential for the success of the project or program” that loaded on factor 6. Also with three exceptions, each observed variable loaded high on only one factor and loaded low (loadings range from .000 to .399) on the other factors. The exception was ”Staff members are more efficient in identifying the needs of the community than are members of the local community”, which loaded higher (.738) in factor 1 but had a loading of .479 (slightly higher than the salient loading of .40) on factor 5; the variable ”Staff members are more efficient in identifying the services needed than
members of the local community” loaded higher (loading at .679) on factor 1 but had a loading of .485 on factor 5; and the variable ”Beneficiaries participation is essential for the success of the project or program” loaded at .330 on factor 1 and .395 on factor 6. For each of the 7 factors all loadings were positive, which considerably simplifies the interpretation of the factor-based scores (derived variables). High values for each observed variable (favorable attitude toward the concept) correspond to high values for the factor-based scores.

As a result, the rotated (orthogonal) component matrix indicated a simple structure (each observed variables loads high on one factor and load low on all the other factors). The factors were also meaningful, thus the following names are proposed for the seven factors:

**Factor 1: ”Participation time requirement”**: The most highly loaded items in this factor are items emphasizing loss of time as a result of participation and conclude that staff members are more efficient in needs identification than the beneficiaries (ex. the item: ”A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in implementation of the project” had loadings of .802, and the item ”Staff members are more efficient in identifying the needs of the community than are members of the local community” had a loading of .738).

**Factor 2: ”Equal partnership”**: The items of factor 2 are mostly related to how the respondents perceive the possibility of having equal partnership between staff and beneficiaries in identifying problems, developing solutions or/and evaluating the projects (ex: “There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in developing solutions to address the problems” had the highest loading, which was .849, while the second highest loadings was the item ”There is no way to make sure that the community participate in equal partnership with the professionals in evaluating the actions taken” with a loading of .840).

**Factor 3: “Level of agreement among beneficiaries and community members”**: The items for factor 3 contained items related to perception of the communities’ members as being in
disagreement and biased. The item “There is usually disagreement within the community on their priorities” had a loading of .762, and the item “Beneficiaries’ opinions are usually biased” had a loading of .687.

Factor 4: “Participation regarding cost and changing direction of the project”: The highest loadings of .888 was for the item “It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can demand change in the directions of their own choosing”. The item “It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can implement change in the directions of their own choosing” had a loading of .879.

Factor 5: “Professionals are better because of experience”: The items in factor 5 contained two items that are related to appraising the role of professionals in the project for their experience and training. The item “When it comes to decision-making, professional staff members make better decisions because of their experience and/or training” had a loading of .683, and the item “We have clear ideas as professionals of what kind of projects to implement” had a loading of .645.

Factor 6: “Participation leads to success and is time effective”: The items in factor 6 contained three items related to appraising the effectiveness of participation as being time efficient and effective. The item “Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in identifying their needs” had a loading of .886, and the item “Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in implementation of the project” had a loading of .846.

Factor 7: “Community should have power in the project”: The highly loaded item in factor 7 was “Community members or the target group should have the power to demand implementing change in the direction of the project” with a loading of .777.

In conclusion, 7 factors were identified as a result of factor analysis using the principal components, orthogonal rotation. The interpretation of these different factors are based on the
variables related to each factor, there was a unique set of variables loading high on one factor and loading low on others, which provided the basis for interpreting and naming the factors. As noted earlier, the factors, for all practical purposes, are not correlated.

The factor-based scores further guide the interpretation of the factors. Therefore, factor-based scores were calculated (see Table 4.23), assuming that the underlying constructs of the 26 items measuring the general opinions regarding participation in social development projects were identified.

These factor-based scales could be used in further analysis in future research projects. Nevertheless, the researcher was able to interpret what these factor-based scores mean. High factor-based scores indicate that one strongly agrees with the factor concepts, or has a favorable attitude toward the concept, while low values indicate one strongly disagrees with the factor concepts. Comparing the 7 factor scores showed that respondents most agreed on participation leading to the success of the project and is time effective with the highest mean of 4.03 and a median of 4.00 (SD = .62, n = 107. They least agree that professionals are better than beneficiaries’ in identifying their needs with a mean of 2.61 and a median of 2.50 (SD = .89, n = 109).

The statistics showed that respondents in general have positive attitudes toward participation where they perceive that there should be ways to assure that beneficiaries participate in equal partnership with professionals in identifying needs, finding solutions and evaluating the projects. They have more agreement on participation being time effective and leading to the success of the project, and on beneficiaries’ and community members having more power in the projects. On the other hand, they agree less with beneficiaries being biased in their opinions and professionals being better than beneficiaries in terms of their experience and training in identifying needs.
Participation time requirement
Equal Participation
Level of Agreement among Beneficiaries
Participation regarding cost and changing direction of the project
Professionals are better because of experience
Participation leads to success and is time effective
Community member to have power

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participation time requirement</th>
<th>Equal Participation</th>
<th>Level of Agreement among Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Participation regarding cost and changing direction of the project</th>
<th>Professionals are better because of experience</th>
<th>Participation leads to success and is time effective</th>
<th>Community member to have power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.23  Factor analysis for attitudes-factor-based scores’ descriptive.

Research Question # 5

Can factor analysis be used to reduce the observed variables that describe the practices of beneficiaries’ participation to a lesser number of derived variables (factors, or components) that are interpretable? Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? Is the produced factor structure simple, substantively meaningful and conceptually sound?

The question here attempts to answer whether the general practices of beneficiaries’ participation in social development projects cluster in different dimensions in such a way as to encompass some shared themes that are meaningful and interpretable? The purpose is to examine the different participatory practices of participation in social development and social work projects as the social workers and development workers who work in the local Palestinian NGOs practice them.
Therefore, this question is concerned with the idea if there are underlying structures or constructs to the 26 items that represent different activities of participation. Does the clustering of these items (variables) reveal an underlying structure? The section on the instrument that contained the items 58, 70-71, 73-77, 80, 83-85, 87-89, 94-101, and 105-107 (see Appendix F) had all items that reflect actual practices and activities of participation in the project. Respondents, who responded to the Likert-type five-item scale, were asked to indicate the extent to which they agree that these practices take place at their projects/programs. The ranges of the answers were 1) strongly disagree; 2) disagree; 3) not sure; 4) agree; and 5) strongly disagree. In these 26 items, 13 reversed statements were used and 13 non-reversed, to insure the reliability of the scoring. The resulting reliability of the 26 items used in this study to explore the actual practices and activities of participation as it is perceived by the social workers was considered acceptable (coefficient alpha = .7903); nevertheless, a principal components factor analysis (Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization) of the 26 items on practices was conducted to extract the items that have higher internal consistency and together best represents the different constructs.

**Appropriateness of factor analysis for the data:** The consideration of these statistics could support or not support the feasibility of performing a factor analysis.

- There are correlations between variables in the observed variable set, which indicates that the variables are related to each other. Several of the correlations have \( r = .3 \) and more. So the factor analysis model is appropriate because of the correlations of the variables to each other, as is the case here.

- Bartlett’s test of sphericity tests the hypothesis that the correlation matrix is an identity matrix. H0: the null hypothesis that the population correlation matrix is an identity matrix can be rejected (\( p < .000 \)) because the significance is less than alpha .05. All diagonal terms are 1.0 and all off-diagonal terms are zero. Factor analysis for this data appears tenable.
• Measures of sampling adequacy for the matrix: KMO = .732 is middling (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998), so this KMO value validates the use of factor analysis. The MSA for the individual variables except three were above .6, seventeen of the variables were above .7 and three were between .440-.556. All of them are reasonably high, which is needed for good factor analysis (see Table 4.24).

• The initial estimates of communality for each variable: It is recommended that these be around .40 or higher since high communalities are desirable for factor analysis. All of the communalities were .40 and above, twelve of them were .70 and above (see Table 4.24). These high initial communality estimates suggest that variables will load high on factors.

All the above considerations support the feasibility of performing factor analysis, where factor analysis in this case is empirically feasible and conceptually sound. Thus, in order to identify the underlying constructs (dimensions) of the 26-item scale representing practices and activities of participation at the different stages of the project, factor analysis was performed using principal component extraction with orthogonal rotation.

*Extraction:* The guidelines to determine the number of factors extracted resulted in the following:

• Eigenvalues: The Kaiser (latent root) criterion to extract components with eigenvalues equal to or greater than 1.0 indicates a 7-factor model, where factor 1 had an eigenvalue = 5.630 factor 2 eigenvalue = 3,826, factor 3 eigenvalue = 2.165, factor 4 eigenvalue = 1,803, factor 5 eigenvalue = 1,383, factor 6 eigenvalue = 1,175, and factor 7 eigenvalue = 1,192 (see Table 4.24).

• Examination of the scree plot supports a 7-factor model. A sharp drop after factor one and leveling of the curve after factor 7 supporting the 7-factor model.
• Computing the total variance explained showed:

1. The total variance in the observed variable set is 26, which is the number of the items or variables.

2. The amount of total variance extracted is:

\[ 1.630 + 3.826 + 2.165 + 1.803 + 1.383 + 1.275 + 1.192 = 17.274 \]

3. The percentage of total variance extracted by the 6 factor model is 66.436% of the total variance, which closely meets the guidelines that the number of components to extract should account for approximately 70% of the total variance in the observed variable set.

The guidelines above support a seven-factor model structure. This 7-model structure is most conceptually sound and provides a simple and interpretable structure which also meets the parsimous goal (see Table 4.24).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Factor Analysis</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries inform practices of the project/program.</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries inform decisions of the project/program.</td>
<td>.817</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries inform policies of the project/program.</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of beneficiaries in the decision-making in our project/program is minimal.</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries are consulted in the planning phase of the project/program.</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly hold focus group discussions to listen to the needs of community members/target groups.</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td>.751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hold public hearings and community meetings</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions in the project are a result of negotiation between community members and professionals in the organization</td>
<td>.754</td>
<td>.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we held public meetings, we listen to beneficiaries’ opinions, but usually our staffs are the ones who lead the meeting.</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.24  Factor Analysis for practices of participation-Factor loadings-Principal component extraction-orthogonal rotation: Varimax with Kaiser normalization (n = 109)

(TABLE CONTINUED)
Table 4.24: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Beneficiaries are consulted and informed policies</th>
<th>Focus groups and community meetings</th>
<th>Decision making not consultation</th>
<th>Encouraging involvement after defining the agenda</th>
<th>Administration and donors put no emphasis</th>
<th>Increase participation of the marginalized</th>
<th>Sensitive to target group and seek their opinions</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We invite clients’ opinion so as to consult with them, but staff usually makes the decisions regarding how to run the project.</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We consider the situation of the marginalized groups in our practice.</td>
<td>- .604</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor.</td>
<td>- .533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our funding source/s determine our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take some responsibility in the project.</td>
<td>- .851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take part in the activities.</td>
<td>.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We provide members of the community with information about the project at a late stage of planning for the projects</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The donor organizations don’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(TABLE CONTINUED)
Table 4.24: CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Beneficiaries are consulted and informed policies</th>
<th>Focus groups and community meetings</th>
<th>Decision making not consultation</th>
<th>Encouraging involvement after defining the agenda</th>
<th>Administration and donors put no emphasis</th>
<th>Increase participation of the marginalized</th>
<th>Sensitive to target group and seek their opinions</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administration in our organization doesn’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services.</td>
<td>.715</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not trained enough to conduct participatory activities.</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We make it as a usual procedure to consult with our beneficiaries about what they think of the project.</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We try to increase participation of the marginalized groups (such as women) in the project.</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly change our practices based on beneficiaries’ feedback.</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hold regular meetings with the community to discuss the implementation of the projects with them.</td>
<td>.635</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social stratification, age, and ethnicity, to make sure that the marginalized are included.</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We conduct beneficiaries’ attitude surveys to get opinions about the services we provide.</td>
<td>.625</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the planning stage of the project we seek the community’s feedback and their opinions of the kind of services they need.</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eigenvalues: 5.630 3.826 2.165 1.803 1.383 1.175 1.192 17.274
Stability and reliability of the model: In comparing the principal component factor analysis with an orthogonal varimax rotation, with the maximum likelihood factor analysis with a varimax rotation, it was concluded that the two factor analysis solutions had the loadings group in the same manner, which means that the two solutions provided the same structures, with a slight difference in the loading for some of the variables and difference in the number of the factors; only 2 variables loaded in different factors in the maximum likelihood (see Table 4.24 and Appendix O for comparisons).

Rotation: The factors with the exception of a pair were not correlated, all the correlations were .299 and under, which is considered small, except for the factor 1 and 5 in that they were correlated at \( r = .446 \). On the basis that the correlations among the factors are negligible, the interpretation of the orthogonal solution becomes tenable.

Principal component with Orthogonal Rotation:

Examining the rotated component matrix, the following factors were extracted (see Table 4.24):

Factor One: The following items loaded on factor one:

1. It is rare that the beneficiaries inform practices of the project/programs (Loaded at .831).
2. It is rare that the beneficiaries inform decisions of the project/programs (Loaded at .817)
3. It is rare that the beneficiaries inform polices of the project/programs (Loaded at .805)
4. Participation of beneficiaries in the decision-making in our project/programs is minimal (Loaded at .772)
5. It is rare that the beneficiaries are consulted in the planning phase of the project/programs. Loaded at .661)
This component had 3 loadings that are .80 and above. According to Stevens (1996) any component with at least three loadings equal to or greater than .80 (absolute) is considered reliable regardless of sample size.

**Factor Two:** The following items loaded on factor two:

1. We regularly hold focus group discussions to listen to the needs of community members/target groups (Loaded at .850).
2. We hold public hearings and community meetings (Loaded at .800).
3. The decisions in the project are a result of negotiation between community members and professionals in the organization (Loaded at .754).

This component had 4 loadings that are .754 and above. These loading are considered high.

**Factor Three:** The following items loaded on factor three:

1. If we held public meetings we listen to beneficiaries’ opinions, but usually our staff are the ones who lead the meeting (Loaded at .781).
2. We invite clients’ opinion so as to consult with them, but the staff usually makes the decisions regarding how to run the project (Loaded at .674).
3. We consider the situation of the marginalized groups in our practice (Loaded at -.604).
4. We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor (Loaded at -.533).
5. Our funding source/s determines our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say (Loaded at .444).

This component had 3 loadings that are .6 and above. But all loadings are above .4 the salient criteria.
Factor Four: The following items loaded on factor four

1. After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take some responsibility in the project (Loaded at -.851)

2. After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take part in the activities (Loaded at .765)

3. We provide members of the community with information about the project at a late stage of planning for the projects (Loaded at .632).

All the loadings were .6 and above which are considered practically significant.

Factor Five: The following items loaded on factor five

1. The donors’ organizations do not put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services (Loaded at .785)

2. The administration in our organization does not put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services (Loaded at .715)

3. We are not trained enough to conduct participatory activities (Loaded at .618).

4. We make it a usual procedure to consult with our beneficiaries about what they think of the project (Loaded at .401).

The loadings in this component ranged between .401 and .785, which are considered high, using Stevens criteria (1996) that recommends using loadings which are .40 (absolute) or higher for identifying variables that load on a particular factor which is considered practically significant.

Factor Six: The following items loaded on factor six

1. We try to increase participation of the marginalized groups (such as women) in the project (Loaded at .776).

2. We regularly change our practices based on beneficiaries’ feedback (Loaded at .661).
3. We hold regular meetings with the community to discuss the implementation of the projects with them (Loaded at .635).

The three loadings in this component were above .635, which are considered high according to Stevens’ criteria.

Factor Seven: The following items loaded on factor six

1. We differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social stratification, age, and ethnicity, to make sure that the marginalized are included (Loaded at .781).
2. We conduct beneficiaries’ attitude surveys to get opinions about the services we provide (Loaded at .625).
3. In the planning stage of the project we seek the community’s feedback and their opinions of the kind of services they need (Loaded at .575).

The three loadings in this component are above .575, which are considered high according to Stevens’ criteria.

In choosing which rotation is preferable, orthogonal or oblique, the inter-correlation between the obliquely rotated components was examined. For all practical purposes the seven rotated components are not correlated. An examination of the size correlation coefficients in the Component Correlation Matrix indicates that six of the seven coefficients range from .00 to .189. There is low correlation ($r = .353$) between only one pair of components (Factor 1 and 6). The absence of substantial correlations between pairs of components supports the decision to interpret the orthogonal rotation. Moreover, both component structures reveal the same component structure. Thus the orthogonal rotation will be the one to be interpreted.

Naming and interpreting the factors: Using .40 as the salient loading, five observed variables loaded on factor 1; three observed variables loaded on factor 2; five observed variables loaded on factor 3; three observed variables loaded on factor 4; four observed variables loaded on
factor 5; three observed variables loaded on factor 6; and three observed variables loaded on factor 7. With three exceptions all the loadings for each of the 26 observed variables on its respective factor were .60 or higher. The exceptions were the -.533 loading for the item ”We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor” on factor 3; the .444 loading for the item ”Our funding source/s determine our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say” on factor 3; and the .575 loading for the item ”In the planning stage of the project we seek the community’s feedback and their opinions of the kind of services they need” on factor 7. These loadings are considered high. Also with few exceptions, each observed variable loaded high on only one factor and loaded low (loadings range from .000 to .350) on the others. It is worth to note that the exceptions were the item ”Our funding source/s determine our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say” which had a loading of .444 on factor 3 and .401 (slightly higher than the salient loading of .40) on factor 1; also the item ”We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor” that had a loading of -.533 on factor 3 and .436 on factor 2. For each of the 7 factors (except for three variables) all loadings are positive, which considerably simplifies the interpretation of the factor-based scores (derived variables). High values for each observed variable (more agreement that participation activity takes place in the project) correspond to high values for the factor-based scores. Meanwhile, the negative loadings indicate that high values for each observed variable (more agreement that participation activity takes place in the project) factor corresponds with low values for the factor-based scores.
The rotated (orthogonal) component matrix indicated a simple structure (each observed variable loads high on one factor and low on all the other factors). The information on the types of activities carried by each factor is also meaningful. The following names are proposed for the seven factors:

Factor 1: “Beneficiaries are consulted and inform policies”: The most highly loaded items in this factor are related to activities of consultation with beneficiaries and the level they inform decisions, practices and policies of the organization (ex. the item “It is rare that the beneficiaries inform practices of the project/program” had loading of .831, and the item “It is rare that the beneficiaries inform decisions of the project/program” had a loading of .817).

Factor 2: “Focus groups and community meetings”: The items of factor 2 are mostly related to the extent to which the organization conducts focus groups or community meetings to listen to the community (ex: the item ”We regularly hold focus group discussions to listen to the needs of community members/target groups” had the highest loading, which was .850, while the second highest loading in this factor was the item ”We hold public hearings and community meetings” with a loading of .800).

Factor 3: “Decision-making not consultation”: Factor 4 contained items that talk about the decision-making process where staff and the funding organizations have more say in the project than the beneficiaries. The item ”If we held public meetings, we listen to beneficiaries’ opinions, but usually our staff are the ones who lead the meeting” had a loading of .78; and the item ”We invite clients’ opinions so as to consult with them, but staff usually makes the decisions regarding how to run the project” had a loading of .674. Two items with smaller loadings than the previous one seem not to fit in this factor, and since they have smaller loadings, they were not considered in naming of the factor. These were the items “We consider the situation of the marginalized
groups in our practice” and “We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor” that had .533 and .444 loadings respectively.

Factor 4: “Encouraging involvement after defining the agenda”. The highest loading of -.851 was for the item “After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take some responsibility in the project” while the relevant item had a loading of .765, which was “After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take part in the activities”.

Factor 5: “Administration and donors put no emphasis”: Factor 5 contained items that are related to how administration and donors perceive participation. The highest loading of .785 was for the item “The donor organizations do not put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services”, and the second highest with a loading of .715 was for the item “The administration in our organization does not put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services”.

Factor 6: “Increase participation of the marginalized”: Factor 6 contains items on the activities taking place in the project related to increasing the participation of the marginalized groups in the community and changing practices depending on community’s feedback. The highest loading on this factor was for the item “We try to increase participation of the marginalized groups (such as women) in the project” with a loading of .815, the second highest loading was for the item “We regularly change our practices based on beneficiaries’ feedback” with a loading of .661.

Factor 7: “Sensitive to target group and seek their opinions”: The items in factor 7 are related to activities that take place in the needs assessment phase of the project, whether they are sensitive to the marginalized and listen to the opinions of the beneficiaries. The highest loading on this factor was for the item “We differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social
stratification, age, and ethnicity, to make sure that the marginalized are included” with a loading of .781; the second highest loading was for the item “We conduct beneficiaries’ attitude surveys to get opinions about the services we provide” with a loading of .625.

In conclusion, 7 factors were identified as a result of factor analysis using principal components, orthogonal rotation. The interpretation of these different factors are based on the variables related to each factor; there was a unique set of variables loading high on one factor and loading low on the other factors, which provided the basis for interpreting and naming the factors. As noted earlier, the factors are, with one exception for all practical purposes not correlated. The exception is the relationship between factor 1 “beneficiaries informing policies and consultation” and factor 6 “increase participation of the marginalized” ($r = .353$). Since the loadings for factor 1 and factor 6 were both positive, the positive correlation coefficient indicates that high values for factor 1 scores (high agreement with the practice) correspond to high values for factor 6 scores. Likewise, low values for factor 1 scores (low agreement with the practice) correspond to low values for factor 6 scores.

In interpretation of factor scores attention must be paid to the way the observed variables are measured (scaled) and the signs of the factor loadings for the observed variables that load on each factor. The observed variables (level of agreement that the specific practice take place at the project level) were measured on a five-point scale, where 1= strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree. Regarding the orthogonal rotation, all factor loadings for the observed variables except three were positive; consequently, high values for the factor "Beneficiaries informing policies and consultation” indicate that social workers perceive that these kind of activities have high occurrence in the project, whereas low values indicate "low agreement that these activities take place in their project”. The factor scores for factor 1 "Beneficiaries informing policies and consultation” range from −2.48-2.06 (see Table 4.25), which means that the degree to which respondents had high agreement or low agreement ranges from 2.48 standard deviations below
the mean to 2.06 standards deviations above the mean. The higher the factor score the more respondents agreed that beneficiaries inform decisions in the project and they are consulted. The lower the factor score the less respondents agree that the beneficiaries are consulted or inform decisions in the projects. Similar interpretations can be made for the other six factor scores, considering the loadings signs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>108</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>107</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>-2.82</td>
<td>-1.90</td>
<td>-3.79</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>-4.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.25  Factor analysis for practices of participation: Factor scores decriptives for extracted components.

The factor-based scores further guide the interpretation of the factors. Therefore, factor-based scores were calculated (see Table 4.26), assuming that the underlying constructs of the 26 items measuring practices in the projects were identified. The correlations among the factors were always not equal zero, which was the case when the factor scores were correlated. The
reason is that factor scores for each factor are based on all items in the instrument. Factor-based scores for each factor are based only on the items in the original instrument that load on each factor.

High factor-based scores indicate strong agreement that the practice takes place in the project, while low values indicate strong disagreement with the occurrence of the practice in the project. Comparing the 7 factor scores, respondents mostly agree that activities related to increasing the participation of the marginalized groups take place in the project, with a mean of 3.94 and a median of 4.00 (SD = .63, n = 109). On the other hand, the practice perceived to take place less at the project is allowing beneficiaries to participate in the decision-making of the project, where consultation with the beneficiaries is perceived to take place more, with a mean of 3.09 and a median of 3.00 (SD = .46, n = 105). Examining the factor-based scores’ means, medians and standard deviations, we conclude that there were not any differences between the factors in these statistics (see Table 4.26). The means for the 7 factors ranged from 3.09 to 3.94, and the median from 3.20 to 4.00. Standard deviations were considerably low for most ranging from .44 to .86. Therefore, these statistics should be interpreted with caution, as we cannot conclude that there were any real and major differences in practices except for factor 6 regarding activities to increase participation of the marginalized, where the mean was the highest possible among the others (x = 3.94).
Beneficiaries are consulted and inform policies
Focus groups and community meetings
Decision making not Consultation

Encouraging involvement after defining the agenda
Administration and donors put no emphasis
Increase participation of the marginalized
Sensitive to target group and seek their opinions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>108</th>
<th>105</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>107</th>
<th>109</th>
<th>107</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.26  Factor analysis for practices- Factor-based scores descriptives.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

The explosive emergence of NGOs since the 1980s as major collective actors in development activities, as well as their perception as the preferred vehicle in designing and implementing social development projects in the areas of participatory development, have produced much debate both in academic circles as well as among the international development organizations (Pyle, 1996). As a result, NGOs have become a very popular topic of research (Nelson, 1995; & Rooy, 2000). However, research issues in the area of participatory development still present special challenges. One such challenge is related to the problem of the different meanings associated with participation mechanisms, and the different ways people’s participation is conceptualized and understood in various contexts.

Despite the fact that the participatory nature has been one of the dynamic characteristics of the alternative development paradigm represented by these NGOs (Cernea, 1989; Clark; 1991; Korten, 1990; Nelson, 1995; & Tandon, 2000), the specific policies and visions influencing the work of NGOs regarding participation are still far from being clear. NGOs still face many challenges regarding the design and implementation of participatory projects. Moreover, participation objectives are not always clear, which poses a problem in assessing the effectiveness of participation (Rosner, 1978). These challenges are of special concern to research, since the
assessment of outcomes of development projects which implement participatory strategies that produce results which are rarely concrete and often take a long time to become evident, are not easy to achieve (Pyle, 1996). With these challenges in mind, the intent of this research has been to investigate the different dimensions of the concept of people’s participation as perceived and conceptualized by Northern donor NGOs and their local Palestinian NGOs, as well as to examine how the concept is practiced in social development projects in Palestine.

This fifth and final chapter discusses and interprets the study findings in relationship to the debate regarding participatory development approaches. In an attempt to justify the aim of this research, this chapter is divided into four sections. The first section focuses on the issues and themes addressed in the different conceptualizations of people’s participation in social development projects of the respondents from donor organizations vs. those from local Palestinian NGOs. Also addressing a discussion of the attitudes and practices of the respondents from local organizations, this section will incorporate the relevant descriptive findings and the different scales’ results - measuring the definitions, practices, activities, and attitudes and will connect the study’s two phases. The second section discusses the factor analysis results on the definitions, practices, activities, and attitudes toward participation, and highlights the extent to which these results support the discussion in the first section. The third section discusses the study’s limitation, its contribution, and recommended directions for future research on this topic. The fourth section discusses the implications for donor and local organizations and for social work practice and education. This chapter ends with concluding remarks.
5.1 Northern Donor NGOs vs. Local Palestinian NGOs: Definitions and Conceptualization of People’s Participation: A Discussion Focused Around Participation Themes Incorporating the Results from the Two Phases of the Study

This section discusses the conceptualizations and definitions of the respondents from donor NGOs in comparison to the conceptualizations and definitions of the respondents from local NGOs. Participation themes from phase one of the study, which investigated the conceptualizations and definitions of the concept of ‘people’s participation’ as perceived, defined, and conceptualized by representatives from Northern donor NGOs, and from phase two, which examined how the concept is perceived, defined and practiced in actual social development projects of local Palestinian NGOs, are combined or related in an attempt to understand how both groups deal with the concept. The aim is to critically reflect on how and where both groups of respondents coincide, how they understand each other or depend on each other to make decisions, and how they therefore influence the actual practices of participation.

5.1.1 A Typology of Definitions

Different views exist regarding the definition of participation, although the majority of most of the responses from donor organizations revealed what participation actually entails. The different conceptualizations formulated by respondents from Northern NGOs could be clustered in five major themes:

- Participation is an ongoing process that entails the full involvement of the beneficiaries in all phases of a social development project needs assessment, decision-making, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation, and follow up.

- Participation is a consultation process which entails consultation with the organization’s beneficiaries during the needs’ identification, implementation phase and follow-up, with the aim of incorporating their feedback and assuring that the organization’s constituency informs the projects’ practices and policies.
• Participation is a collaborative process that entails exchanging ideas with the community during the project identification and design phase (mainly during the needs assessment phase) to make sure the needs of the community are taken into consideration.

• Participation is the voluntary involvement of target groups in the implementation phase of the project, and is manifested in their practical contribution of labor, time, effort and/or money/property to the project.

• Participation should entail a comprehensive empowerment process (political, economical, social, and cultural) of the people/beneficiaries, which should not be restricted to their active role and full involvement in all stages of the development project, but should also entail increasing their ability to participate through removing barriers related to the broader social power relations and dynamics that might hinder participation. Thus, it is critical to differentiate the target groups by criteria of gender, social stratification, age and ethnicity to make sure the marginalized sectors are represented. Thus, projects should adopt practices and policies directed toward and aimed at:

1. Increasing people’s awareness and their abilities to challenge their disadvantages and structures with which they live.

2. Ensuring the protection of the needs and interests of the vulnerable, the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor.

Respondents from Northern donor organizations agreed that participation entails a form of involvement in the development process; yet, they agreed less on how beneficiaries should be involved, in what phase they should be involved, and the aim behind their involvement. Some respondents emphasized that participation should take place in all stages of the development project, while others restricted this involvement to a specific phase. These themes will be discussed in detail and will be compared with the responses derived from local organizations.
5.1.2 Participation: A Process vs. Short-Term Activity

Respondents from Northern donor organizations who considered participation to entail the full involvement in all phases of the project - needs assessment, decision-making, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, and follow up perceived this as a continuous process. While continuity was considered a main feature, respondents from Northern donor organizations were less clear about the nature of this continuity, and how this would be manifested. If the nature of this continuity were clarified, the ambiguity regarding its manifestations would be greatly resolved.

When continuity is used as an adjective to describe the process of beneficiaries’ involvement in the project in terms of being ongoing, long-term, sustained and stable, it would be manifested differently when used to describe the kind of communication taking place between staff and beneficiaries of the organization during the various stages. If continuity means long-term and sustained involvement, it becomes essential to address in which ways the internal structure and characteristics of a specific organization may facilitate or hinder such involvement. This would help to establish the basis for truly realizing participation at the project level as a means of empowerment. In this regard, when involvement of the beneficiaries is conceptualized as a continuous process in the project cycle as lasting and permanent, it is proposed that this should not be left to coincidence or to the personal judgment of the organizations’ staff. In order for this continuous involvement to be genuine and conducive to the whole process of beneficiaries’ or/and communities’ empowerment, it is necessary for the organization to create structures to facilitate such involvement in a meaningful way to the beneficiaries. Without such structures, involvement may well be perceived as a burden on the organization and as obstructing the implementation of projects. Since power is enhanced when people have the opportunity to work toward desired goals (Sullivian, 1994), participation as means of empowerment may be operationalized at the project level when the organization’s structure allows the beneficiaries and
community members to directly influence the decisions on how a project is run; or when the organization’s structure also allows beneficiaries the power to change the direction of the project when they consider it to better serve their needs.

On the other hand, if the proper structures to enable such continuity of involvement do not exist within the organization the process of involvement may be sought purely as a means of confirming the objectives of established projects, and of achieving predetermined goals in the implementation of projects designed by outsiders, where people’s needs are filtered to fit the professionally designated projects. Hence, when the structure of the organization is bureaucratic and rigid, incorporating the voices of the beneficiaries in the different stages of the project is not necessarily a desired goal, and participation becomes a means in itself to serve the pre-designed goals of the project and not as a goal to achieve empowerment of the beneficiaries. This kind of participation has been described by Stiefel & Wolfe (1994) as serving the goal of system maintenance. In this case, continuity of involvement does not only mean a good thing in itself as long as the ramification of this continuity is not clearly formulated in the organizations’ policies and structures. In this sense, the rhetoric of participation used by donor organizations would be faced with a dilemma, which is not related to the conceptualizations themselves but to the implications that these conceptualizations would have for the actual projects and how they are promoted.

In contrast, the respondents’ definitions from the local Palestinian organizations were less abstract and more practical regarding participation. For example, respondents from local organizations addressed the function that beneficiaries’ involvement has for the project. In this respect, participation plays a role in facilitating the staff’s work and their smooth entrance into the community. Hence, beneficiaries become advocates for the project and mainly disseminate information about the project to the community, which helps to achieve the predetermined goal of project objectives. This is a clear indication of a system-maintenance function of participation,
which according to Smith (1998) may be termed passive participation: passive in that it does not
tackle the issue of power people usually lack when not involved in the different decision-making
processes. In addition, respondents from local organizations saw the best forms of participation
as being two-fold: 1) when beneficiaries participate in identifying their needs, and 2) when they
contribute to the project with their own resources. Respondents from local organizations placed
emphasis on how participation could be operationalized in a specific phase of the project in a way
meaningful to them. Hence, participation is not perceived as continuous, but as a short-term
activity, to serve the pre-designed goals of a project. Because respondents from local
organizations have a different understanding of participation, they would therefore be excused
from having to define the nature of this participation as continuity which respondents from donor
organizations seemed to need to emphasize.

The different orientation toward participation on the part of both responding groups
highlights their different points of departure. Both orientations appear to have shortcomings.
While the emphasis on the continuity aspect of the process on the part of most respondents from
donor organizations lacked a clear operationalization of the concept at the project level, the
emphasis on participation as being a short-term activity on the part of respondents from local
organizations clearly raises the issue of passive participation. These differences clearly outline
the dichotomy between “idealistic vs. realistic” definitions. Nevertheless, a few respondents from
donor organizations attempted to operationalize this continuous aspect of participation in the
project by addressing the way they monitor how democratic values are embedded in the local
organizations’ own internal practices and strategies, yet without clearly defining what
‘democratic’ means and how manifests in the project.

The perception of participation as short term and confined to a specific stage of the project
held by the respondents from local organizations was also reflected in their reports in that
beneficiaries’ involvement in the different stages is very minimal, and when it does occur, then
only during the needs assessment stage. These findings were supported by the results of the scale measuring the frequency of actual practices at different phases of the project, where respondents were asked to indicate to what extent beneficiaries have actually participated in activities of the different stages, which revealed an overall low occurrence of participation activities.

Regarding participation at the different stages of the project, respondents from local organizations indicated that participation takes place some of the time in most stages and, if it takes place more, then mostly during the needs assessment phase. Moreover, respondents from local organizations also reported that project participation occurs more often in the evaluation phase than in the project design and implementation phases, which suggests that respondents from the local organizations perceived participation of the target groups and community members to be most important in identifying their needs in the initial phase. Similarly, participation of the beneficiaries in implementing project activities was also seen as important, especially when beneficiaries contribute resources to the projects. Respondents from local organizations also agreed mostly with statements linking participation to needs assessment. They scored high, for example, on statements defining the best forms of participation, as an exchange of ideas between staff and community members during needs assessment, to make sure needs of the community are considered. The findings suggested by the scale results of the responses from local organizations support the emphasis on participation in the needs assessment phase.

The involvement of beneficiaries and/or community members in the identification of their needs, as reported by the respondents from local organizations, is accomplished through ‘focus group sessions’ where community members are invited to brainstorm with staff about their needs and changes they think should be implemented in their community. This method is reported to be widely used among local Palestinian organizations. The findings suggest that, in actual practice, beneficiaries are not really involved continuously during different stages of the project. However, respondents from local organizations appear limited by very structured projects where,
usually, there is pressure either from their administration or indirectly from their donors to meet the objectives of the projects usually spelled out in the policy statements of local organizations and reported to the donor organizations. In addition, continuous involvement is also limited by efforts of local NGOs to seek projects that fit the donors’ requirement and not those most needed by the community. Therefore, the projects are primarily designed and their objectives set by professionals, yet based on the rationale to submit for funding for a specific project on its urgency to the specific target group. The claim that a proposed project is needed by the community or the target group therefore may be based on an assessment of needs which may have involved not more than just holding meetings with community members to confirm already set objectives. This raises the issue of dependency of the local Palestinian organizations. Local NGOs are completely dependent on donor money to operate their projects. Many NGOs in Palestine were criticized for being established as a result of some recognized fads among donor organizations, and their motives and agenda not determined locally. For example, projects targeting women and gender issues, or projects providing credits or loans to the poor were considered among those that attracted the work of NGOs in Palestine. Conversely, these projects reported to fail to enhance the situation either of women or the poor (Samara, 2003).

The dependency of local NGOs on foreign funding raises some contradictions for the rhetoric of participation. The current sector of local Palestinian NGOs working in social development face a problem of dependency; they are tied by different policies and structures imposed on them by different funding organizations (and those may be governmental as well as non-governmental). Because of this relationship, the choices these local NGOs have regarding their projects and how to run them are always tied to their funding organizations’ requirements, which are believed to impose restrictions on genuine participation. This issue becomes problematic when Northern NGOs maintain the same procedures and policies as official organizations in terms of being a funding organization and ignoring their role as partners in
development initiatives to promote different kinds of practices in development projects. In the Palestinian context this problem becomes obvious, as NGOs also seek official aid money and are not restricted to non-governmental funding. In this regard, Northern NGOs would face problems in implementing their rhetoric of participation if no agreement existed with their local NGO partners on clear ways to manifest participatory practices. Yet the dilemma that Northern NGOs would keep facing in Palestine is how they should deal with the continuous emergent needs of the Palestinian population and avoid a dependency relationship. The respondents from Northern NGOs addressed the issue of dependency when stating how poverty creates a dependency relationship for the beneficiaries, yet failed to address the implications of such a dependency relationship on the local NGOs themselves. In such a relationship, if participation occurs it would serve the system-maintenance and be far from transformative. In such a restricted view, what becomes idealistic is not the empowerment rhetoric which in this case is very irrelevant one but the expectation that poor people contribute to the project.

5.1.3 Consultation and/or Collaboration

Despite the differences in views between the two groups of respondents, there were points of agreement. One of the definitions addressed by the respondents from local organizations considered the involvement of the beneficiaries in the needs assessment phase as a crucial form of participation. The respondents from donor organizations who advocated greater involvement of beneficiaries during the problem identification and needs assessment phase argued that involvement of beneficiaries in this stage provides people with a realistic opportunity and a chance to define their own needs and claim some kind of ownership over the process of their own development. In this regard, consultation appeared to be the key word. Despite the emphasis placed on consultation as a practical manifestation of participation in the needs assessment phase, it was less clear what consultation exactly entails, and how it is achieved.
In many cases, consultation may be no more than part of the information-gathering process (Smith, 1998), which is mostly one-way. In other cases, consultation could be described as continuous, where continuity describes the nature of communication between the staff and beneficiaries of the organization during different stages of the project, which does not necessarily mean that the communication flows in both directions. In this case, consultation at specific stages of the project would not be much different than a consultation process taking place at every stage of the project if the goal is only to gather information from local communities. Some respondents from donor organizations recognized that in praxis consultation is not more than one-way, which they consider a limitation to consultation. Nevertheless, respondents from donor organizations tried to conceptualize consultation differently. For those respondents, consultation aims to make sure that beneficiaries’ needs are incorporated into the projects by including their feedback, and assuring that the organization’s constituency informs the projects’ practices and policies. There could be two ways of looking at this conceptualization for consultation, the first one addresses the way beneficiaries are consulted and, as a result, informs decisions regarding their needs; yet beneficiaries do not make the decisions, which is ultimately in the hands of the professionals. The limitation to this approach is that the flow of information is from the beneficiary to the staff, without the information flowing back to the beneficiaries or communities.

The second way is to perceive consultation as an exchange of information that is not one-way but takes the form of information going both ways. This information sharing may be, as Smith (1998) argues, a source of power if it helps to raise the consciousness of people regarding local conditions. On the other hand, it is not possible for this form of consultation to be considered capable of transforming people’s realities unless there are structures inside the organization to make this information or knowledge a valuable resource of influence in the hands
of the beneficiaries, as Kondrat (1994) described it. If the structures in the organizations are not conducive to beneficiaries’ influence, participation described as consultation would be considered a weak form of participation serving to maintain the system.

Consultation’s system-maintenance function is firm in looking at participation as a short-term activity which might happen during needs assessment and perhaps during other stages, which was a conceptualization formulated by the respondents from local organizations. This way of looking at participation seems not to be about information sharing with the community, but about collecting information from the community, or target groups, who in turn are passive.

Respondents from donor Northern organizations, for instance, defined other forms of involvement occurring when the staff exchanges ideas with the beneficiaries and the community members, a form of collaboration to make sure the needs of the community are being addressed and taken into consideration during project design. This specific aspect of the participation concept implies more continuity in participation activities, and it much resembles the second form of consultation discussed above. Yet, participation as collaboration implies that without cooperation of the community members or target groups, activities would not be sustained. However, this form of involvement (collaborative exchanging of ideas) is more accommodating to the beneficiaries and community members’ needs than the one encompassing a one-way consultation only. However, this conceptualization still considers that the ultimate decision still lies with those who plan the project in the first place, usually professionals of the implementing organizations.

Despite these differences in conceptualizing participation as consultation, there seems to be some agreement between both groups of respondents from Northern and local organizations on the need for consultation that incorporates the needs of the community in the project designs. How much power such consultation processes entail is not yet clear to both groups, and this should be addressed.
5.1.4 ‘Voluntary’ Resource Contribution and Illusion of People’s Power

Both groups of respondents, those from the donor Northern organizations and those from local Palestinian organizations emphasized in their conceptualizations “the contribution of beneficiaries and community members to the project” as a viable form of participation. This is considered a very common use of the term (Smith, 1998). In fact, respondents from local Palestinian organizations addressed this issue at large and considered it a very crucial aspect of participation. Moreover, both groups of respondents considered this form of participation as crucial to a project’s success. In this form of participation, the beneficiaries are expected to give cash or volunteer with their labor, or with other material resources.

The importance placed especially by the respondents from local Palestinian organizations on beneficiaries’ material and resource contributions seems to underline the emphasis placed by the local NGOs as well as donor organizations on the need of local communities to be self-reliant and meet their needs with their own resources. In the experience of the researcher working with NGOs in Palestine, this issue was raised many times. When activities of the project are reported to the donors, the organization always made sure to report the amount of contribution of local communities and beneficiaries in the different project’s activities. This practice was valued highly by the donors, and considered to be crucial to the project’s success. Moreover, it seems that resource contribution by the beneficiaries and the local communities is perceived to indicate the operationalization of participation and is used to evaluate participatory activities in the project.

Moreover, the amount of contribution of the local communities or the beneficiaries is considered as an indicator of how much the communities and beneficiaries are able to be self-reliant and fund their own development. These ideals of self-reliance and autonomy, praised by both donor and local NGOs, may raise problems in the Palestinian context where the majority of the population lives in poverty, and much of the population lives in refugee camps barely able to
sustain their daily needs. Added to this is the devastation of a whole Palestinian society by continuous violence, manifested through on-going confiscation of agricultural land and demolition of houses, and so on. Thus, it seems that both groups of respondents from donor and local Palestinian organizations seem to overemphasize the contribution of people as a crucial form of participation, overlooking the desperately needed external resources on the part of poor communities where, in most cases, communities’ local resources are insufficient to meet local needs. Moreover, this emphasis on resource contribution disregards the issues of power and disparity largely existing in the Palestinian society.

Many argue that the mobilization of community resources is a step towards empowerment, towards increasing independence and self-reliance where dependency on external funding fails (Burkey, 1993; & Smith, 1998).

If the idea of participation is to involve people in the projects financially or with personal resources, certainly poverty forbids it. The problem arises when participation is limited to these ideas and conceptualization becomes misleading. In fact, this form of participation would be problematic when beneficiaries or community members are expected to contribute financially or with labor in a project they do not have much say in. Also, if beneficiaries and community members are not able to decide on what direction and how their efforts will be directed, such participatory methods would aim only, as Nelson and Wright (1995) described it, towards transferring project costs from an agency to the intended beneficiaries. This would fit very well in the system-maintenance function of participation described by Stiefel & Wolfe (1994), where ‘voluntary’ contribution becomes deceptive when people are expected to contribute to the project regardless of people’s exhaustion, continuous worries about sustaining their basic needs, and dangers. As Clark (1991) questioned, how much voluntary contribution is ‘voluntary,’ when the poor are sometimes coerced to contribute to the project in the spirit of participation. In this sense, when voluntary contribution is expected, it is not genuinely ‘voluntary’ and it does not come from
the people themselves. It becomes particularly problematic if it stands alone to express participation in a specific project, without spelling out the role of people in the different processes of the project cycle and the degree of power they have. Not to forget we are talking about projects not initiated by the community or grassroots oriented, but about projects initiated by organizations that set rules for self-reliant development, considering it a form of empowerment to the communities without considering the lack of power these communities have in the project.

5.1.5 Participation as a Means and Participation as an End or as a Goal

Some aspects of the definition expressed by respondents from donor Northern organizations encompassed ambitious elements, while some aspects of the definition expressed by respondents from local Palestinian organizations included a view of participation much closer to how it is perceived within the framework of their social work practice. Respondents from donor Northern organizations perceive participation as an end in itself besides being a means of making projects function better. This approach to promote participation as an end in itself is discussed in the literature extensively (Oakley, 1995, UNDP, 1997), and perceives participation as a process leading to comprehensive empowerment of the beneficiaries and community members. This may be achieved when people and local communities acquire the skills, knowledge and experience to take greater responsibility for their development. The ambitious part in this definition is that it is not operationalized in practice, with no reference to how it could be manifested at the project level.

At the other end, respondents from local Palestinian organizations view participation within the viewpoint of the social work profession as an informed value in the practice of the social worker, which is referred to as “clients’ self-determination” in mainstream social work activities. This view acknowledges the right of the ‘clients’ to participate and decide on their individual intervention plans. In this specific instance, the respondents from the local Palestinian
organizations use both concepts of participation and self-determination interchangeably, where participation is considered the same as recognizing the right of ‘clients’ to self-determination, while self-determination is expressed through giving the ‘clients’ the opportunity to participate. Within this point of departure, beneficiaries do not have much say in the decision-making processes of the project or its overall design. On another level, the mainstream social welfare system perceives ‘clients’ as having the possibility to decide for themselves if they want to receive the services of the project or not, and then having the possibility to define their own needs from the project as a result. This view is so much like a “provide-receive relationship” in that the established projects provide services seen by professionals as those needed by a target group who would be at the other end of receiving in the relationship and would decide on receiving the services or not, depending on how much it fits the ‘clients’ needs. In this approach, participation is no more than cooperation with the services and voluntary reception, and, to some extent, the choice of selecting from options provided by the organization.

Addressing participation and self-determination interchangeably in the conceptualizations of the respondents from local Palestinian organizations could be related to the fact that the majority of the respondents from the local organizations have social work training. Linking this to the emphasis put in social work training on empowerment and strength perspective as a form of operationalization of empowerment of the most disadvantaged (Rose, 1992; Saleebey, 1990; & Weick, Rapp, Sullivan, & Kisthardt, 1989), the focus of the respondents from local organizations in this approach could be perceived to be much related to their training in social work. For example, an organization in Palestine targeting disabled youth states in its policy statement that “empowerment of the target group is a goal of the rehabilitation activities,” in this sense, this organization uses empowerment to mean the increase of the ‘clients’ individual choices in life through training and rehabilitation. This empowerment approach parallels the commonly used approach connoting the ability of an individual to enlarge and use personal power, which is linked
to the concepts of competence and self-efficacy (Sullivan, 1994). In this sense, participation of a client would be a means to achieve his/her individual goal, which s/he might actively design, and which may also be perceived as a means for his/her individual empowerment resulting from being active in designing his/her individual plan. The shortcoming in this approach lies in the fact that the definition of empowerment of the target groups is constructed around definitions usually established in the organization’s objectives. These definitions of empowerment might not be consistent with the empowerment expectations and experiences of the target groups. Moreover, this approach deals more with individual empowerment than collective, and does not clarify how empowering a person individually to actively make choices in his/her own life can be channeled through collective action. The above example shows that the question is how are the disabled to be empowered on the individual level to influence policies and behaviors that discriminate against them as a group at the societal level?

The approaches to participation discussed above highlight the two different ways ‘participants’ or ‘target groups’ are framed. The approach expressed by the respondents from donor organizations emphasized empowerment at the collective level, framing the target group as ‘actors’ and the staff as ‘facilitators’ to such a process. On the other hand, the approach expressed by the respondents from local organizations emphasized empowerment at the individual level, and sees the target groups as ‘recipients of services,’ ‘clients’ and/or ‘beneficiaries’, and the staff as ‘professionals.’

These two different ways of perceiving the target groups would indicate different ways of interacting with them and the various expectations regarding participation, which may not be interchangeable or synonymous. Part of the issue is related to the context in which local NGOs work. The view expressed by the respondents of local organizations addresses the challenges that social development NGOs face in Palestine, which makes the rhetoric of participation irrelevant for both donor and local organizations. While, local NGOs are involved in development
activities, the extreme poverty in Palestine makes it hard for development NGOs to move away from the charity mentality, which has characterized their work in Palestine for a long time. Moreover, the pressing basic needs of the Palestinian society in the last three years have reawakened this charitable approach, an aspect that respondents from the donor Northern organizations addressed when they discussed how the context obstructs participation. Samara (2002) emphasized that despite the claim of NGOs that their work is focused on developing the Palestinian society, their activities appeared charitable. Even if they target the poor, as Samara argued, projects are based on charity. Therefore, it is not surprising that respondents from local Palestinian NGOs scored high on seeing participation as mostly a function of the need assessment phase of the project and least as a function for empowerment of the beneficiaries.

It is very important to place how respondents from donor organizations perceive participation as a tool for empowerment in the context of the literature on participation, which treats this issue extensively. Many authors and international organizations who have conceptualized participation have touched upon prerequisites for participation and have consistently claimed that participation requires ‘profound and social structural change’ as well as a ‘massive redistribution of power (Oakley, 1995; Pearse & Stiefel, 1980; Stiefel & Wolfe, 1994; & UNDP, 1997). Despite the emphasis that respondents from donor Northern have placed on participation as a process of comprehensive empowerment “through increasing the ability of the poorest of the poor, the vulnerable, and the most marginalized to participate, and emphasizing on removing barriers (those could be related to the broader social power relations and dynamics) that might hinder their participation, through increasing their abilities to challenge their disadvantaged realities and structures within which they exist in order to ensure the protection of their needs and interests,” they avoided addressing what a redistribution of power and social structural change might entail. Their approach to empowerment could well be described as accommodating the reality that exists in Palestine; and therefore, their approach is confined to: “people or
communities having the awareness of their rights and what they entail for them as human beings without including how to “remove barriers related to the broader social power relations and dynamics.”

As a result, respondents from donor organizations may tackle the issue of people’s transformation from being passive receivers of services to real actors in the issues that concern them, but they fail to define how this can take place without undertaking structural changes in the society, and they do not deal with the power disparity in the society and the structural forces working against such transformation. Respondents from donor organizations recognized many obstacles in implementing participatory activities in the project, and referred among many other factors to the on-going political oppression and discrimination the Palestinian society faces as a result of militarily occupation, as well as to the patriarchal nature of the Palestinian society, with its social inequalities between men and women and constraints on women’s participation. They also referred to how power structures in the Palestinian communities exclude certain groups/individuals such as refugees and the disabled. These factors, closely linked to the issue of structural forces, were mentioned by the respondents from donor organizations as obstructing participatory activities, and were considered hard to tackle in general. In this case, providing people with the information and the skills, enabling the Palestinian people to be actors and not subjects of development, would thus be even more relevant for donor organizations.

Respondents from donor organizations also perceived the traditional form of Palestinian community leadership as a potential problem for wider participation. Respondents from donor organizations saw these obstacles to participation as related to the interpersonal relationships arising in all communities, not only in Palestine, where communities suffer from conflicts, rivalries, and factionalism. Many respondents from donor organizations considered these problems to be real obstacles toward participation. This reflects a contradiction in the views of the respondents from donor organizations. On one level, their detailed consideration of the
problems in Palestinian society obstructing participation might be perceived as value judgments. On another level, their failure to promote practices to overcome such obstacles makes their rhetoric about participation very idealistic. Why is it considered a practical option in development projects run or administered by these organizations to use authoritative structures if, in fact, they feel authoritative and patriarchal societies obstruct participatory practices? If donor organizations genuinely believe in empowering the poor, the vulnerable, and the less advantaged in society, as they have indeed formulated in their conceptualizations, why do they expect to have no resistance? If a women’s project, for example, requiring women’s participation in its activities were stopped because women face a different kind of oppression from a different source, what is project’s stance? Will the project’s staff help the women increase their awareness of oppression and support them in advancing their role, jeopardizing the loss of their reputation and stance in the community, or are they going to compromise on a middle way that does not best serve the interests of the women, but rather makes the project more acceptable to the existing power structure, thus maintaining the status quo? These are difficult questions that the local NGO staff often raise. If, however, NGOs spend more time analyzing the obstacles toward participation than finding solutions, what is the goal behind the empowerment they preach? Should projects be neutral in their orientation and try to accommodate all parties in the community, or should they be clear on their stance in supporting the poor, for the poor and because of the poor?

Apparently, Northern NGOs cannot be perceived as part of the struggle of the Palestinian people, as they try to be neutral in delivering development activities and meeting the needs of the population. It is therefore hard to view them as transforming the realities of the Palestinian society and its political situation. They fund and conduct sector-oriented development activities, but they are far from being revolutionary in their practices of challenging and fostering structural change.
In conclusion, it is true that the respondents from donor organizations’ conceptualizations on empowerment differ from that of the respondents from local organizations, yet both share the idea that empowerment is to take place at an individual level. It is far from being a form of empowerment that addresses the power relations in the society on a collective level.

5.1.6 Empowerment in the Framework of Charity

Referring to the above discussion on the charitable mentality of development, it is important to discuss the obstacles that respondents from Northern donor and local NGOs mention as obstructing participation due to the situation in Palestine. Both groups of respondents from donor and local organizations alluded to what they considered a detrimental factor for participation: the complicated socio-political and economic realities in the Palestinian society. In places like the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the alleviation of immediate suffering is the primary concern and development NGOs claim to find themselves obliged to fund relief activities. In this case, beneficiaries of social development projects become recipients of aid and participation rhetoric becomes irrelevant where the long term development goals are set back to allow relief efforts to dominate the work of local development NGOs. This problem is a continuous one in Palestine; time and again the Palestinian people are treated as an undifferentiated passive group with no control over their lives. This continuing rise of survival needs in the Palestinian communities, as a result of the political instability, determines the thinking and vision of the projects that claim to work directly with the poorest of the poor and with the most deprived sectors in the society. Such conditions seemed to have a great influence on the conceptualization of respondents from local organizations, and highlight the unfavorable attitude among the Palestinian social workers toward participatory development. In contrast, respondents from donor organizations considered these conditions as only obstacles to participation, obstacles that hamper promoting participation activities, which remains a priority task in their view.
Considering that the pressing needs of the communities constitute a major obstacle toward real participation, very critical questions are raised. Is participation a luxury component of development projects that disappears when pressing needs arise? Can participation coexist with pressing needs? If participation is seen to be a tool and a means to help the poorest and the deprived in the process of self-transformation and empowerment, why should it not coexist with pressing needs, when the assumption is that genuine participation cannot be achieved without helping the poor be more aware of repressing realities and they are provided with tools to change these realities? As Burkey (1993) puts it, the first step to achieving genuine participation is a process in which the poor and the deprived become more aware of their situation, of the socio-economic reality around them, of their real problems and the causes, and of what measures they can take to begin changing their situation. For respondents from donor organizations advocating participation as a means of empowerment and addressing the issue of making people become aware of their reality, it is vital to recognize the pressing need to establish a clear policy on how their projects should attempt to remove obstacles to beneficiary participation, instead of continuously resorting to an aid mentality in a situation where political uncertainty is the norm and not the exception that Northern NGOs face in so many developing countries. How can Northern NGOs who fund projects in Palestine and their local Palestinian NGOs envision a policy that is best described by Aung San Suu Kyi, a Nobel Peace Prize receiver in 1991:

“If the people that aid targets are not empowered, it cannot achieve more than a very limited, very short-term alleviation of problems rooted in long-standing social and political ills. After all, human development is not intended to produce impotent objects of charity” (as cited in Human Development Report, 2002).

If Northern NGOs have less ability to envision such a policy, what objective does this rhetoric about participation serve? In such circumstances, the difference between the rhetoric and the practice becomes even wider without a perspective for reconciliation.
5.1.7 Capacity-Building and Staff Training

While respondents from donor organizations made a powerful case for participation, respondents from local organizations seemed less enthusiastic. Even though respondents from local organizations perceived that participation is somehow important to the project’s success, their attitude, according to the scale measuring the value the respondents put on participation (see Appendix F), was in general neutral – neither favorable nor unfavorable. Respondents from donor organizations, on the other hand, place a great emphasis on the issue of ownership and sustainability of the project as a result of participation. Their vision is that the community members’ sense of ownership, as a result of their active participation, will insure the sustainability of the project beyond the donors’ intervention, a goal to be achieved through more involvement of beneficiaries in all aspects of the project cycle. Hence, respondents from donor organizations consider the notion of capacity building as a very important component to insure sustainability.

It was argued that the concept of capacity building has been formulated by international agencies to denote the creation of procedures where people learn or are trained to conduct their own projects (Eade, 1997). According to Eade, capacity building is often used simply to mean enabling institutions to be more effective in implementing development projects. A study by James (1994) (as cited in Eade, 1997) reported that nine out of ten respondents from Northern NGOs identified ‘capacity-building’ in the South as a core activity. According to the same study, fewer were able to define what it means in practice. This emphasis on capacity building was also mirrored in the conceptualizations of the respondents from donor organizations, also with little specification on what it actually means in practice. In this regard, respondents from donor organizations placed capacity-building somewhere on a spectrum ranging from equipping
“beneficiaries with the necessary skills” at the personal level or organizational level, to
strengthening their partners’ organizations capabilities through “exchanging ideas and
collaborative and participatory approaches.”

The passionate attitude of the respondents from donor Northern organizations toward
participation did not forbid them to specify the potential liabilities and real problems in
participation related mostly to local organizations and staff. They argued that participation could
be problematic if the process is managed poorly, and this could happen when the staff do not have
the proper training or skills regarding participatory approaches, and/or when the organization’s
structure does not facilitate participatory activities. In contrast, only 30.3% of the respondents
from local organizations reported receiving any training in the issues of participatory
development. Moreover, the neutral attitude expressed by the respondents from local
organizations would not be very conducive to participation.

In fact, the issue of staff training in participatory methodologies is closely related to the issue
of capacity building, and is much likely to be a core issue. The emphasis that respondents from
donor organizations placed on building the capacity of their partner organizations, and their
expressed belief that a lack of staff training hinders participation, would lead one to assume that
this issue will be well thought-out in the local organizations. It would be assumed that staff
training on participatory methodologies would be crucial to donor organizations to the point that
they would greatly promote and encourage training at the local organizations. On the contrary,
this study showed that the majority of the respondents from local organizations (approx. 70%) did
not report to have training in the area of participatory development or methodologies, and
warrants the conclusion that respondents are not equipped properly to promote participatory
activities in their projects. Moreover, training, if it takes place, is reported to not be continuous
and only partial, and also not part of continuous supervision.
Moreover, how can one expect genuine participation to be incorporated in the organization’s structure without being only a catchword or a fad among the donors and/or the local organizations, if the staff of the local organizations have an uncaring attitude toward the concept? Burkey (1993) emphasized that participatory development activities rarely arise from within poor groups without any form of outside stimulus, and people are not expected to be involved in the projects on their own without incentives. Therefore, some external agents should best play this role, and those external agents are best represented by the staff of local organizations. Hence, how can one expect a staff to promote participatory activities if is not equipped with the proper and adequate training? In this case, it is more likely that genuine participation would not be feasible when the staff is not equipped with the proper awareness, understanding, and skills for participatory mechanisms. Therefore, would be logical to conclude that participation in local Palestinian organizations takes place as a spontaneous activity, which means it is not practiced through using what Midgley (1986) called interventionist strategies and techniques, which promote participatory activities in a deliberate way. This view is supported by the lack of evidence that donor organizations or their local Palestinian partners were able to provide that promote the deliberate and systematic activities of participation in their projects, as well as by the fact that local staff reported having a neutral attitude and lack of the appropriate training and skills to promote participatory activities.

5.1.8  **Implications of the Rhetoric on Practice is Confused**

If, according to the respondents from donor organizations, social development projects are expected to facilitate empowerment, it is worthwhile to analyze the implications of such a vision for the social development projects and for those who work on them.

First, the majority of staff working on social development projects are trained as social workers (43% of respondents from local NGOs reported to have a social work degree or to have
been trained as a social worker). Social workers are usually trained to be sensitive to the values, beliefs, and political or religious orientation of their clientele, and they are taught to accept the clients or the community as it is. They are also taught to respect local religious beliefs and traditions. Moreover, the social work profession in the Palestinian context is characterized by a conservative tradition well organized around charity and aid. Historically, the social work profession in the Palestinian context has been grounded on the implementation of projects heavily written-off as charitable activities.

Secondly, women are predominant as social workers in local Palestinian NGO projects (the study population consisted predominately of female social workers, 59\% of the whole study population). Women in general are vulnerable to oppression as a result of the existing socio-cultural value system in the Palestinian society. It would be unrealistic to sometimes expect women social workers to facilitate the empowerment of the marginalized and the vulnerable while they themselves are subject to the same oppressions. In one case, a woman social worker’s family opposed her traveling from one village to another as her work requires, and agreed only for her to work if she was placed in an office.

These are critical issues, which the researcher personally confronted as a supervisor and social worker in development projects and as a social work educator who taught courses at a local university in Palestine. There is no simple answer, and there is a clear contradiction between two poles: one is the issue of targeting the most vulnerable and marginalized, and not to replicate power structures and inequality; and the other is the issue of how much social workers should do within the existing social structure. It seems that the ideology of empowerment maintained by respondents from donor organizations has proved to be unrealistic, given the way projects are designed and practiced in the Palestinian society. As a result, it is not realistic to expect social
workers to challenge the existing and repressive power structure. Social workers are not equipped with the vision for such a role, they are not equipped with the skills to perform such a task, and projects are not structured with this aim in mind.

One of the major challenges faced by the social work profession in Palestine is how to place its practice within the framework of social development. This requires that the role of social work and the education of social workers, who comprise the majority of the staff in social development projects, be reconsidered. A reconsideration of social work was emphasized by Billups (1994), among other social work scholars, who advocated that social development should be the organizing framework for social work practice, and social workers in turn should be well grounded in the subject of social development, as well as in participatory approaches to development. Sanders (1986) also emphasized a developmental perspective in social work focused on institutional development and structural change, an approach that makes social work more responsive to the changing needs and aspirations of people, which makes it possible to alert practices and even social agencies. Midgley (1986) addressed the importance of preparing social workers effectively to perform this role.

Another issue related to the implication of the rhetoric of participation on practice is the degree to which the structure of the local organizations may be obstructing participation. Respondents from donor organizations considered local organizations to lack the facilitative structures for participation, yet they failed to acknowledge how these structures, which they perceived to be bureaucratic, non democratic, and based on charismatic personalities, are usually influenced by the relationship of local organizations to their funding bodies. Also overlooked by the respondents from donor organizations is how they provide funding to local organizations, which they expect to be spent in a cost-effective manner. For the implementing organization, participation could entail delays, which in turn would mean that the implementing organization might view participation as not really viable because the projects may require more time to
implement. Therefore, participation could be problematic when there are deadlines for funding, and when donors seek projects that report successful outcomes and are cost effective. Some respondents from donor organizations raised concerns about contradictions between what implementing organizations see as priority and what the community sees as priority. In this case, the concern is that the local organization will yield to the community and give them the power to decide. This is very doubtful, especially when funds are received from donor organizations to be spent toward an established and specific project.

In the Palestinian context, funding usually flows to established local NGOs. These local NGOs in most cases try to conform to models defined by, and oriented to, priorities chosen by the donors, an issue identified by Clark (1991) in his analysis of Northern NGOs and their Southern partners. Therefore, since projects should be implemented according to established goals, local NGOs try to modify the community’s needs to fit the projects and not vice versa. Therefore, there is only room for what Oakley (1991) called passive participation; it is passive participation when local involvement is elicited as a means to some end, and it is passive in that participation is sought to achieve a predetermined goal of development, where participation diminishes once the task is completed. And if the community opposes the project, negotiation takes place to make the community accept the project. Local NGOs might consider negotiation and persuasion a form of participation. The researcher personally witnessed this during her work in Palestine. A project designed to target women received opposition from the women themselves because it was designed as a self-help project, which excluded their husbands or fathers from the decision-making process. Women were concerned that if their husbands or fathers were not involved, there would be less chance to conduct the self-help projects themselves. Women were told it was not in their best interest to involve their men. In the end, however, the whole project collapsed because of the high resistance it received from the community.
While respondents from donor organizations clearly alluded to obstacles related to the local organizations’ structure, they did not mention how their funding policies and their requirements impose obstacles on local organizations to engage in participatory activities. Often the way funding is set by donor Northern organizations hinders or obstructs participation. Many times, funding is restricted to specific projects targeting specific groups or issues, and the donors set timetables, which limits the possibility of participation. Perhaps donor organizations are indeed aware that participatory practices in the projects require different organizational structures and different project characteristics than the established projects, yet recognize that participation would be a burden not only to the local organizations but also to donors. There is a major difference between supporting grassroots initiatives with less opportunity to receive funds from donors, and supporting an established, well-formulated project that looks good to donors. In this respect, donor organizations fail to provide the right ground for participation because in this case these established local organizations depend on funding from donor organizations who in turn determine the kind of projects funded and ultimately carried out, therefore it depends to a great extent on them if participatory practices are actually carried out in the field. Again, a big contradiction between what the respondents from donor organizations preach and what the practices are is illustrated here.

5.1.9 Evaluation Criteria for Participation is Confused

An issue, which due to its importance requires special attention and is much related to the above discussion on the rhetoric of participation in practice, refers to the evaluation methods of participatory activities. Respondents from donor Northern organizations reported to lack clear criteria in evaluating participatory activities in the local Palestinian organizations they fund. It seems that some of the definitions of the respondents from donor organizations express, to some extent, an ambitious philosophy of what they would like to see happen in the projects they fund,
but a lack of the right tools to evaluate the manifestations in practice. This issue was also addressed by Midgley (1986) when he reviewed the different participation definitions and concluded that most definitions of participation are distinctly utopian in character. Similarly, Lane (1995) argued that the rhetoric of empowerment among Northern NGOs is prominent in their projects and policy statements as a result of an ideological commitment. While respondents from donor organizations echoed dimensions of the empowerment debate existing in the literature, they reported problems in trying to implement such approaches, agreeing with Lane (1995) that it is far from being simple. Donor NGOs are continuously faced with pressing questions related to how they actually promote empowerment in practice in local projects, and how local Palestinian NGOs secure either directly or via representative participation of the poor and the marginalized. These questions signal the need for NGOs to have clear evaluative criteria to enable them to evaluate the participatory practices in the projects.

The discussion of the respondents from donor organizations regarding evaluative criteria is very interesting. On the one hand, the majority of respondents from donor Northern organizations reported that they have no clear-cut criteria to evaluate the participatory activities of the local organizations they fund. On the other hand, 43% of the respondents from local Palestinian organizations were not aware whether such evaluation took place in their organization or in the project. At another level, some respondents from donor Northern organizations reported to have such criteria in their organizations, yet confused criteria with the issue of methods of evaluation. This confusion appeared when respondents from donor organizations reported methods they usually use to evaluate participatory activities and considered it as criteria to evaluate participatory activities. The most common methods defined as criteria were as follows: site and field visits, beneficiaries’ surveys, and official evaluation studies of the project,
especially those conducted by outside experts. Another group of respondents from donor organizations reported that they evaluate participatory activities as part of the evaluation of the project as a whole, also confusing criteria with methods.

As a consequence, when trying to determine what donor organizations expect from a participatory project and how participatory qualities of the project are expected to manifest, one is confronted with ambiguity. From this one may conclude that establishing criteria is not a clear or straightforward matter for the donor organizations themselves, even when the donor organizations expect local NGOs to report participatory activity as part of their projects’ evaluations or quarterly reports. Moreover, they fail to provide the staff of the local organizations they fund with clear guidelines on what is expected from them, leaving this to value judgment of those who write or conduct these evaluations. In the experience of the researcher working with one of the largest local Palestinian NGOs, these reports mostly emphasized how much the beneficiaries and community members contribute to activities of the project, and this was usually counted in terms of contribution of cash and/or other material resources and labor. Thus, each local organization finds its own reporting system that usually receives the approval of their donors. Rarely are unified forms of reporting or evaluation adopted by organizations, as there is not much clarity on what is expected from local projects.

Nevertheless, some respondents from donor organizations presented some indicators that could be treated as evaluative criteria for participation lending themselves for monitoring and evaluation. These indicators are: assessing the representation of the target group in councils, boards, and committees’ or/and members’ organizations; evaluating the representation of the different groups (less advantaged, such as women, specific disadvantaged groups etc.) in the organization’s target group; monitoring membership in membership organizations to assess the degree to which a transparent and democratic general assembly exists; and how members are
chosen to become a member of the board, council, or committees; and assessing the level of contribution (cash, efforts labor, land, and/or time-sheets) of the community to the project.

A problem faced by local Palestinian NGOs is how they should measure indicators that are spelled out by the respondents from donor organizations. In fact, most of these indicators have qualitative dimensions difficult to quantify, and their reports would be based on case studies from local organizations. When it comes to assessing how participation occurs, Cohen and Uphoff (1977) recognized the need for more qualitative measures. Oakley (1991) addressed the issue in measuring these indicators where faced with concerns that they are usually matters of degree as well as kind, so he emphasized that their measurement would usually be expressed in terms of categories rather than in numbers. The distinctions to be made are more complex than can be encompassed by counting persons’ presence and participation in meetings, as well as their contributions of labor or money.

As a result, the absence of criteria and of the appropriate measurements would place the donor Northern NGOs in a position to only make comparative judgments on issues such as the degree of participation, the representation of different groups, the frequency of community meetings and so on. This is problematic because the actual representation of the poor or the marginalized does not lend itself to evaluation by outsiders. Linking this with the conceptualization presented by respondents from donor Northern, how would donor NGOs measure such representation? One very crucial matter in the Palestinian context is the issue of women’s representation. Donor organizations in general are largely preoccupied with the representation of women in development activities. Respondents from donor organizations argued that the socio-cultural nature of the Palestinian society where social inequalities between men and women and patriarchy exist, and key decisions in the family are commonly made by men and the elderly, is a constraint on women’s participation. As a result, donor organizations recognize that women are usually less represented in the different community activities. The
critical issue to the Northern donor and their local organizations is how donor organizations would monitor and evaluate the involvement of women in local projects. Would they be satisfied with reports on the percentage of women as beneficiaries in the organization - which is a common practice among local NGOs, while recognizing that percentages do not usually reflect much about women’s actual representation. Or would they look at who attends meetings, if their opinions represent to the whole community, and how that representation influences the outcome of the project, which needs different assessment tools.

As represented in this study, a huge number of projects in the Palestinian society target women in their services, 46 of the organizations out of 55 who participated in this study reported to target women. Lack of criteria of donor organizations to evaluate the actual representation of poor women, however, or the women who live in the camps or in isolated Palestinian villages, challenge the emphasis that donor organizations put on participation as a goal leading to empowerment. Palestinian women’s organizations were accused by local Palestinians of targeting the most advantaged women in the society, leaving out the poorest of the poor, the most marginalized and the vulnerable sectors of women inhibited by the restrictive socio-cultural conditions which prohibit participation in the issues concerning them.

In this regard, donor organizations are faced with a critical question relating to what kind of measuring tools they are willing to promote and advocate in the local organizations to ensure better representation of the marginalized in the society. Eade (1997) has addressed the issue of a reporting system between donors and their implementing organizations. She argued that the reporting system is mostly shaped by the demand for information which passes down the structure from upper to lower levels, and which encompasses a bias towards what those lower down perceive that those higher up want to hear. Therefore, monitoring actual activities that target the less advantaged groups would be suspect to false reporting and lack the ability to influence any biased policies in practice against marginalized groups.
It seems that this conceptual confusion regarding participation and its indicators among donor organizations and their local partners limit those NGOs to general proclamations and advocacy of participation without putting pressure on those NGOs to spell out the practical implications, the political aspects, and thus, the power consequences of participation. This, according to Stiefel and Wolfe (1994), makes participation not more than serving a purpose toward a system-maintenance function, where participation assists only in the implementation of the projects with goals established by outsiders for the communities, designed by professionals and experts. That aim is to keep the status quo and not change it. In this case, the rhetoric regarding participation as serving the goal of empowerment moves to the other end of the continuum where participation is treated as a means to ensure the successful outcome of externally designed development projects, and as a mechanistic activity, and where evaluation is focused on whether it exists or not regardless of what it entails.

Much related to the discussion is how donor organizations perceive the degree of involvement they have with local NGOs, and how that influences the amount of participation at the project level. Often donor organizations are satisfied with the reports they receive from local NGOs about their work. They might raise questions, but mostly leave it to the local organizations to run the projects. In this case, their involvement would be minimal, just to ensure that the local organization spends their money effectively. In other examples, donor organizations are more heavily involved in local organizations they run or supervise directly; in this case, it is not clear how policies of the donor Northern organizations determine the different kinds of donor involvement. The intention of this research is not to make such comparisons; hence, this could be a potential for further research study.
5.1.10 Who Funds Who

Palestinian NGOs participating in this study reported multiple sources of funding. This can be a problem when trying to identify those local NGOs that only receive funds for their activities from Northern NGOs because many NGOs in Palestine are increasingly funded by international official organizations linked to the Western governments (e.g. USAID (USA), CIDA (Canada), and GTZ (Germany). In fact, their loyalties become more attached to the policies of the governments and they might therefore lose their independence. One example discussed widely in the Palestinian areas is the political requirement that a funding body like USAID imposes on the Palestinian NGOs if they want to receive funds from this organization. Powell and Seddon (1997) (cited in Eade, 1997) argued that increasing official development assistance from some countries is being channeled through NGOs; Clark (1991) also found that official agencies are increasingly contracting NGOs to implement components of their projects. Hence, few NGOs in Palestine could be identified as receiving funds from only Western non-governmental resources. This would actually pose questions on the multiple accountabilities these NGOs usually have, where local NGOs might find themselves accountable to different donors based on different project the donors fund. When local Palestinian NGOs have different projects at the same time, it is very likely that different donors fund the different projects within the same organization. This means the same organization might have a different reporting system for each project to fit the demands or requirements of each donor. This could be described as an obscured situation that local NGOs usually face in which it tries to adapt its work to fit different requirements. Thus, no clear distinctions between the different influences from different donors can actually be made, whether governmental or non-governmental.
5.2 *Factor Analysis Results*

In this study, factor analysis of the different scales resulted in the identification of relationships between the different items in the instrument by examining the correlations between the variables. Different dimensions were identified in the different scales.

The structure resulting from the scale which represented the definitions of participation identified the different constructs and reflected the different conceptualizations of participation defined by respondents from donor Northern organizations in the first phase. This was discussed in depth in the previous section. What is remarkable is that the dimension of needs assessment had a high factor score when compared to the other dimensions. These results support the emphasis placed by the respondents from local organizations on participation in the needs assessment phase. On the other hand, while respondents from donor organizations emphasized empowerment, perceiving participation as a means of empowering the beneficiaries, this was the least favorable construct among respondents from local organizations. Again, these results support the discussion in the previous section which identified a gap between what respondents from donor organizations feel that participation entails and what is actually believed and practiced by the respondents from the local organizations. There should be some caution in interpreting the structure produced by the scale, which measures the definition of participation, since the two extraction methods did not produce exactly the same structure. This in turn jeopardizes the stability of the constructs. Nevertheless many similarities in the variables loaded in the different factors, which warrant this conclusion.

Moreover, one reliable and stable structure produced as a result of the factor analysis was the scale of the importance of participation in different stages of the project. The different extraction and rotation methods produced the same structures. The interpretation of the factor scores showed that, according to the respondents from local organizations, resource contribution of the beneficiaries to the project was seen as the most important form of participation, an emphasis also
highlighted by the respondents from donor organizations to a lesser extent. The second most important form of participation is in the needs assessment phase, which also supports the previous results and discussion addressed in the first section. Regarding practices and activities of participation, the factor analysis structure for the practices showed that social workers in the local Palestinian NGOs view participation in its practical form in that beneficiaries and community contribute to their project with resources and information and are involved in the identification of their needs during the initial phase of the project. Yet one also should not forget that actual participation in all stages had very low scores, which warrants the conclusion that participation is not very well grounded in the local NGOs’ projects.

Another stable structure was the attitude scale measuring the value that the respondents from local organizations put on participation and their different beliefs regarding it. The attitude scale showed that, in general, respondents from local organizations show moderate attitudes toward participation, and mostly perceive participation as an important factor in the project’s success. This result contradicts some of the results discussed in the previous section, where respondents from local organizations reported to have a neutral attitude toward participation. This contradiction could be explained by the fact that, at the conceptual level, when respondents were asked about the value of participation, they reported to perceive it as necessary and good, but when they were asked about specific beliefs related to participation they seemed to oppose it or to have a neutral attitude.

Another interesting finding showing that beneficiaries’ participation in project decisions is less likely to take place resulted in the factor analysis of the scale measuring specific practices of participation. The result of this factor analysis showed that respondents from local organizations reported that practices aimed at increasing participation of marginalized groups took place at the project level more frequently, while practices allowing beneficiaries to be involved in the project’s decision-making rarely occurs. This specific result could be explained by the fact that
high percentages of respondents from local organizations are employed by women’s organizations, where the staff usually has high awareness of the need to involve women as a marginalized group in their activities.

While the results of the different factor analysis on the different scales provided stable structures, some structures were less stable when examining different extraction methods. Nevertheless, the different structures were conceptually sound and make sense in their relation to the topic. In this case, factor scores provided a way to compare the value of the different constructs to the respondents. Factor analysis would be a more powerful method if it were used to extract information from a large number of respondents. In this study, the sample size was relatively small and thus could be responsible for the difficulty in explaining some of the factor analysis results as a result of the high error percentage or the unexplained variance in the structures.

In conclusion, while respondents from donor organizations put a great emphasis on participation as a means of empowering communities and beneficiaries in order to challenge the status quo, the respondents from local Palestinian organizations showed that, in practice, this aim seems to be irrelevant. Respondents from local organizations believed that in the needs assessment stage of the project, participation has a real opportunity of taking place. At a later stage, contribution of the beneficiaries and the communities is considered a very important form of participation. In the same line, respondents from local organizations saw that participation activities in general do not take place on a regular basis in their projects or programs. If they do take place, it is most likely during the problem identification and needs assessment phases, in the form of consultation with the beneficiaries and the communities. Moreover, both groups of respondents perceived that the complicated political conditions of the Palestinian people, with their continuous needs of survival in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, is counterproductive to participatory activities and makes participation in such conditions inappropriate and unfeasible.
5.3 Limitations of the Study, Contributions, and Recommended Directions for Future Research on this Topic.

5.3.1 Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study:

- The scope: this study is mainly descriptive and exploratory, which limits the type of the analysis used as well as the possibility to draw general conclusions.

- Limitations of an individual level of analysis and the target population: an apparent inconsistency in examining people's participation as the topic of this study, but not obtaining people's input in the study itself could be a critical limitation. The study of people’s participation in social development projects emphasizes the importance of expanding our understanding of the nature of participation beyond the individual level of analysis. Since this study mainly focuses on selected organizations and their activities from the social workers’ or/and development workers’ and staff’s point of view, the views of those who are targets of these projects regarding their level of involvement and participation and the way they are affected is not included. Although the researcher regarded the subject of people's perceptions of their own participation in social development projects as a very important issue, the political realities in Palestine at the time this research was conducted made onsite interviews of grassroots participants unfeasible and dangerous. The original plan to incorporate this element into the research design had to be set aside. Although the objectives of this research justified the use of this unit of analysis in examining the issue, looking at the issue from the point of view of the people affected by these practices would be a valuable research study for the future.

- The methodology: the study looked at the difference between how people’s participation is conceptualized and what is actually being done about participation in practice according to the staff of the organizations. Therefore, it contained two phases; the first
one used a two-round Delphi Technique, where the first round of the Delphi study took more time than planned (October, 2002-February, 2003). This fact made it difficult to give extended time for the second round (February, 2003-April, 2003). Therefore, the number of respondents for the second round was only five, which jeopardized the reliability of the second phase. As a result, the researcher decided not to use the results of the second round completely, except in verifying some of the answers of the first round, as well in providing credibility for the extracted clusters from the first phase.

Instead of reaching a consensus on the definition as the aim of the Delphi, the researcher ended up with different definitions of the concept of people’s participation. Even so, this has served the goals of research better than reaching a consensus on the definition of the concept. Given the nature of the concept, different conceptualizations of the concept of people’s participation are more expected than a universal definition, where the conceptualization of the concept is based on how the organization’s perspective on development may vary from one organization to another.

- Although the data from the local Palestinian NGOs was collected in a reasonable time period, there were many difficulties in collecting the data given the circumstances in the Palestinian areas. Some of these difficulties were related to the curfews, military closures of the areas, and restrictions of movement from one place to another imposed by the Israeli occupation on the Palestinian areas. This situation hindered the distribution of more questionnaires (n=109). Moreover, these facts hindered the possibility of collecting data from the Gaza strip, since data were only collected from the West Bank.
• The study collected data during one time period, limiting any comparisons with other time periods. It was not the intention of this research to compare time periods, but it might have been beneficial to have had the chance to compare actual practices in the Palestinian areas three years ago, when the political situation was to some extent more conducive to participatory activities.

• The study was limited to some Northern NGOs and a non-probability sample of the Palestinian local NGOs. Thus, findings of this exploratory study cannot be generalized to all Northern donor NGOs and to all local Palestinian NGOs.

• The timing of the study for the Palestinian NGOs came when the Northern and Palestinian NGOs were primarily trying to cope with the increasing humanitarian crisis caused by the political situation. Moreover, many local NGOs have designed projects to counteract the psychological turmoil faced by the Palestinian people as a result of the Israeli occupation and its measures against the Palestinians. Therefore, many NGOs claimed they have to re-orient their services to face the humanitarian crisis and to give up their development orientation and strategic development plans, targeting the immediate needs of the mass population instead.

5.3.2 The Contribution of this Study

Despite the above limitations, this study provided very important information on the actual gap between the rhetoric of participatory development and its practice. This study could be considered valuable for the following reasons:

1. The study attempted to solicit the different conceptualizations and definitions of people’s participation in social development projects, as respondents from donor Northern NGOs perceive it.
2. The study aimed to test the operationalizations of these definitions and the conceptualizations of the respondents from donor organizations considering their relationship to the actual practice in a specific context, the Palestinian areas in the West Bank. This second phase of the study added valuable findings that contributed to our understanding of how participation is conceptualized and practiced in a specific context, as well as how the context usually influences the understanding and the practice of participatory activities.

3. Conducting the study in two phases added important knowledge about how donor organizations and their local Palestinian partners coincided or differed in their understanding of the concept of people’s participation, and how that understanding influences the projects and the possibility of designing, implementing, and running projects that incorporate participatory practices.

4. This study showed the wide gap between what respondents from Northern Donor organizations proclaim and what is actually conceptualized, believed, and practiced regarding people’s participation in actual social development projects. It also pointed out discrepancies and barriers to conducting participatory activities.

5. This study confirmed a lack of evaluative criteria for participatory practices, which creates a special challenge for both donor organizations and the local NGOs.

As a result of this study, a workable vision could be suggested, which would focus on features of how participation could be built gradually into the Palestinian context, rather than on establishing a definition of participation. This could be considered an explicit statement on how to build a participation culture that is looked upon as an accumulative process, where the clearer it becomes, the more it is implemented in its different forms. This vision could be instrumental in helping donor and local NGOs in designing a strategy and methodology of people’s participation in their social development projects. This vision should be as interactive as possible; interactive
in a way that is not related to a requirement from a specific group, or to coercion but rather to a process of interaction and dialogue between donors, local organizations, and local communities and target groups, in the form of learning from each other and valuing each other’s experience. This process could be characterized by:

1. The need for donor organizations to open a genuine dialogue with their local partner organizations on how participation could be best implemented in their project. In such a dialogue, donor organizations should not have preconceived formulas on what participation is and how it should be implemented, but, they should recognize the need to be aware of local conditions and realities that facilitate more participatory practices, and expand on them as well as cooperate with the local indigenous organizations to find solutions for the problems that obstruct participatory activities.

2. In order for local organizations to commit themselves to participation, they have to ensure their work remains consistent, examine their organizational culture and determine whether it is conducive to participation. If the organizational structure is hierarchical and restricts staff participation it will be less likely to promote participation in its projects. In this regard, participation is to be perceived not only as practices to be implemented at the project level, but as a central objective to guide the internal management practices of the organization itself. According to UNDP’s guidebook of participation (1997), this is called downstreaming participation within an organization. In this regard, training is crucial, along with flexible leadership which is open to changes in their organizational structure that such process warrants.

3. The need to create clear structure in the organization that encourages target groups and communities to be involved in the needs assessment, project design, implementation, and evaluation of the projects. This could be achieved by opening a dialogue with the local communities on how they could be involved in the project and how this...
involvement could be facilitated by the organization. Organizations should discuss the obstacles and constraints with them, as well as how to overcome them or create solutions to suit the local communities. They should also extend the conditions that facilitate participatory activities and build on them to provide people with the skills and the ability to become actively involved.

4. As a result of this interaction, evaluative criteria could be created and agreed upon as guidelines. As these may be in flux in the course of the process, they should be monitored and modified according to local conditions. The following sections include more operational ways in which this relationship could be advanced through research and training.

5.3.3 Recommended Directions for Future Research on this Topic

It is widely recognized that NGOs in general are continuously challenged to prove their effectiveness and to present a systematic conscious awareness of participatory development, as well as to demonstrate consistent methods and ways to implement participation. Nevertheless, NGOs are confronted with lack and paucity of systematic research in participatory development. As Clark (1991) reported, the documentation of NGO experiences is often irregular, subjective, and geared more to fund-raising than to institutional learning. Moreover, the evaluations conducted by NGOs, or on behalf of NGOs, are usually directed toward funding organizations.

Local NGOs in Palestine barely document their experiences regarding participatory activities. In general, NGOs pay little attention to a serious analysis of project experiences regarding participation; moreover, less attention is given to impact studies or broader research. Therefore, valuable research studies could be done through replicating this study in other contexts or countries to explore the different dimensions of the concept and the way the concept is practiced in the field in general. The dimensions identified in this study as a result of factor
analysis can be examined in later studies using a larger sample size, or another sample could be
chosen and the results could be compared to see if the same dimensions are identified. The lack
of agreement on what participation is all about should provide a good incentive for building such
understanding. The more research studies are conducted to examine the concept in different
contexts and in different practices, the more systematic knowledge would be available to facilitate
a clearer understanding of the concept and its ramifications in practice.

Since the issue of evaluative criteria for participatory activities poses a special challenge to
donor and local organizations, it is crucial to pay special attention to this in research. NGOs are
always challenged with the dilemma of how to evaluate participatory activities where there is no
agreement on the definition of participation. Therefore, the proposed vision would also be
helpful in acquiring knowledge on how participatory activities would be best evaluated, which
could be placed at the service of donor and local NGOs.

Local realities could also be taken into account when trying to define the criteria and
definitions that fit different cultures, by which it would become possible to explain different
responses to similar structural circumstances. Hulme & Turner (1990) and Long (1990)
conceptualized what Long (1990) called a ‘conditional approach,’ which could inform research
on the issue of participatory development. According to these authors, this approach focuses on
people and their function in the heart of social development processes and advocates for an
approach that would be able to adopt the particular conditions and explanations applying to one
country to another, if that specific country meets the same conditions. Within this frame of
reference, understanding the specific issues such as ethnicity, class, or gender roles in a specific
society could explain how people are positioned in those roles, how they act on them, how they
perceive their constraints and act to ultimately improve their roles and positions in society (Long,
1990). This approach, called conditional according to the above writers, would view participation
definitions, mechanisms, strategies, and activities as based on research on the people and their
specific situations, and may be generalized to other situations if conditions are met. Based on this, the different definitions and conceptualizations would not necessarily produce ambiguity, since there is no merit in creating a formula for participation and standard evaluative criteria applicable to all situations, contexts, and practices. On the contrary, this approach views local realities and local knowledge as the basis for such understanding and evaluation.

Many tools are available to researchers to help NGOs in the process of building their own knowledge base with regard to participatory development. Nelson & Wright (1995) for example, proposed participant observation fieldwork as a method that organizations could adopt to help identify contradictions between rhetoric and practice, and as a way to fill the gap between the ideal (what people say should be the normative practice) and the real (what actually happens), which may assist in promoting organizational change.

Another powerful tool available to NGOs is participatory action research (PAR). As a tool to help people define their own development (Fals Borda, 1988) and thus nature of participation, PAR would be suitable to build a better understanding of the concept from the viewpoint of the people themselves. While the purpose of both approaches (PAR, and participatory development), as argued by Kondrat & Julia (1997), is to collectively investigate social reality in order to transform it through encouraging self-reliance and people’s realization of their full potential, examining the meaning of participation in development would be superficial unless people are given the power to investigate their reality and plan and design their own projects, therefore also define participation for themselves.
5.4 Implications for Northern Donor NGOs and Local NGOs, and Social Work Practice and Education

5.4.1 Implications for Donor and Local Organizations

Northern donor development NGOs’ approach to participation could be described as somewhat paradoxical. In their work in Palestine, this paradox is particularly evident in their orientation of funding sector-oriented programs or projects that have an individual service delivery approach, in which they stress the importance of participation and empowerment. If participation entails facilitating possibilities for the marginalized and vulnerable sector of the society to participate in the decisions that affect their lives, Northern donor NGOs are required to reconsider this individual service and sector-based orientation and evaluate how much it facilitates participation. Within this frame of reference, Northern and local NGOs are challenged to examine the existing structural and institutional constraints that treat people as “recipients of services.” The fact that local NGOs are financially controlled by donors and are restricted in time to implement the projects and report the products makes participation only a spontaneous activity in established projects. Thus, the policy of donor funding should be reconsidered, so as to understand how donors exert pressure to speed up implementation, thus putting local organizations in a critical position, which obstructs the encouragement of greater levels of participation in their projects.

Moreover, Northern donor organizations should be aware of the danger in their usual practice of sending Western experts to conduct research studies or to be engaged in evaluation of projects in Palestine or other developing countries. This issue poses special ethical concerns that Rakowski (1993) addressed. As Rakowski noted, the problem becomes clear when Western researchers try to apply Western theories and methods in evaluating or researching social issues to developing countries. This issue becomes even more problematic if donor organizations send Western researchers to evaluate participatory activities.
It becomes critical for donor NGOs to open a dialogue with local NGOs aiming to help local NGOs to ultimately define practices and activities that promote participation in the projects as being explicit project objectives, and not to rely on spontaneous practices not incorporated into the structure of the objectives and activities of local projects. In this regard, if donor NGOs clearly discuss the objective of participation with the implementing local organizations and allow local organizations to operationalize these practices within a framework of dialogue which takes the specific socio-economic and cultural context into consideration, participation becomes more than the “print” in donor organizations’ policy documents, and local organizations would be in a better position to find creative ways to implement participation in their activities. On the other hand, donor NGOs should have a more flexible structure to allow them to fund more grassroots initiatives than in already established projects.

On the other end, Palestinian local NGOs should be challenged to create internal structures to facilitate the design and implementation of participatory projects. Moreover, local organizations need to pay more attention to the issues of staff training and attitude. In this regard, Chambers (1998) acknowledged that in PRA experience, attitude and behavior change among facilitators is recognized as more important than methods. Therefore, participatory training that is experiential and interactive with staff would facilitate such a change in attitude.

5.4.2 Implications to Social Work Practice and Education

Social development as the organizing framework for social work, where it becomes possible for the social work profession to deal with human problems in a multicultural societal context, is a perspective that many social work scholars have addressed (Billups, 1994; Elliott, 1993; Midgley, 1991; & Sanders, 1986, to name a few). The conditions in Palestine stress the importance of this. In the opinion of the researcher, this means that social work education and the
practice of social work in Palestine should be reconsidered. This study emphasized the need for Palestinian social workers to be more grounded in social development and participatory approaches. Therefore, the following implications should be considered:

1. The failure of charity and aid-oriented activities of the social services in Palestine to eradicate poverty or achieve a minimum level of human dignity for the Palestinians calls for the social work profession in Palestine to give serious consideration to its role. The social work profession should adopt a vision that takes an integrative model into consideration which not only focuses on individual work based on remedy and therapy interventions, but begins to closely work with people in their larger community groups and organizations and within a framework of social development (this is a social work issue addressed specifically by many social work scholars in their writings, Bernstein, 1995; Billups, 1994; Elliot, 1993; Elliot, & Mayadas, 1996; Estes, 1993; Midgley, 1994; Sanders, 1986 & Ragab, 1990 to name few).

2. Such a framework for social work practice calls attention to the type of education that social workers in the Palestinian local universities receive, which is basically focused on clinical casework according to Western models, and which do not fit the Palestinian culture and society. An issue largely discussed in different contexts, where many made the case that the case work method of social work practice developed in the West has not provided an answer to the problems that people in developing countries encounter (Adler & Midgley, 1978; Billups & Julia, 1996; Bogo & Herington, 1986; Brigham, 1982; Goldstein, 1986; Guzzetta, 1996; Hammoud, 1988 Hardiman & Midgley, 1982). In Palestine there is an urgent need to move social work education away from the clinical approach emphasizing individual pathology, towards the need to develop indigenous materials relevant to their social reality.
3. The reconsideration of the role of the profession should be manifested in reconsidering the education of social workers. As Kaseke (1990) and Billups (1994) maintained, social development orientation demands that social work practitioners have a deeper understanding of the impact of the political, social, and economic structures of poverty and underdevelopment, and must acquire skills in such areas as social planning, advocacy, and evaluation. The curriculum of social work education should not be limited to acquiring the knowledge and skills of direct clinical intervention, but should be expanded to provide students with knowledge and skills in the field of social development and participation. Curriculum must be geared toward providing students with the knowledge and skills of participatory methodologies, of planning participatory activities, community building and organizing, PAR and its variants, to name a few.

4. Local development organizations should encourage and facilitate possibilities for social workers in local development organizations to document their experiences; and local researchers should organize these experiences systematically in order to create local models that could be used in social work education in the local universities.

Concluding Remarks

The first UNDP report in 1990 emphasized, “People are the real wealth of a nation” (UNDP, 1990). This emphasis on people was largely adopted by NGOs, where people were perceived not only as beneficiaries of economic and social progress, but also as agents of development (UNDP, 2002). In the UNDP’s report of 2002, this emphasis was broadened to include participation at the heart of human development strategies, and to expand the scope of human development to include not only education and health, but to include more capabilities important in expanding human choices (Human Development Report, 2002). Twelve years have passed, and still the gap between the rhetoric and the practice is wide.
Each form of participation that Stiefel & Wolfe (1994) addressed - one that serves a system maintenance function and the second that serves a transformative function - yields different results for people regarding issues of power and knowledge. This research study, which is an attempt to examine the definitions of people’s participation according to respondents from donor NGOs and their Palestinian partners, sheds some light on the actual practices of participation. To some extent, donor NGOs appeared to conceptualize participation as transformative, an aspect extensively emphasized in the literature, while respondents of the local organizations operationalized this approach in a more limited way to express what it means for them in practice. This study suggests that if people do participate, which is still not clear how, they do so in already established projects, but rarely have a say the way projects are implemented or are rarely involved in the decision making processes regarding what project is to be implemented. This suggests that if people have no access to power in designing their own projects, they become even further disempowered by “participation,” as it could be used against them. How many more years do we need to wait to more closely fulfill this vision: “People should be in the heart of the development process.”
ENDNOTES

1 Estimates put the Palestinian population at approximately 6.6 million in 1995 (United Nations Relief and Works Agency, 2000). In 1995, UNRWA data showed some 3,172,641 registered refugees in its "area of operation" (West Bank, Gaza, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon), plus an estimated 335,000 non-registered "displaced persons" (UNRWA, 1995). According to the UNRWA’s figures, the total number of registered refugees as of 31 March 2003 is 647,919 in the West Bank and 901,092 in Gaza Strip (UNRWA, 2003).

2 Intifada is the Arabic word for the Palestinian uprising, literally meaning the "rising up and shaking off". The first Intifada took place from 1987-1993 as an uprising of the Palestinian people in the West Bank and Gaza-Strip against the Israeli occupation (Jerusalem and Media Communication Center, 1992).

3 For example the mobilization of the different sectors such as women, students, workers…etc. to resist the occupation (Hammami, 1995; Nimer, 1997 & Taraki, 1989).

4 The majority of NGO projects have become very dependent on these funding sources, and it was clear that without international donor funding, these professional development-oriented organizations would have very little ability to survive.

5 The peace treaty between the PLO Palestinian Liberation organization- and the Israeli government, agreeing on the aim of achieving peace between the two parties (Jerusalem Media and Communication Center, 1997).

6 This debate concerning the government organizations (GOs) critique of foreign aid to NGOs was waged not only in Palestine, but also in many developing countries (Monje, 1995). Monje on his study of the Bolivian’s NGOs addressed the same issue.

7 Donors from around the world who used to support local Palestinian NGOs started to re-direct their funds and pour money into the Palestinian Authority with the intention to foster Palestinian administrative infrastructure and economic and social development, a role that NGOs had traditionally been performing.
The situation became more of a concern to the Palestinian NGOs when the PNA decided in 1994 to form a committee of five ministries, called the Interim Ministerial Steering Committee, with the goal of coordinating NGO activities and the regulations surrounding them. The aim of this committee was to formulate the PNA public policy towards NGOs (PNA special reports, 1998). NGO officials naturally regarded the establishment of such a committee as an unfavorable development. As a result, NGOs started to voice concern over their future status. The main issue for the NGOs was their fear of losing independence, which would possibly have lead to a loss of their claimed distinguished identity (Betz, 1995). For some, it was an issue of control over their organizations, and for many others it concerned their freedom to access international funds, being of crucial importance to their ability to continue their work.

In the summer of 1995, there were at least six foreign organizations sponsoring activities on democracy and citizenship, and more than twenty Palestinian NGOs carrying out related programs (Hammami, 1995). It is estimated that over thirty local and foreign agencies carry out projects related to providing credits (Farraj, 1995).

There are different estimates on the number of NGOs in all their various forms. Some put the number at close to one thousand; foreign NGOs carrying out activities in the 1967 occupied territories put the number at the hundreds, including over 130 European NGOs and over 40 NGOs from North America (Samara, 2001).

Thomas Kuhn—the father of paradigms—speaks of paradigms as schools of thought in the natural and social sciences, as different ways of looking at the same phenomenon. For him, a paradigm also provides models that include coherent “traditions”, such as acceptable laws, theories and applications that have attained consensus from peer practitioners of science (1970). On the other hand, the terms paradigm and model are usually used interchangeably (Ary; Jacobs; & Razavieh, 1996). Models are analogies that provide conceptual schemes, which attempt to explain the relationships of variables under consideration (ibid.).

Based on this, it was assumed that if the developing countries satisfy the conditions of economic growth, many of social needs of would be met. Moreover, this approach argues that despite the initial inequality that could result, the growth benefits would supposedly either trickle down to the poor masses, or government would be able to take corrective welfare measures to assure greater social equity (Heller, 1986). An implicit assumption underlying this point of view in development theory and practice has been that the desired socially beneficial effects, such as improved living standards, would automatically evolve from enhanced economic growth (Jayasuriya, 1997). As a result, development in the developing countries was perceived through the lens of economic growth, particularly through their countries’ GNP (Gross National Product).

Escobar, (1992) asserted that with Truman’s 1949 declaration, ‘underdevelopment’ began. In addition, by using the word underdevelopment in this context, Truman converted two billion citizens of the developing world into underdeveloped people. In this context, Escobar commented as follows on the consequences of this declaration on the people in the developing countries: “In a real sense, from that time on, they ceased being what they were, in all their diversity, and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others’ reality: a mirror that belittles them and sends them off to the end of the queue, a mirror that defines their identity, which is really that of a heterogeneous and diverse majority, simply in the terms of a homogenizing and narrow minority” (1992, p. 7).
This trickle down effect has been recognized as the illusion of those economists who strongly advocated the idea of the primacy of the economic factor over all other factors in development (for example Rostow, 1964).

The dream of achieving a trickle-down effect to the poor masses when economic growth is pursued has not been fulfilled. Moreover, the development policies and experiments undertaken by ‘Third World’ countries proved to be devastating. The majority of the population in the developing countries has stagnated and become mired in a poverty trap (Frank, 1986).

Since dependency is understood to be caused by external conditions, it can be traced throughout the history of capitalism from the sixteenth century to the present - in the form of dependence imposed from the outside; as the most important obstacle to national development and beyond the domain of the national economy and beyond indigenous control (So, 1990). Dos Santos (1971) tried to define what dependence means. He concluded that there are three historical forms of dependence, the first two are colonial and financial-industrial dependence, and the third is technological-industrial dependence.

The disconnection between economic growth and social progress has been referred to as “distorted development” (Midgley, 1995). Midgley (1995) defined distorted development as the phenomenon that exists in societies where economic development has not been accompanied by a concomitant level of social development. He argued, along with many others, that the distorted development problem is not the absence of economic development but rather is a failure to harmonize economic and social development objectives.

Human Needs Approach emerged as a result of the increasing awareness of the social dimensions of development; that development is not only about economic growth, but also about the quality of life and social change, so that purposeful efforts should be undertaken to understand social and human welfare as related to development goals (Midgley, 1995).

Sen has in particular stressed the significance of mortality when considering the position of groups suffering discrimination on grounds of caste, race or gender (Atkinson, 1999).

In 1975, the UN’s Economic and Social Council recommended in its report of the 24th Session that “governments should adopt popular participation as a basic policy measure in national development strategy” and should “encourage the widest possible active participation of all individuals and national non-governmental organizations, such as trade unions, youth and women’s organizations, in the development process in setting goals, formulating policies and implementing plans.” (as cited in Uphoff, Cohen, & Goldsmith, 1979).

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is an action research that is considered to be a strategy for using scientific methods to solve practical problems in a way that contribute to general social science theory and knowledge. It is conducted with or alongside people whose lives will be affected. From problem identification to action to evaluation, the formal researcher and the other participants share decision-making. Participation in the inquiry process helps assure that decisions based on research are relevant to the cultural conditions of the people who are presumed to benefit. PAR maximizes people’s involvement in knowledge building on behalf of their development. People affected by proposed change should contribute to defining needs and be consulted in determining appropriate action (Fals Borda, 1988; & Hall, 1981)
22 Paulo Freire, a famous Brazilian educator who attained international importance, in the early 1970s. Freire’s work aimed at raising the consciousness of the poor in order to change their oppressed reality.

23 In this regard, Chambers (1995) has identified three families of approaches illustrating the more widespread changes: 1) The huge amount of literature in agricultural research and extension testifying to the greater participation of farmers, and the spread of different approaches to research and practice in this field such as: farmer participatory research, participatory technology development, and farmer-first approaches. 2) The approaches, which developed the participatory management of local natural resources, have spread to different countries such as India and elsewhere, where local people and governments manage forests jointly. 3) Several streams of approaches and methods - applied social anthropology, agro ecosystem analysis, farming systems research, participatory research (much of based on the work of Paulo Freire), and rapid rural appraisal leading to participatory rural appraisal -are examples of a shift from outsiders’ data collection to local empowerment as the dominant mode.

24 SARAR is based on an acronym based on five attributes, which the approach seeks to build: self-esteem, associative strength, resourcefulness, action planning and responsibility (World Bank, 1996).

25 It is important to clarify the notion of NGOs. The term NGO is not very helpful as a starting point for an analytical discussion, since it is an umbrella term covering a wide range of organizations from household names such as Oxfam to small agricultural organizations in any developing country (Lane, 1995). As their name indicates, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are any of those organizations not part of a government and not been established as a result of an agreement between governments (Padron, 1987). NGOs can be research institutions, professional associations, trade unions, chambers of commerce, youth organizations, religious institutions, senior citizens’ associations, tourist bodies, private foundations, political parties, funding or development-international and indigenous – agencies, and any other organization of a non-governmental nature (United Nations, 1980). On the other hand, governmental organizations (GOs) are those organizations or agencies part of a government, and established as part of the government structure. For the purposes of this study, I will confine our consideration of NGOs to a subset of these organizations, namely one form of NGOs devoted specifically to the design, study and/or execution of social development programs and projects in the developing countries. In particular, I will focus primarily on the experience of a group of ‘international Northern NGOs’, which are concerned with Palestinian development issues and which deal with local Palestinian partners.

26 The focus of relief aid is on short-term assistance in the form of shelter, food, medicine and clothing donations, addressing the symptoms of poverty rather than its causes. In contrast, the focus of development aid is on long-term support programs, which aim at improving infrastructure, technical skills, income, and local self-help institutional capacities (Heller, 1986).
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APPENDIX A

FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD SOLICITATION LETTERS TO DIRECTORS OF NORTHERN NGOS
October 21, 2002

Director
(Name and address of the organization)

Dear director,

My name is Eman AbuSa'da, a social worker and a doctoral student at the Ohio State University. I am currently working with Dr. Maria Julia on my doctoral dissertation about beneficiaries' participation in NGOs' social development projects. As a Palestinian social worker, I worked for eight years before starting my doctoral education for a West-Bank NGO that was funded and sponsored by an international NGO. During that time, I noticed that there seemed to be little consensus regarding the definition and measures of beneficiary participation in social development projects. Yet, participation is often required by funders. I am very interested in learning more about how NGOs define participation and how beneficiaries participate in social development projects.

To this end, my study explores the definitions and practice of participation from the viewpoint of the policy makers or/and administrators of Northern Non-governmental Organizations who fund or/and administrate social development projects in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip. Because these experts are likely to have direct knowledge of the ways in which participation occurs in social development projects, their opinions and examples are the focus of the study.

Your organization has been chosen for this research study because of your valuable work in conducting or funding projects in the Palestinian West-Bank and Gaza Strip. The names and the addresses of the NGOs selected, were obtained from the "Directory of Non-governmental Organizations in Donor Countries Assisting the Palestinian People in the West Bank and Gaza Strip", designed and developed by the UNSCO in 1997. By participating in this study, you and/or your staff will help shape a broader understanding of the concept of beneficiary participation in social development. This knowledge will be helpful to social workers that work in social development projects to improve the lives of those living in poverty.

To participate in this study, one person from your management staff who is regarded as expert on ‘beneficiary participation in social development’ will be asked to complete a series of three questionnaires. The first questionnaire, which consists of an open-ended questions will take approximately 45 minutes to complete and consists of general questions about how you or your staff define the concept beneficiary participation in social development projects and about the ways beneficiaries participate in your organizations' social development projects. The second and third questionnaires will
take approximately 30 minutes to complete. These last two questionnaires will consist of itemized questions that will be based on the answers to the first one. The questionnaires will be as e-mail attachments and the responses will be completed via e-mail as well. We expect that the process will begin in October 2002 and that all three rounds of questions will be completed by December, 2002.

For research purposes, all participants to complete the questionnaires must meet the following criteria. They must have worked with your NGO for at least a year, be considered by the administration of the organization a representative of the organization, be regarded by the administration within your organization as an “expert” in the area of beneficiaries’ participation, have had experiences with beneficiaries’ participation in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip social development projects, and be knowledgeable of your organization’s policy and procedures regarding the issue of beneficiaries’ participation.

Information provided will be kept confidential. That means that the respondents’ information will be used in research papers but her/his name will not be used and there will be no way to identify any specific participant or project. To ensure confidentiality, a number will be assigned to each participant. This number will be used on all printed material, which will be kept in a locked cabinet. All electronic communications will be printed and the electronic message will be deleted from the researcher’s files. Use of questionnaires will be restricted to this research. Participant contact information will not be released to a third party. Please know that: participation is completely voluntary; you and/or your employee may stop participation at any time without any consequences for you, your employee, or/and for your organization; you and/or your employee have the right to refuse to answer any specific question; and all information obtained through these questionnaires will be kept completely confidential. No names or identifying references will be used in any written or verbal report or any published account of the study. Data will be kept in a locked box in a secure location, to which only the researchers will have access.

Your participation in this research study is very important to its success. If you are willing to participate in this study, please provide a list of one recommended name for responding to the questionnaires and his/her contact information to me via e-mail at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de by October 31st, 2002. I have provided my e-mail address as my preferred means of communication but I can also be reached by phone or mail as provided below. Please feel free to nominate yourself for participation if you meet the criteria. I will contact the person on your list and solicit his/her participation in the study.

Also, I will be happy to share with you the results of the research study upon its completion. Please let me know if you would like to receive a copy of the study report. Also, please do not hesitate to contact me at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de or at the address/phone number below for any questions. For more general information about human participation in research at the Ohio State University, you can also contact the Campus Institutional Review Board office at 614/292-6950 or at kelsey.18@osu.edu.
This study will hopefully shed light on a controversial and important issue in social development. I hope you agree with us about the importance of this project and will take a few minutes to send an email to me with contact information about potential participant. By sending an e-mail with the recommended staff member, you are giving consent for your organization to participate in this study. Thank you in advance for your assistance with this important project!

Sincerely,

Signed: ____________________________
Maria Julia, PhD, Professor
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)

Signed: ____________________________
Eman Abu Sa’d, PhD Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Co-Principal Investigator)

Contact information:
Eman Abu Sa’d, PhD Candidate
Anna Schmitz-Str-28
50321 Brühl
Germany
Tel-49/2232/411197
E-mail:  Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de

Dr. Maria Julia,
College of Social Work,
The Ohio State University
300 Stillman Hall
1947 College Road
Columbus, OH 43210, USA
Tel-1614/292-6288
E-mail: Julia.1@osu.edu
Dear director,

More than a week ago a letter asking for your participation in a study that explores the definitions and practices of participation from the viewpoint of the policy makers or/and administrators of Northern Non-governmental Organizations who fund or/and administer social development projects in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip was faxed to you. Your organization has been chosen for this research study because of your valuable work in conducting or funding projects in the Palestinian West-Bank and Gaza Strip. The names and the addresses of the NGOs selected, were obtained from the “Directory of Non-governmental Organizations in Donor Countries Assisting the Palestinian People in the West Bank and Gaza Strip”, designed and developed by the UNSCO in 1997. Because these experts are likely to have direct knowledge of the ways in which participation occurs in social development projects, their opinions and examples are the focus of the study.

If you have already considered participation and you need more time to select the person to participate please accept our sincere thanks, and please do send me an e-mail at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de clarifying your intent to participate. If not, please do consider participating. Because the letters have been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of Northern NGOs it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of Northern NGOs. We do believe that your organization would have a valuable contribution to this research project. By participating in this study, you and/or your staff will help shape a broader understanding of the concept of beneficiary participation in social development. This knowledge will be helpful to social workers that work in social development projects to improve the lives of those living in poverty.

If by some chance you did not receive the letter, or it was misplaced, please e-mail me right now at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de and I will get another one to you today.

Sincerely,

Signed: _________________________             Signed:__________________________

Maria Julia, PhD, Professor              Eman AbuSa’da, PhD Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)               (Co-Principal Investigator)
November 13, 2002

Director
(Name and address of the organizations)

Dear director,

Again I contact you regarding my research study. The role that your organization plays in the field of development makes it hard to settle for not including you in this important research study. Your organization has been chosen for this research study because of your valuable work in conducting or funding projects in the Palestinian West-Bank and Gaza Strip. The study explores the definitions and practices of participation from the viewpoint of the policy makers or/and administrators of Northern Non-governmental Organizations who fund or/and administrate social development projects in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip.

Because the letters have been sent to only a small, but representative, sample of Northern NGOs it is extremely important that yours also be included in the study if the results are to accurately represent the opinions of Northern NGOs.

I urge you to consider participation in this research project. It is our hope that you will respond to this letter positively.

If by some chance you did not receive the original letter that explains the research study, or it was misplaced, please e-mail me right now at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de and I will get another one to you today. If you for any reasons have decided not to participate, please e-mail me at the previous e-mail so I don’t contact you again.

Thank you for your consideration, it is so much appreciated!

Sincerely,

Signed:

Maria Julia, PhD, Professor
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)

Signed:

Eman AbuSa’da, PhD Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Co-investigator)
APPENDIX B

SOLICITATION LETTER TO THE CHOSEN PANEL OF DELPHI FROM NORTHERN NGOS
November 18, 2002

Name and address of the participant provided

Dear Mrs/Mr (Name provided),

My name is Eman AbuSa’da, a social worker and a doctoral student at the Ohio State University. I am currently working with Dr. Maria Julia on my doctoral dissertation about beneficiaries’ participation in NGOs’ social development projects. As a Palestinian social worker, I worked for eight years before starting my doctoral education for a West-Bank NGO that was funded and sponsored by an international NGO. During that time, I noticed that there seemed to be little consensus regarding the definition and measures of beneficiary participation in social development projects. Yet, participation is often required by funders. I am very interested in learning more about how NGOs define participation and how beneficiaries participate in social development projects.

To this end, my study explores the definitions and practice of participation from the view point of the policy makers or/and administrators of Northern Non-governmental Organizations who fund or/and administrate social development projects in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip. Because these experts are likely to have direct knowledge of the ways in which participation occurs in social development projects, their opinions and examples are the focus of the study.

Your organization has been chosen for this research study because of your valuable work in conducting or funding projects in the Palestinian West-Bank and Gaza Strip. The names and the addresses of the NGOs selected, were obtained from the “Directory of Non-governmental Organizations in Donor Countries Assisting the Palestinian People in the West Bank and Gaza Strip”, designed and developed by the UNSCO in 1997. By participating in this study, you and/or your staff will help shape a broader understanding of the concept of beneficiary participation in social development. This knowledge will be helpful to social workers who work in social development projects to improve the lives of those living in poverty.

Your name was provided by your organization’s director, as an expert on ‘beneficiary participation in social development projects’ in your organization. For research purposes, all participants to complete the questionnaires must be selected according to a criteria. You have been chosen because you meet the following criteria

- You have worked with your NGO for at least a year,
- you are considered by the director of your organization as representative of the organization,
- you are regarded by the director within your organization as an “expert” in the area of beneficiaries’ participation,
• you have had experiences with beneficiaries’ participation in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip social development projects, and
• you are knowledgeable of your organization’s policy and procedures regarding the issue of beneficiaries’ participation.

You will be one of a group of experts from other Northern NGOs from USA and Europe who will be asked to complete a series of three questionnaires. The first questionnaire, which consists of an open-ended questions will take approximately 45 minutes to complete and consists of general questions about how each expert define the concept beneficiary participation in social development projects and about the ways beneficiaries participate in your organization’s social development projects. The second and third questionnaires will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. These last two questionnaires will consist of itemized questionnaires that will be based on the answers to the first one. The questionnaires will be as e-mail attachments and the responses will be completed via e-mail as well. We expect that the process will begin in November 2002 and that all three rounds of questions will be completed by January, 2002.

Information provided will be kept confidential. That means that the respondents’ information will be used in research papers but your name will not be used and there will be no way to identify any specific participant or project. To ensure confidentiality, a number will be assigned to each participant. This number will be used on all printed material, which will be kept in a locked cabinet. All electronic communications will be printed and the electronic message will be deleted from the researcher’s files. Use of questionnaires will be restricted to this research. Participant contact information will not be released to a third party.

Please know that:
• participation is completely voluntary;
• you may stop participation at any time without any consequences for you or/and for your organization;
• You have the right to refuse to answer any specific question; and
• all information obtained through these questionnaires will be kept completely confidential. No names or identifying references will be used in any written or verbal report or any published account of the study. Data will be kept in a locked box in a secure location, to which only the researchers will have access.

Your participation in this research study is very important to its success. To participate in this study, please answer the attached open-ended questions and return to me via email by November 26th, 2002. I have provided my email address below as my preferred means of communication but I can also be reached by phone or mail.

If you choose not to participate in this study, or if you think you don’t meet the qualification for participation, please send me e-mail at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de so I don’t contact you any further.

Also, I will be happy to share with you the results of the research study upon its completion. Please let me know if you would like to receive a copy of the study report. Also, please do not hesitate to contact me at Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de or at the address/phone number below for any questions. For more general information about human participation in research at the Ohio State University, you can also contact the Campus Institutional Review Board office at 614/292-6950 or at kelsey.18@osu.edu.
This study will hopefully shed light on a controversial and important issue in social development. I hope you agree with us about the importance of this project and will take a few minutes to answer the attached questions. By completing and returning the attached questions, you are giving consent to participate in this study. Thank you in advance for your assistance with this important project!

Sincerely,

Signed:

Maria Julia, PhD, Professor
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Principal Investigator)

Signed:

Eman AbuSa’da, PhD Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
(Co-Principal Investigator)

Contact information:
Eman Abu Sa’da, PhD Candidate
Anna Schmitz-Str-28
50321 Brühl
Germany
Tel-49/2232/411197
E-mail: Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de

Dr. Maria Julia,
College of Social Work,
The Ohio State University
300 Stillman Hall
1947 College Road
Columbus, OH 43210, USA
Tel-1614/292-6288
E-mail: Julia.1@osu.edu
APPENDIX C

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE RESPONDENTS FROM NORTHERN NGOS
Open-ended Questionnaire to the NGOs’ Panel of Experts

The aim of this open-format questionnaire is to solicit as much as possible your ideas, thoughts and opinions regarding the concept of ‘beneficiaries’ participation’ in social development projects. Please elaborate as much as you need. Please type the answer of each question after the question and send back as attachment to the researcher at: Eman-AbuSada@t-online.de

I Questions on Conceptualization

1. The concept of "People's participation" (i.e. people who are the targeted beneficiaries) has been receiving increasing attention in the literature on social and economic development. There appear to be differences in the ways various experts define the concept "people's participation". How do you, as an expert in social development, define the concept "people's participation"?

2. The literature talks about various potential benefits of people's participation in social development projects. Based on your experience, what, if any, are some of the benefits you see to having people participate in social and economic development projects. (Please list all of the benefits you can think of; if you cannot think of any benefits, just say "not applicable")

3. The literature talks about potential liabilities or problems of having people participate in the economic and social development process. According to your experience, what, if any, are the potential problems that could occur with people's participation. (Please list all of the problems you can think of (if you cannot think of any problems, just write "not applicable")

II Questions on Application and Evaluation

1. What (if any) are the kinds of development activities in which people's participation may be useful and/or beneficial? (Please list all the activities you can think of. if you cannot think of any activities, just write "not applicable")?

2. What (if any) are the kinds of development activities in which people's participation is not useful or even problematic? (Please list all the activities you can think of, if you cannot think of any problems, just write "not applicable")?

3. What (if any) are the criteria that your organization as donor NGO use that allow you to evaluate the activities of people’s participation in the projects?
4 If you think that participation is essential to the success of the projects’ goals, in what ways does participation influence the direction of the projects (Please list all the ways you think are applicable).

5 If you think that participation is not essential to the success of the projects’ goals, what other factors you think essential to the success of the projects. (Please think of all the factors that are applicable).

III Questions on the Palestinian Context

The literature talks about how a particular social, cultural, political, and economic context influences the direction of participation initiatives in social and economic development projects. Based on your organization’s development projects in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip

1 What are the conditions in Palestine that facilitate People’s participation in the development projects? (Please list all the conditions you can think of, if you cannot think of any conditions, just write ‘not applicable).

2 What are the conditions in Palestine that hinders People’s participation in the development projects? (Please list all the conditions you can think of, if you cannot think of any conditions, just write ‘not applicable).
APPENDIX D

SOLICITATION LETTER TO THE RESPONDENTS FROM NORTHERN NGOs IN THE SECOND-ROUND DELPHI
March 24, 2003

Dear Panel Member (Name of Participant),

First of all I would like to thank you for staying with us from the start of this research project! The development of the second questionnaire has taken more time then has been expected, the reason is that your answers to the open-ended questionnaire have been so comprehensive and thick in information. Nevertheless, the second itemized questionnaire is here.

Your answers in the first questionnaire have been clustered and categorized along with other participants’ answers, at the end; items were developed. Please remember that this second questionnaire is the product of your answers along with other participants’ to the first questionnaire. The questionnaire is now in your hands to fill and to comment on it.

Please don’t let the number of pages scares you, and makes you delay to answer this itemized questionnaire, even though it seems to be long, but it is easy to fill, since it is an itemized questionnaire which you need just to check the appropriate rating, which doesn’t suppose to take that much time from you, it is expected to take not more then 35-40 minutes to fill.

The questionnaire is divided into eight major questions and each question has different numbers of items that you need to rate. Please highlight the number of your ratings in each question with another colour, which allows me to figure your answer to each item. At the end of each question a space is provided for you to comment, clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise any questions if you need. Another space is provided to add items that you think should be added under any specific question.

You are part of a group of 13 international NGOs from all over the world who responded to the first questionnaire. As a member of this international panel you are contributing in defining the concept of peoples’ participation in the praxis of international donor NGOs, therefore, staying with us at this second phase is very crucial and important for the success of this project. In order for this research process to move along quicker then before, I would so much appreciate if you are able to answer the questionnaire and send back to me by April 4th, 2003.

Again I would like to stress that I so much recognize and appreciate your efforts in this research project. Also I would double assure you that a final report at the end of this research project will be developed exclusively to those organizations who are participating in the research, this report will be send to you as a gratitude and thank you for your participation in the research project.

Please accept my gratitude and many thanks for your efforts and commitment!

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Eman AbuSa’da, PhD Candidate
College of Social Work, Ohio State University
APPENDIX E

THE SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE (THE SECOND-ROUND DELPHI) TO THE RESPONDENTS FROM NGOS
1. Definitions and conceptualisations of participation.

- For the following items, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements that most represent your beliefs about what is participation. Your answer ranges from "1" strongly disagree to "5" strongly agree.
- Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Agreement (For each item circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Participation is an ongoing process which entails the full involvement of the beneficiaries in all phases of social development project - needs assessment, decision making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and follow up.

2. Participation mostly is the involvement of the beneficiaries in only two phases of the project cycle: needs assessment phase and implementation phase.

3. Participation is a collaborative way to exchange ideas with the community during project identification and design phase (mainly in needs assessment phase) to make sure that that the needs of the community are taken into consideration.

4. Participation is a consultation process where the staff of the organization consults as they see appropriate with the beneficiaries group and exchange information to choose the appropriate approach for the particular task in hand.

5. Members of the organisation consult with the organisation’s target groups in a way that organisation’s constituency informs practices and policy.

6. Participation is a one-way consultation process in which the organization incorporates beneficiaries’ feedback during the identification of needs and the implementation phase and follow up.

7. Participation means community involvement in a practical level and it is manifested in the voluntary involvement of the beneficiaries in the project and, as far as possible, their financial contributions.

8. Participation entails comprehensive empowerment process (meaning political, economical, social and cultural empowerment) of the people/beneficiaries concerned and involved in the development through not only their active role and full participation in all stages of a development project, but also linked to the broader social power relations and dynamics that should be challenged.
9. Participation ensures the integration of indigenous and scientific or professional knowledge through gathering direct information on projects’ priorities, needs, and concerns from the beneficiaries.

10. The empowerment goal of participation makes it critical to differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social stratification, age and ethnicity to increase the representation of the marginalized sectors.

11. The empowerment goal of participation includes the process of empowering beneficiaries to be included as a part of a given social development project that is to be implemented or evaluated.

12. The empowerment goal of participation makes it critical that projects adopt practices that ensure protection of the vulnerable, the most marginalized and the poorest of the poor.

13. In empowering people practices should be deliberately directed toward increasing their awareness of their realities and the disadvantaged structures within which they exist and also to increase their ability to participate.

14. The quality of communication and the relationship between staff and the target group during project preparation set the tone for and have effects on the levels of subsequent participation especially in project implementation.

15. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…

16. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on.
2. How to ensure success of participation.

1. For the following items, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements that most represent your beliefs about how to ensure the success of participation. Your answer ranges from "1" strongly disagree to "5" strongly agree.

2. Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end of the question for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

Level of Agreement
(For each item circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To facilitate "People's participation", and to ensure success of participation in the social development projects:

1. It is the duty of the organizations to provide an organizational and technical assistance to the communities to enhance their ability to participate.

2. It is the duty of the workers in the social and economic development field to help raise people’s awareness about their rights and responsibilities.

3. A special attention should be paid by the staff of the project in order to avoid open confrontations with the predominant traditional values, which might constraint participation.

4. The local staff has to be capable of openly discussing issues in order to identify appropriate strategies and interventions to promote the acceptance and involvement of the whole community.

5. It is absolutely necessary that local staff acquire the capability to better examine how the imbalance in social power between men and women affects relationships between the two sexes and influence women’s participation.

6. Success of participation is manifested when beneficiaries and communities have the awareness about their rights and what they entail for them as human beings and how to claim them.

7. In order for projects to be successful and sustainable, they must be fully geared to the desires wishes, interests, needs and capabilities of the target group.

8. The projects that considered participatory are those that people create and adopt and voluntarily invest energy, time, and efforts on them with the aim of strengthening their community.

9. The term that your organisation mostly like to use to refer to people who are targeted for services, please circle…
   a. Target groups
   b. Beneficiaries
   c. Stakeholders
   d. Participants
   e. Constituency
   f. People
   g. Other, please specify: __________________
10. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

11. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…
3. Potential benefits of people's participation in social development projects.

1. For the following items, please circle the number corresponding to your ratings. The ratings range from "1" - Almost never true to "5" - Almost always true. The statements represent potential benefits of people’s participation in social development projects.

2. Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood (For each item circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost never True</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

People participation in social and economic development projects:

1. Is essential and key to the success of any social development project.
   
2. Is essential from an ethical point of view.
   
3. Ensures and facilitates long-term sustainability and lasting impact (socio-cultural, financially and economically, and institutionally) of the project.
   
4. Makes people feel that they have a stake in the project so they develop the necessary commitment to its continuation to last beyond the phase of donor’s support and its development.
   
5. Assures the appropriateness/relevance and sensitivity of the project to the communities’ locally identified and real needs and assets.
   
6. Promotes sense of ownership of and responsibility toward the project.
   
7. Promotes dignity: people feel that they are owners of the project rather than recipients of aid.
   
8. Promotes a spirit of voluntarism and local fundraising.
   
9. Promotes independency of (international) funds.
   
10. Empower people: Allows people to gain influence and control over issues of their immediate concern and for their own social and economic development.
    
11. Facilitates the possibilities for the beneficiaries to know their rights and how to claim them.
    
12. Draws attention to internal societal structures of power and inequalities (status of marginalized and weak social groups such as women, children, other religious and/or ethnic groups, etc.) and offers a forum to negotiate and challenge these inequalities.
    
13. Increases the likelihood that the most marginalized or vulnerable sectors of the society are reached and benefited: Through making their specific needs visible, their integration into the development process is facilitated.
    
For each item circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost never True</th>
<th>Usually not true</th>
<th>Occasionally true</th>
<th>Usually True</th>
<th>Almost always True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Promotes effectiveness in and ensures improved implementation mechanisms.

16. Ensures better management of the project through making informed decisions and guiding toward better alternatives.

17. Guarantee the achievements of the desired results (both qualitative and quantitative).

18. Allows a continuous feedback from the people.

19. Facilitates better time-management: When people are involved from an early stage in the lifetime of the project, little or no changes are required in the implementation phase, so effectiveness in meeting the time frame, schedule and work plan is expected.

20. Participation is cost effective-Budget wise-

21. Makes it possible to overcome crisis or problems that face the project.

22. Increases the community’s confidence in their own ability to come up with creative solutions to their own problems.

23. Increases peoples’ trust in the work of NGOs.

24. Introduces new techniques.

25. Integrates local knowledge and capacities of the communities into the projects.

26. Re-enforce concepts of accountability, internal financial transparency and democratic practices within the organizations.

27. Facilities accessibility to the communities and ensures their acceptance and support for the project during its implementation.


29. Facilitates co-ordination with other providers in the same field during the identification phase for a new project that leads to consider similar existing services by other providers which warns against duplication of services.

30. Improves co-operation among different sectors of the society which helps to overcome cultural/social barriers and ensures increased social cohesion and objectives’ sharing.

31. Develop the capacities and the skills of the communities vis-à-vis the NGOs and the governmental level.

32. Increases awareness of diversity issues within the organisation and its projects.
33. Increases awareness and knowledge of the communities in issues related to their concerns.

34. Building up the skills of the people to be able to have a tangible contribution to their community.

35. Increases the possibility of facilitated access to quality services.

36. Increases future capacities: Participation might contribute on the long term to building awareness about democracy and participatory processes within the organization and/or the society.

37. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

38. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…
4. Potential Problems or liabilities of peoples’ participation in social development projects.

1. For the following items, please circle the number corresponding to your ratings. The rating ranges from ”1”- Almost never true to ”5”- Almost always true. The statements represent potential problems of people’s participation in social development projects.

2. Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(For each item circle one)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost never True</th>
<th>Usually not true</th>
<th>Occasionally true</th>
<th>Usually True</th>
<th>Almost always True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Definitely no potential liabilities or problems of having people participate in the economic and social development projects.

2. Problems only arise when the process is not managed properly.

3. Problems may arise when organization’s staff lacks of understanding of participatory approaches, ways of working, and the implications of it.

4. Problems arise when the staff of the organization gives only ‘tokenism’ about the importance of participation without implementing its requirements.

5. Problems arise when the organisation is unable to follow through on the momentum generated during the participation process.

6. Participation of people in problem identification and needs assessment phase may raise or create high expectations, which may not be feasible to satisfy.

7. When the project does not meet peoples’ expectations, they might get frustrated and lose interest in the process, which damages potential future participation.

8. Political goals of the participants and power struggle within the project can distort and affect the project in a negative way.

9. People might be incorporated onto the projects that are co-ordinated by professional NGOs, in a way that the staff could guide their own initiatives and their own independence without recognizing it.

10. Participation may produce conflictual relations among different beneficiary groups, which might create divisions within the community.

11. Unresolved issues in the communities might jeopardize the success of the project especially in small communities.
12. When the roles of the different stakeholders are not clearly defined that result in confusion and overlapping of responsibility.

13. Inability to reach consensus within the community.

14. When the repressive social structures in the society are reproduced within the project, participation may create a problem of representation (who participates representing what group).

15. If the repressive social structures are being reproduced in the project, participation might favor certain people who have the capacity to be involved and often little attempts are directed to overcome these structures to ensure the inclusion of certain groups/individuals.

16. Some individuals/groups might believe that they gain power so they attempt to influence, monopolize and dominate the discussion and the direction of the project to fit their own private interests, rather than the community.

17. Difficulty in the decision making process may lead to less efficiency in project management and delays in project implementation: Increased time and energy are believed to be required when a large range of people are given the possibility to analyse their own situation, express their wishes and needs, and agree on the types of action to be taken.

18. The process of participation may become a problem if there are deadlines for getting funding for the project.

19. Participation could be less ‘efficient’ regarding output per time: Time consumed might be increased in a participative process.

20. Implementing organizations might fear of losing control over decision-making process.

21. Implementing organizations might fear unfavourable actions that could be taken in the project as a result of participation.

22. There might be fear of reproduction of existing knowledge at the expense of new or scientific knowledge.

23. Project goals may be subject to local political or religious influences that do not correspond anymore to the donor/ NGOs’ intentions.

24. If the NGO’s and donors’ perception of what are needed contradict those of the community, NGOs could face a problem in accepting the change in their own plans.

25. The recommended project by the community might not fit very well within the strategic objectives of the country: Sometimes project could be problematic if there is no proper coordination with the appropriate authorities and ministries.
26. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

27. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…
5. **The criteria that is used by your organization as a donor NGO to evaluate the activities of peoples’ participation in the projects.**

1. For the following items, please indicate the frequency of use. Please circle the number corresponding to your ratings. The ratings range from "1"- "Never" to "5"- "Always". The statements represent the criteria that as donor NGO you use to evaluate the activities of peoples’ participation in the projects.

2. Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end of the question for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

---

**Frequency**

(For each item circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>About half of the time</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. We do not have any written criteria to evaluate people’s participation in the projects.

2. Despite lack of written criteria to evaluate activities of participation we still monitor and evaluate people’s participation through different informal procedures.

Some of these informal procedures we use:

3. Monitoring activities through informal and evaluation missions from our staff to visit sites of projects to assess the practices of peoples’ participation in different activities: The attendance of the target community to the project activities is assessed, both in terms of quality and quantity.

4. Asking direct questions (in informal meeting setting with project’s staff) about the methodologies and participatory approaches they deploy in project implementation and management.

5. We don’t evaluate “the activities of peoples’ participation” as a separate activity but we expect that the partners organisations we support, to function according to democratic principles and use participatory mechanisms throughout all stages of their projects.

Within this framework participation is evaluated and assessed:

6. As part of our general monitoring and assessing interventions of the projects, which allows us to monitor the way, these democratic values are embedded in these organisations’ own internal practices and strategies.

7. As part of the formal evaluations of the projects.

8. Based on the work of the monitoring and evaluation missions of experts with technical expertise who are sent to evaluate projects in general, participatory methodologies are being also assessed.

9. Based on partners’ organizations description of the participation of beneficiaries: The way peoples’ participation during planning, monitoring and evaluation stages is described in the projects’ documents and reports.

10. Based on field visits to and meetings with the beneficiaries.
11. Beneficiaries' satisfaction surveys.

12. We have a criteria that our organisation uses systematically to allow us to evaluate the level of people’s participation in our partners organizations’ projects

Within this framework participation is evaluated and assessed:

13. Regular quarter or/and annual reports of local partners about the projects.

14. Studies and analysis of the participatory methods in the project’s activities (before, ongoing and after the project implementation (both qualitative and quantitative).

15. Analysis of surveys that are completed by a random sample of beneficiaries from the community.

16. Community satisfaction surveys that measure the level of satisfaction of people from their participation.

17. Monitoring and technical assistance missions.

18. Assessing the degree that the organization considers gender aspects in its projects.

19. Evaluating the representation of different groups (less advantaged, such as women, specific groups etc.), and assessing the representation of the target group in councils, boards, and committees or/and member organizations.

20. Monitoring membership and whether a transparent and democratic general assembly exits, where members can be chosen to become a member of the board.

21. Constant and open communication with various beneficiary groups: Through field visits to the beneficiaries.

22. The level of contribution (cash, efforts labour, land, and/or timesheets) of the community to the project.

23. Checks and balances within the organisation: The degree to which the organisation follows its own guidelines; the way in which the organisation organises its planning, monitoring and evaluation phases; the way "beneficiaries" participate in each of these phases; and the way in which the activities are organised.

24. Internal structures of democracy and participative process within the organization.
25. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

26. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…
6. **Application and Evaluation: Development activities that participation may be useful and/or beneficial.**

- For the following items, please indicate the level of importance of participation in the different stages and activities in development projects. Please circle the number corresponding to your ratings. The ratings range from “1” - Unimportant to “5” - Very important. *The statements represent development activities which peoples’ participation may be useful and/or beneficial.*
- Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end of the question for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>(For each item circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>Of little Importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Very Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation of the beneficiaries and their involvement in and influence of:**

**I. The planning and needs assessment phase of the project:**

1. Generating ideas for the project
   - 1 2 3 4 5
2. Identification of the local needs: formulation of options and alternatives.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
3. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
4. Prioritizing the local needs.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
5. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
6. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community: Selection of beneficiaries.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
7. Project design: strategy and policy formulation for the project.
   - 1 2 3 4 5

**II. Implementation phase of the project:**

8. Identification of the direction for the project.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
9. Involvement in administration and coordination of project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.
   - 1 2 3 4 5
10. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
11. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
12. Controlling; monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.
    - 1 2 3 4 5
13. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project: Through provision of labor, cash and material goods and information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

14. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### III. Evaluation and monitoring phase and follow up of the project.

15. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

16. Assessing the success of activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Evaluation and follow up: The involvement of the community in follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

18. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

19. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…

1. For the following items, please indicate the level of importance for the following conditions that are related to the Palestinian context, which you think they facilitate peoples’ participation in the development projects. Please circle the number corresponding to your ratings. The rating ranges from “1”- Unimportant” to ”5”- “Very important”.

2. Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end of the question for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little Importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The availability of virant movement of local and international NGOs and other interest groups who work in the area of social development in the Palestinians areas

2. Proliferation of international donors who (some of them) foster participatory techniques.

3. Proliferation of international donors who have tradition in asking the communities about their needs.

4. Proliferation of international donors who respect the cultural issues and traditions.

5. On the other hand, people participation is facilitated by the capacity and clear direction of strong Palestinian partners organizations (implementing, local NGOs).

**These local NGOs have the following features:**

6. Are deeply rooted in the Palestinian community.

7. Have substantial experience in organising people at the grassroots level.

8. Have experiences in rights-based approaches in development

9. Have long and consolidated experience in implementing social development projects.

10. Represent valuable and trust-worthy partners.

11. Are strongly committed to the development of their community.

12. Aware of the importance of beneficiaries’ participation in the projects.

13. Have flexibility to undertake participatory methods in designing and implementing development projects.
14. Follow some participatory practices in their projects.

15. People have Familiarity with their work.

16. The staff of these local NGOs usually have the required training of identifying and understanding the needs of the marginalized groups (such as women, handicapped...etc.), and the ways of promoting their participation in the projects.

Factors that are related to the political conditions of the country:

17. The occupation of Palestine has made situations in the Palestinian areas so intolerable that communities have felt the need to be involved in doing whatever they could in order to help mitigate the effects of the occupation.

18. Political situation has made people more outspoken and demanding to achieve their rights.

19. Non-existing or weak governmental structures due to the specific political context of Palestine has created a need among people to search for alternatives to meet their own needs.

The political situation has facilitated participation in the following ways:

20. The Palestinian people never could rely on a government to provide them with the basic services, but they had to rely on themselves.

21. Unlike other Arabic countries-where donors try to promote the civil society-, Palestinians have had a vivid civil society which encompassed before Oslo not only social organisations such as the family, mosques, and churches but also trade unions and Palestinian non-governmental organisations, which played a key role in the political, social and economic life of the West Bank and Gaza Strip before any governmental structure was emerged.

22. Palestinian people have always ‘exercised’ a form of participation as a mean for struggle for surviving and against the occupation.

23. During the first ‘Intifada’, levels of popular participation in political and social action have increased dramatically through the popular committee structures, which has composed broader popular social movements.

24. Democratic principles and election of committees were widespread in the Palestinian society.

Factors related to the nature of the Palestinian society, which facilitates participation:

25. High educational level and high percentage of the Palestinian people who are educated that facilitates the mobilisation and integration of local resources and capacities.

26. High potential through well educated and committed leaders and members of society.
(For each item circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant 1</th>
<th>Of little Importance 2</th>
<th>Moderately important 3</th>
<th>Important 4</th>
<th>Very Important 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

27. The will of Palestinian people to be part of the decisions that affects their lives and their commitment to change.

28. Past experience of participation in decision making through political committees.

29. High levels of the peoples’ political awareness (awareness of problems, needs, and rights) of due to their specific political experiences, which facilitates the implementation of participatory approaches.

30. Personal interests in the projects and curiosity.

31. High degree of flexibility and coping-mechanisms (how to deal with uncertainties and the permanent crisis without having to turn to the leadership): People has learned to manage to survive without a capable leadership and in many instances with the help of NGOs.

32. Strong Palestinian civil society.

33. Growing sense of solidarity among the people against the external threat, due to the continuous political crisis.

34. High sense of pride and refusal to accept charity: Communities are still interested in solving their problems and are proud that they are able to find their own solutions.

35. Fair levels of women’s participation and presence of feminist organisations.

36. Good communication facilities.

37. Geographic proximity especially in Gaza

38. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

39. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…
7. **Questions on the Palestinian context: Conditions in Palestine that hinder and obstacle peoples’ participation in development projects.**

1. For the following items, please indicate the level of importance for the following conditions that are related to the Palestinian context, which you think they may hinder peoples’ participation in the development projects. Please circle the number corresponding to your ratings. The rating ranges from “1”- Unimportant” to ”5“- ”Very important”.

2. Comment on any items you wish. Feel free to ask questions, make clarifications or argue in favor or against items. A space is provided at the end of the question for your comments. Add items, which you believe, are important which are not included.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of importance</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little Importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### I. Conditions that are related to the current overall political situation of the Palestinians:

1. Ongoing conflict and Israeli occupation of the Palestinian areas
   - 1

### Which is exacerbated by the following conditions:

2. Israeli closure policy of Palestinian cities, towns and villages: curfews and checkpoints.
   - 1

### Which results in:

3. Hampering people’s physical access: Immobility and lack of access.
   - 1
4. Increasing of time of travelling.
   - 1
5. Irregular access due to daily changing roadblocks.
   - 1
6. Most of the time, difficulties in the ability to travel at all.
   - 1
7. Bad personal security conditions in moving from one site to another, which might endanger life.
   - 1
8. Deteriorating and a continuous difficult economic situation.
   - 1
9. Onset of poverty and un-employment due to closures which has influenced all aspects of life for the Palestinians.
   - 1
10. The destruction of the infra structure and house and property of the Palestinians.
    - 1

### The specific ways that these conditions have influenced promoting participatory approaches in the work of NGOs are:

11. The closure measures which are imposed by Israel forces limits mobility of both the project staff and the target groups, which hinders the organizations from carrying out the project’s activities.
    - 1
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(For each item circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little Importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Participants are not able to attend the activities due to limited freedom of movement.

13. Israeli policy of internal and intra-province closure increases the time for the project staff to reach the beneficiaries and reduces the number of follow-up visits, thus, activities sometimes are hard to implement.

14. Beneficiaries are afraid for their own safety so they prefer not to leave their houses or they are prevented from reaching the project’s location even within the same area.

15. The proximity of the projects to conflict areas endangers the staff of the project that faces difficulties such as damages to the cars and the impossibility to return to their homes due to checkpoints and roadblocks.

16. Damages to project sites and property.

17. The deteriorating political, socio-economic situation and the high rate of unemployment and the resulted high poverty rate has resulted in a deteriorating humanitarian crisis.

On the background of the raising poverty level and humanitarian crisis:

18. High percentages of Palestinian people have become dependent on humanitarian aid, as a result people have become ‘receivers’ of aid, with hardly any possibilities to influence decisions or participate.

19. The attention of many NGO’s is shifted from development to emergency oriented activities.

20. The priorities of people are changed to those of more immediate day-to-day survival needs.

21. People become preoccupied with the constant struggle for survival, to cover the basic immediate needs and problems, and to face and cope with the escalation of violence.

22. The difficult economic circumstances do not allow Partner-NGO to develop strategies for self-financing.

23. It is unfeasible to raise the subject of financial contribution of the beneficiaries for services as form of participation.

24. Long-term development perspectives were put to a secondary level, which has enforced a unilateral dependence on external support and donors.

25. A critical reflection and discussion of the current attitudes and understanding about the development concept and ‘peoples’ participation’ (vis-à-vis) the paternalistic ‘welfare concept’) is prevented or very difficult to talk about.

26. People have no time and energy for participation.

27. The relatively little amount of money available for development when compared to the need.
(For each item circle one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Of little Importance</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. In such a situation people’s participation becomes of no relevance to the donor agencies nor to the people themselves, and it is regarded a luxury.

29. The fear, despair, loss of security and hope and sense of lack of future that Palestinian people live instigate disempowerment.

II. Factors that are related to socio-cultural nature of the Palestinian society:

Till here.

30. The socio-cultural nature of the Palestinian society where social inequalities between men and women and patriarchy (male dominated society) exist: this include that key decisions in the family are commonly made by men and elderly which imposes constraints on women’s participation.

31. Social and cultural norm that encourages women to bear many children, and to be responsible alone for the household matters allowing little time for activities outside of the home.

32. Domestic physical and emotional violence against women in the family and the society where women suffer from its consequences such as high rates of anxiety, irregular sleep and difficulties in concentration and continuous sense of fear, which hinders women’s participation.

33. The ongoing poetical oppression and discrimination that the Palestinian society face as a whole may lead to ignore internal social inequalities and hierarchies that are difficult to challenge under the given circumstances (i.e. gender relations, differences between the various religious groups and secular people, dominance of family structures in public and political life, and a social gap between (camp) refugees and non refugees).

34. Some social, political and religious movements who in order to get the wide support of their constituencies promote in their social services a welfare orientation rather then a participatory empowering approaches.

35. The difficult current political circumstances of the Palestinians impose obstacles in opening a dialogue about different development concepts and the various meaning and understanding of people’s participation vis-à-vis the ‘welfare attitude’.

36. Power structures: Certain groups/individuals are excluded

37. Local population groups are controlled by local political fractions.

38. Fatalism attitude: ‘the world owes us’.
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III. **Factors that are related to NGOs themselves:**

39. The withdrawal and weakening of political parties and NGOs associated with them since OSLO: After 1993, there was a general withdrawal from political activism, thus political parties and the NGOs associated with them were not able to sustain the previous levels of popular engagement. On the other hand, more specific interest groups and NGOs with weak links to the grassroots were developed.

40. The professionalisms of NGOs: NGOs have become more dominated by well-educated middle-class professionals, while not denying the many positive achievements of this professionalism, this process also has led to a kind of alienation of the NGOs from their constituencies at the grassroots level.

41. NGOs professionally have taken over people’s interests and initiatives, so that people have become more dependent on those development NGOs.

42. Top-down management structure and top-down leadership traditions, charismatic leaders dominate organisations: Even many progressive NGOs, work for democracy and human rights, have very authoritative organisational structures and are built around known and charismatic personalities that do not allow much of participation by the members and the employees.

43. Authoritative structures and paternalistic attitudes of some NGO towards the beneficiary groups may hinder participation of different societal groups.

44. Paying lip service to participation: Some projects have conditions where people participate mainly in a contributitional way without ability to influence decisions related to the projects.

45. Bad experiences with some NGOs who raise hopes and aspirations and not meet those expectations, which hinder future participation.

46. Mistrust in the work of the NGOs that is usually related to previous bad experiences.

47. Lack of confidence in the quality of work of NGOs.

48. Lack of cooperation and coordination.

49. Competition over funds and political aims.

50. Lack of recognition of other that also might do a good job.

51. Lack of strategic thinking and planning.

52. Lack of professionalism among some groups implementing social development projects.

53. “Easy” donor money that needs to be spent quickly.

54. Increased focus on relief where people have expectations that aid will be provided.
55. Politicised aid, which impose conditions on the projects and limit wider participation.

56. Non-sufficient participation in planning, monitoring and evaluation where participation of the people is not always taken seriously.

57. Lack of membership organisations where people can participate widely.

58. Lack of information: Lack of independent media: Newspapers are not truly independent, nor truly critical about the donor community/NGO’s: NGO’s yearly reports to the donors and never to their consistencies.

59. Some Palestinian NGOs still face a serious problem with core values such as accountability, transparency and democracy.

60. The larger NGOs tend to be perceived as part of a privileged employment sector.

61. Grassroots and (relatively) small initiatives 'owned' by the community were often lost in competition for funds with the larger NGOs.

62. Your comments: please clarify, argue in favor or against any item and/or raise questions. Please state the number of the item you want to comment on:

63. Other items that are not mentioned that you think should be included: please add…
APPENDIX F

THE ENGLISH VERSION OF THE SOLICITATION LETTER AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE SOCIAL WORKERS FROM THE LOCAL NGOS PROJECTS
Dear Participant:

My name is Eman Abu Sa’da. I am a social worker and a doctoral student at The Ohio State University. Currently, I am working on my doctoral dissertation with Dr. Maria Julia. The topic of my dissertation is the concept of beneficiary participation in social development projects sponsored by Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs). This study explores the definitions of beneficiary participation from the viewpoint of policy makers or/and administrators of Northern NGOs who fund or/and administrate social development projects/programs in the West-Bank and Gaza Strip. In addition, it explores how local Palestinian NGO staff members perceive and practice beneficiary participation in their daily work.

For research purposes, all participants must be social workers who are working in the front line with beneficiaries and/or communities of NGO sponsored social development projects. If you fit this criterion, please consider participating in our study. If you do not fit this criterion, please let the researcher know and/or pass along this packet to a social worker at your agency. **By completing and returning the attached survey, you are providing consent to participate in this study.**

The attached survey consists of 112 questions in two sections and will take approximately 30-45 minutes to complete. The first section contains questions that are related to your definitions and beliefs about beneficiary participation in social development projects, as well as, the actual ways beneficiaries participate in your organization’s social development projects. The second section consists of general background questions about you and your organization.

Your information will be kept confidential. This means that your name and/or the name of your organization will never be used in any such research publications or presentations that may result from the study. Specific participant or project/program will not identifiable. **Regarding confidentiality, please know that:**

- Your participation is completely voluntary;
- You have the right to refuse to answer any specific question and/or to quit participation in this study at any time; and
- All information obtained through this survey will be kept completely confidential. Data will be kept in a locked box in a secure location, to which only the researchers will have access. A number will be assigned to identify each participant. No names or identifying references will be used in any written or verbal report or any published account of the study.

Your participation in this research study is very important to its success. This study will hopefully shed light on a controversial and important issue in social development. We hope you will take a few minutes now to answer the attached questions. **If you agree to participate in this study, please answer the attached questionnaire and return it to the person who gave it to you.** Thank you in advance for your assistance with this important project!

Sincerely,

Eman Abu Sa’da, MSW, PhD Candidate

Maria Julia, Professor
Beneficiary Participation in Social Development Projects: Definitions, Beliefs, and Practice

Section I

By circling the appropriate number to the statements below, please indicate the extent to which you BELIEVE that each of the following project/program activities is an IMPORTANT form of beneficiary participation in social development projects. For each item circle only ONE number. Your responses for questions 1-21 should be interpreted in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Of little Importance</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you believe that the following activities are important forms of beneficiary participation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Project design: policy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Project design: strategy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Identification of the direction for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Importance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of little Importance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Important</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Important</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do you believe that the following activities are important forms of beneficiary participation?</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Assessing the success of activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By circling the appropriate number to the statements below, please indicate to what extent beneficiaries of your project/program have ACTUALLY participated in each of the following activities.

For each item circle only ONE number. Your responses for questions 23-53 should be interpreted in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent do the beneficiaries of your program participate in the following activities?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Project design: policy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Project design: strategy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Identification of the direction for the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**To what extent do the beneficiaries of your program participate in the following activities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.  
36. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.  
37. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.  
38. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects.  
39. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects.  
40. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects.  
41. Resource contribution by the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information)  
42. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.  
43. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.  
44. Assessing the success of activities.  
45. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.  
46. Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.
For questions 47-112, please indicate by circling the appropriate number the degree to which you agree with the following statements about beneficiary participation. For each item circle only ONE answer. Your responses should be interpreted in the following manner:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what level you agree with the following statements?</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. Peoples’ participation in the life cycle of the project is an ongoing process.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Peoples’ participation is a short-term activity in the project that ends at some point while the project still goes on.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Peoples’ participation is voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Peoples’ participation in the projects is very important characteristic of the project that contributes to its success.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Peoples’ participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation of the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Peoples’ participation in its best forms is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Peoples’ participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Peoples’ participation in its best forms is collaborating between the beneficiaries and the staffs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Peoples’ participation in its best forms is making sure that during implementation of the project, the right decisions are being taken.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in identifying their needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Usually less time is needed for the project/program when community is involved in implementation of the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. We make it as a usual procedure to consult with our beneficiaries about what they think of the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what level you agree with the following statements? | Agreement |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59. A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in identifying their needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. A great deal of time is lost when community is involved in implementation of the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Beneficiaries are usually unclear about what they need.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. Staff members are more efficient in identifying the needs of the community than are members of the local community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Staff members are more efficient in identifying the services needed than are members of the local community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. When community is asked about their needs, most likely we will end up with a wish list that is not possible to meet.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. There is usually disagreement within the community on their priorities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Beneficiaries’ opinions are usually biased.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Beneficiaries’ opinions usually could not be taken seriously when evaluating the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. When planning for the project it is unrealistic to change the direction of the project based on the feedback from the local community or the target group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. It is not possible that the community members participate in equal partnership with the staff in setting the agenda for the project/program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. In the planning stage of the project we seek the community’s feedback and their opinions of the kind of services they need.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. We consider the situation of the marginalized groups in our practice.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided or No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To what level you agree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>I don’t see any importance in exchanging ideas with community members before designing a project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries are consulted in the planning phase of the project/program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries inform decisions of the project/program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries inform polices of the project/program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>It is rare that the beneficiaries inform practices of the project/program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Participation of beneficiaries in the decision-making in our project/programs is minimal.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>I don’t see any good argument behind the importance of the involvement of the beneficiaries in all stages of the project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Beneficiaries’ participation is essential for the success of the project/program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Our funding source/s determine our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>We have clear ideas as professional of what kind of projects to implement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>When it comes to decision-making, professional staff members make better decisions because of their experience and/or training.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>We try to increase participation of the marginalized groups (such as women) in the project.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>We hold regular meetings with the community to discuss the implementation of the projects with them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>We regularly change our practices based on beneficiaries’ feedback.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Agreement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided or No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>To what level you agree with the following statements?</strong></th>
<th><strong>Agreement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86. It is not very effective in terms of cost to regularly ask beneficiaries for their opinions of the projects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87. After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take some responsibility in the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88. After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take part in the activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89. We provide members of the community with information about the project at a late stage of planning for the projects.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90. There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in defining their problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91. There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in setting the agenda for the program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92. There is no way to make sure that community members participate in equal partnership with the professionals in developing solutions to address the problems.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93. There is no way to make sure that the community participate in equal partnership with the professionals in evaluating the actions taken.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94. If we held public meetings, we listen to beneficiaries’ opinions, but usually our staffs are the ones who lead the meeting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95. We invite clients’ opinion so as to consult with them, but staff usually makes the decisions regarding how to run the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96. We conduct beneficiaries’ attitude surveys to get opinions about the services we provide.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97. We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98. We differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social stratification, age, and ethnicity, to make sure that the marginalized are included.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided or No Opinion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**To what level you agree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>99. We hold public hearings and community meetings.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. We regularly hold focus group discussions to listen to the needs of community members/target groups.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101. The decisions in the project are a result of negotiation between community members and professionals in the organization.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102. Peoples’ participation in its best forms is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103. Peoples’ participation in its best forms is when beneficiaries volunteer with labour to the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104. Community members or the target group should have the power to demand implementing change in the direction of the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105. We are not trained enough to conduct participatory activities.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106. The administration in our organization doesn’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107. The donor organizations don’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108. There is no possibility that participation in a development project could lead to a comprehensive empowerment of the beneficiaries.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109. It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110. It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111. It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can demand change in the directions of their own choosing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112. It is a problem for us if the community takes over the project and can implement change in the directions of their own choosing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section II
General Information
Please answer all the following questions:

113. What is the name of your organization?
____________________________________________________________________

114. How many social workers are employed by your organization? __________
social workers

115. Source of funds of your organization (Please circle ALL that apply.)
   a) European NGOs
   b) American NGOs
   c) American government
   d) One or more European government
   e) One or more Islamic country
   f) Islamic funds or banks
   g) European Union (EU)
   h) United Nations (UN)
   i) Business
   j) Private and individual donations
   k) Local resources.
   l) Others, please specify: ______________________.

116. What are the types of services that your organization provides? (Please circle ALL that apply.)
   a) Community Intervention, please specify: ____________________________.
   b) Training, please specify: ________________________________________.
   c) Rehabilitation, please specify: ________________________________.
   d) Counseling, please specify: ________________________________.
   e) Other, please specify: ________________________________.

117. Who are the target groups for services in your organization? (Please circle ALL that apply.)
   a) Women
   b) Children
   c) Youth groups
   d) Disabled people
   e) Elderly
   f) Mentally Handicapped
   g) Local communities
   h) Families
   i) Others, please specify: ________________________________
118. What are the geographical area(s) that your services cover? (Please circle **ALL** that apply.)

   a) All West Bank
   b) All Gaza Strip
   c) Jenen area
   d) Nablus area
   e) Rammalla area
   f) Jerusalem area
   g) Bethlehem area
   h) Hebron Area
   i) Others, please specify: ______________________________________

119. Have you participated in any training within your organization that related to the topic beneficiary participation? (Please circle **ONE** answer.)

   1. Yes  
   2. No

If you answer **YES** to question 119, please answer questions 120, 121 & 122 below. If **NO**, please **SKIP** to question 123.

120. Please list the specific topic of the training and how often the training was provided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Topic</th>
<th>Number of times offered during the past fiscal year</th>
<th>Is this training part of the continuous supervision of the organization? Circle <strong>ONE</strong> answer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Yes 2) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Yes 2) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Yes 2) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Yes 2) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Yes 2) No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1) Yes 2) No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
121. In general, was the training helpful to your work? (Please circle ONE number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A little of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

122. In general, was the training related to your work? (Please circle ONE number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>A little of the time</th>
<th>Some of the time</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>All of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


123. Are you aware of any evaluation of beneficiary participation that was conducted by your organization donors? (Please circle ONE answer.)

1. Yes  2. No

124. Please define in your own words what is beneficiary’s participation in the projects/program:

_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________

125. What is your gender?

a) Female  

b) Male
126. What is your highest level of education?
   a) High School (Tawjihi):
      ______________________________________________
   b) Diploma degree, Field:
      ______________________________________________
   c) Bachelor degree, Field:
      ______________________________________________
   d) Masters degree, Field:
      ______________________________________________
   e) Ph.D. degree, Field:
      ______________________________________________

127. What is your current position in the organization?
     ______________________________________________

128. Are you responsible in your work for other people who report to you?
   a) Yes  b) No

129. If you answered YES to question #127, how many people report to you?
     ___________ people.

130. How many years have you been working in this organization? ________ years.

131. How many total years of experience do you have as a social worker? ________ years.
132. Are you in a position in your organization to influence rules and policies of the organization? (Please circle ONE number.)
   a) Yes                     b) No

133. Are you part of any administrative committees in your organization? (Please circle ONE number.)
   a) Yes                     b) No

134. If you answer question #132 YES, please state the responsibilities of these committees:
   a) __________________________________________________________
   b) __________________________________________________________
   c) __________________________________________________________
   d) __________________________________________________________
   e) __________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME AND ASSISTANCE!
APPENDIX G

THE ARABIC VERSION OF THE SOLICITATION LETTER AND THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO THE SOCIAL WORKERS FROM THE LOCAL NGOS PROJECTS
عزيزي المشارك/المشاركة:

إسمح لي أن أعرفك على نفسي، إسمى إيمان أبو سعدى وأعمل كتخصصية اجتماعية ومرشحة لشهادة الدكتوراه من جامعة أوهايو في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية. حالياً أقوم بإعداد بحث لختم متطلبات رسالة الدكتوراه تحت إشراف البروفيسورة ماريا جوليا حول موضوع مشاركة المتطوعين/المتقدمين/المنتديات المحلية في برامج ومشاريع الترجمة والخدمة الاجتماعية التي توفر أو تدار من قبل المؤسسات غير الحكومية.

هذه الدراسة تهدف للتعرف على أراء ومعتقدات الأشخاص/ات الاجتماعيين/ات حول مفهوم مشاركة المتطوعين/المتقدمين/المنتديات في برامج التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية والمدى الذي يشارك فيه المتطوعين/ات في هذه البرامج أو المشاريع.

لأغراض البحث فإن المشاركة/المشاركة عليه/ها أن يكون أخصائياً/اجتماعياً/essel/ العمل الأخصائيين/ات في برامج أو مشاريع التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية الذي توفر أو تشترك به مؤسسات غير الحكومية.

إذا كان هذا الشرط ينطبق على الرجاء أن تذكر/ي بالاشتراك في الدراسة، وإذا لا ينطبق هذا الشرط عليك فارجو أن تجري هذه الاستمارة إذا كان ينطبق على الرجاء أن تذكر/ي بالاشتراك في الدراسة.

تعد الدراسة المرفقة مكونة من 130 سؤالاً موزعة على أقسام، حيث أن الوقت المتوقع لتعبئتها هو من 30-40 دقيقة.

لا يكون من أصله تتعلق بآراء حول مفهوم مشاركة المتطوعين/المتقدمين/المنتديات المحلية في برامج ومشاريع التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية. كذلك في الطرق العملية التي يشارك فيها المتطوعين/المتقدمين/المنتديات المحلية في البرنامج أو المشروع الذي تعمل فيهما.

القسم الثاني يحتوي على معلومات عامة عنك وعن مؤسستك والمعلومات التي ستقدمها ستكون بالسيرة الذاتية. إذا كان أن اسمك واسم مؤسستك لن يستخدم مطلقاً في أي منشورات يمكن أن تنتج عن هذه الدراسة. كذلك ليس هناك داعي لذكر اسمك حيث ليس هناك وسيلة للتعرف على اسم أي مشارك/ة في هذه الدراسة فيما يتعلق بالسيرة الذاتية أن تعلم أي:-

1. مشاركتك في تطوعية بشكل كامل.
2. لديك الحق أن ترفض الإجبار عن أي سؤال أو أن توقف مشاركتك في أي وقت دون أي تبعات لذلك.
3. المعلومات التي ستقدم بها خلال هذا البحث ستتم حفظها بطريقة مغلقة وستكون فقط لأغراض البحث العلمي.

شكرك على مساعدتك الحيوية في هذا المشروع البحثي الهام.

مع الاحترام,

إيمان أبو سعدي

ماريا جوليا

Phone  614-292-6288
Columbus, OH  43210-1160
1947 College Road
Stillman Hall
College of Social Work
دراسة حول مفهوم المشاركة في التنمية والتطبيقات العملية لمشاركة وانخراط المنتفعين/المنظمات المحلية في برامج التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية

القسم الأول

مفهوم وأراء وتطبيقات عملية

الرجاء أن تضع دائرة حول الرقم الذي تراه مناسبًا للأسئلة من 1-23:

- الدائرة حول الرقم المناسب تعبر عن مدى التأكيد على أهمية مشاركة المنتفعين/المشروعات/المجتمعات المحلية في كل من النشاطات المختلفة لمشاريع وبرامج التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية.

- الرجاء أن تضع دائرة حول رقم واحد فقط في كل سؤال، حيث الأرقام من 1-5 تعبير عن الأتي:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مدى الأهمية</th>
<th>غير مهم على الإطلاق</th>
<th>مهم إلى حد ما</th>
<th>متاكدة / مهم</th>
<th>مهم جداً</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. بلورة أفكار لمشاريع وبرامج.
2. تحديد الاحتياجات المحلية من خلال إيجاد خيارات وبدائل.
3. تحديد أولويات الاحتياجات المحلية.
4. اتخاذ القرارات حول أفضل البدائل المتوفرة.
5. اختيار أحد المشاريع من جملة المشاريع المتوفرة.
6. تحديد الفئة المستهدفة الأكثر احتمالًا للخدمة في المجتمع.
7. اختيار المنتفعين/المتفعليات من الخدمة.
8. تحديد السياسات للمشروع/البرنامج.
9. تحديد استراتيجيات العمل للمشروع/البرنامج.
10. تحديد مسار المشروع/البرنامج.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>المدى</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>غير متأكد/غير محدد</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>المدى الادماني</td>
<td>إلى أي مدى تؤمل بين باهمية مشاركة المنتفعين/المتغطيات أو المجتمعات المحلية في النشاطات المختلفة التالية لمشاريع وبرامج التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>المشاركة في إدارة المشروع/البرنامج كأعضاء في هيئة استشارية أو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>المشاركة في تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج كأعضاء في هيئة استشارية أو</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>نشر معلومات في المجتمعات المحلية حول أهداف ونشاطات المشروع/البرنامج وحول عمل المؤسسة غير الحكومية لضمان تأدية الخدمة للذين يستحقونها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>مراقبة تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج وتاثيراته.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>الإشراف العام على تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج وتاثيراته.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>تقييم تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج وتاثيراته.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>مساهمة المنتفعين/المتغطيات أو المجتمعات المحلية من خلال التطور بالجهد والعمل أو المعلومات أو التبرع بالمال/الأرض للمشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>الإشراف على المشروع/البرنامج للتأكد من أنه يتبع الخطة المقررة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>تقييم تأثير المشروع/البرنامج على المجتمع.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>تقييم مدى نجاح نشاطات المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>اشتراك المنتفعين/المتغطيات أو المجتمعات المحلية في تقييم المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 22 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | اشتراك المنتفعين/المتغطيات أو المجتمعات المحلية في متابعة المشروع وضمان بقائه واستمراريه.
1. الرجاء وضع دائرة حول الرقم الذي تراه مناسباً للعبارات التالية من 24-46
2. الدائرة حول الرقم المناسب تعبر عن المدى الذي يشارك به أو شارك المنتفعين/المشتركون من النشاطات المختلفة للمشروع أو البرنامج الذي تعمل/ين به:
3. الرجاء أن تضع دائرة حول رقم واحد فقط في كل سؤال، حيث الأرقام من 1-5 تعبر عن الآتي:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مدى التكرار</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>كل الوقت</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>معظم الوقت</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>بعض الوقت</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>إطلاقاً</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

لأي مدى ينخرط المنتفعين/المشتركون من النشاطات المختلفة للمشروع أو البرنامج الذي تعمل/ين به:

24. بلورة أفكار لمشروع وبرنامج.
25. تحديد الاحتياجات المحلية من خلال أبعاد خيارات وبدائل.
26. تحديد أولويات الاحتياجات المحلية.
27. اتخاذ القرارات حول أفضل البدائل المتوفرة.
28. اختيار أحد المشاريع من جملة المشاريع المتاحة.
29. تحديد الفئة المستهدفة الأكثر احتياجًا للخدمة في المجتمع.
30. اختيار البدائل/المنتفعات من الخدمة.
31. تحديد السياسات المشروع/البرنامج.
32. تحديد استراتيجيات العمل للمشروع/البرنامج.
33. تحديد مسار المشروع/البرنامج.
34. المشاركة في إدارة المشروع / البرنامج كعضو في هيئة اقتصادية أو كصانوي قرار في المشروع/البرنامج.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مدى التكرار</th>
<th>لا يُ مدى يُ خرج المشاريع/المشتركة أو/و المجتمعات المحلية في النشاطات المختلفة التالية للمشروع أو البرنامج الذي تعمل بينه:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>المشاركة في تنسيق المشروع/البرنامج كأعضاء في هيئة/غيير التدريبي أو كصانعي قرار في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>نشر المعلومات في المجتمعات المحلية حول أهداف ونشاطات المشروع والبرنامج وعمل المؤسسة غير الحكومية لضمان تأديته الخدمة للذين يستحقونها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>ترويج طاقم المشروع/البرنامج ومعلومات حول المشاكل المحلية والعقبات التي تعرقل سير المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>الإشراف العام على تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج وتقييمه.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>تقييم تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج وتقييمه.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>مساهمة المشاريع/المشتركة أو المجتمعات المحلية من خلال التطبيق بالجهد والأعمال أو المعلومات أو البرامج بالأرض للمشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>الإشراف على المشروع/البرنامج للتأكد من أنه يتبع الخطوة المقررة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>تقييم تأثير المشروع/البرنامج على المجتمع.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>تقييم مدى نجاح نشاطات المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>اشتراع المشاريع/المشتركة أو المجتمعات المحلية في تقييم المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>إشتراع المشاريع/المشتركة أو المجتمعات المحلية في متابعة المشروع/البرنامج وضمان بقائه واستمراريه.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
الرجاء وضع دائرة حول الرقم الذي تراه مناسبًا للعبارات التالية من 47-112:
• الدائرة حول الرقم المناسب تعبر عن المدى الذي توافق/ين فيه مع العبارات التالية حول مشاركة المنتفعين/المجتمعات المحلية في برامج التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية.
• الرجاء أن تضع دائرة حول رقم واحد فقط لكل سؤال، حيث الأرقام من 1-5 تعبر عن الآتي:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مدى الموافقة</th>
<th>إلى أي مدى توافق/ين على العبارات التالية؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 موافق/ة بشدة</td>
<td>1. المشاركون المنتفعون في البرنامج/المشروع هو عملية مستمرةً ما دام المشروع مستمرًا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 موافق/ة</td>
<td>2. المشاركون المنتفعون في مشروع/البرنامج ينتهي بشدها بحدى المراحل بينما يستمر المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 موافق/ة</td>
<td>3. المشاركون المنتفعون في مشروع/البرنامج هم من خبراتهم التطوعية في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 موافق/ة</td>
<td>4. المشاركون المنتفعون في مشروع/البرنامج هي مهمة مشروع تساهل في نجاحه.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/ة</td>
<td>5. المشاركون المنتفعون في مشروع/البرنامج هو من خلالهم وجهدهم وعملهم أو عندما يشاركون مالياً في المشروع أثناء تنفيذه.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 موافق/ة</td>
<td>6. المشاركون المنتفعون/المجتمعات في المشروع/البرنامج هو عندما يتم تبادل الآراء بين طاقم المؤسسة والمجتمع المحلي خلال فترة تحديد الاحتياجات.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/ة بشدة</td>
<td>7. المشاركون المنتفعون/المجتمعات تضمن أن احتياجات المجتمع يتم أخذها بعين الاعتبار عند تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مدى الموافقة</th>
<th>إلى أي مدى توافق/بن على العبارات التالية؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 موافق/ة بشدة</td>
<td>1. أفضل شكل لمشاركة المنتفعين/المنتفعات هو في تعاونهم مع الطاقم أثناء تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 موافق/ة</td>
<td>2. أفضل شكل لمشاركة المنتفعين/المنتفعات هو قيامهم بالتأكد من أن القرارات المناسبة قد اتخذت أثناء تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 متناقضة</td>
<td>3. عندما ينخرط المجتمع المحلي في تحديد الاحتياجات أولويات العمل فانه يتم تنفيذ المشروع بوقت أقصر.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 غير موافق/ة</td>
<td>4. عندما ينخرط المجتمع المحلي في تنفيذ المشروع فانه يتم تنفيذ المشروع بوقت أقصر.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 بتأذا غير موافق/ة</td>
<td>5. أن استشارة المنتفعين/المنتفعات حول المشروع هو إجراء اعتيادي في برنامجنا.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. يتم إضافة الكثير من الوقت عندما يشارك المجتمع المحلي في تحديد احتياجاته.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. يتم إضافة الكثير من الوقت عندما يشارك المجتمع المحلي في تنفيذ المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. ليس هناك وضوح لدى المنتفعين/المنتفعات حول ما يحتاجونه.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. الطاقم المهني للمشروع/البرنامج أكثر كفاءة بتحديد احتياجات المجتمع من أعضاء المجتمع المحلي.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. الطاقم المهني للمشروع/البرنامج أكثر كفاءة بتحديد الخدمات المناسبة من أعضاء المجتمع المحلي.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مدى الموافقة</td>
<td>إلى أي مدى توافق/ين على العبارات التالية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 موافق/بشدة</td>
<td>64. عندما يتم سؤال المجتمع المحلي عن احتياجاته، إمكانية كبيرة أن نحصل على قائمة من الرغبات لا يمكن تحقيقها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 موافق/حايدة</td>
<td>65. لا يوجد عادة اتفاق بين أفراد المجتمع المحلي الواحد حول أولويات احتياجاتهم.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 موافق/غير موافق/بشدة</td>
<td>66. أراء المنتفعين في المشروع/البرنامج تكون في العادة متحيزة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 موافق/غير موافق /بشدة</td>
<td>67. لا يمكن أخذ أراء المنتفعين بجدية عند تقييم المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/غير موافق/بشتة</td>
<td>68. عند التخطيط لمشروع فإنني من غير الوفاقين أن يتم تغيير مسار المشروع المقرر اعتماداً على أراء المجتمع المحلي.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 غير موافق/洡</td>
<td>69. إنه من غير الممكن أن يشارك المجتمع المحلي بشريكة متكافئة مع طاقم المؤسسة في تحديد برنامج العمل للمشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 غير موافق/بشتة</td>
<td>70. أثناء التخطيط للمشروع فإنني نسعى لأخذ أراء المجتمع حول نوع الخدمات التي يحتاجونها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 غير موافق/بشتة</td>
<td>71. في عمليا نهتم بأوضاع الجماعات المهمشة في المجتمع.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 غير موافق/بشتة</td>
<td>72. لا أرى أهمية في تبادل الأراء مع المجتمع المحلي قبل تصميم البرنامج/المشروع.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مدى الموافقة</td>
<td>إلى أي مدى توافق/ين على العبارات التالية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا أرى سببا مقنعًا بين أهمية مشاركة المنتفعين/المنتقعتين في كل مراحل المشروع.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>لا أرى سببا مقنعًا بين أهمية مشاركة المنتفعين/المنتقعتين في كل مراحل المشروع.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>مشاركة المنتفعين هي عملية ضرورية للنجاح المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>للمشاريع/المشروع يمكن أن يكون نوعية الخدمات متعددة منذ البداية، لهذا فإن المنتفعين/المنتقعتين ليس لديهم الكثير ليقولوه.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>لدينا أفكار واضحة كمهنيين عن أفضل المشاريع الممكن تطبيقها.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

المشاكل المحتملة في الصحة عادة أفضل من المجتمع المحلي في اتخاذ القرار في المشروع بسبب الخبرة والتدريب الذي يتمتع بهما أفراده.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>مدى الموافقة</th>
<th>إلى أي مدى توافق بين العبارات التالية؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 موافق/بشدة</td>
<td>ليس من الممكن أن نضمن أن تكون مشاركة المتعينين/المنتقفين متكافئة مع مشاركة الطاقم المهني في المؤسسة في إيجاد حلول للمشاكل.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 موافق/بشكل محدود</td>
<td>ليس من الممكن أن نضمن أن تكون مشاركة المتعينين/المنتقفين متكافئة مع مشاركة الطاقم المهني في المؤسسة في تقييم النشاطات.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 موافق/بشكل محدود</td>
<td>إذا تم عقد اجتماعات عامة مع المجتمع المحلي، نصفي لأراء المنتقفين/المنتقفين، لكن الطاقم المهني الذي يقوم الاجتماعات في العادة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 موافق/غير موافق</td>
<td>ندعو المنتقفين/المنتقفين لطرح أرائهم ومقترحاتهم، لكن الطاقم المهني هو الذي يتخذ القرارات حول كيفية إدارة المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/غير موافق</td>
<td>نقوم بعمل دراسات لأخذ أرائهم المنتقفين حول الخدمات التي نقدمها.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/بشكل محدود</td>
<td>نحاول اعتماد خطط عمل في المشروع/البرنامج لحماية وتأمين احتياجات واهتمامات الفئات المهمشة.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/بشكل محدود</td>
<td>نقوم بتصنيف الفئات المستهدفة حسب معيار الجنس والخلفية الاجتماعية والاقتصادية والعمر، والعرق، والدين للتأكد أن الفئات المهمشة مخرطة في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 موافق/بشكل محدود</td>
<td>نعقد اجتماعات مستمرة مع المجتمع المحلي لسماع أرائهم.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مدى الموافقة</td>
<td>إلى أي مدى توافق/ ين على العبارة التالية؟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>(FOCUS GROUPS) (للإصغاء للاحتياجات المجتمع المحلي والفنان المستفيد.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>القرارات المتخذة في البرامج هي نتاج مفاوضات تم بين أعضاء المجتمع المحلي والطاقم المهني في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>أفضل شكل لمشاركة المنتفعين/المستحقات هو عندما يساهم المنتفعون/المستحقات مالياً في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>أفضل شكل لمشاركة المنتفعين/المستحقات هو عندما يساهم ويتطوع المنتفعون بعملهم في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>يجب أن تمنح الفرصة لأعضاء المجتمع المحلي أو الفئة المستهدفة للمطالبة بتغير مسار المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>ليس لدينا التدريب المناسب لعمل نشاطات تشرك المنتفعين/المستحقات في المشروع/البرنامج.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>إدارة المشروع/البرنامج في المؤسسة لا تعطي أي قيمة لأهمية انخراط المنتفعين/المستحقات في البرنامج غير كونهم في الطرف المتقى للخدمات.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>المؤسسات المانحة للمشروع/البرنامج لا تعطي أي قيمة لأهمية انخراط المنتفعين/المستحقات في البرنامج غير كونهم في الطرف المتقى للخدمات.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مدى الموافقة</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>موافق / بشدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>موافق / غير موافق</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>متفاقدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>غير موافق / غير موافق</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>بتأثر موافق / غير موافق</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

108. ليس من مسئوليتنا أن نتبني ممارسات تصب في زيادة قدرات ومكانيات المجتمعات المحلية للمشاركة في المشروع / البرنامج.

109. قد يكون مشكلة بالنسبة لنا إذا استلم المجتمع المحلي المشروع / البرنامج وكان لديه الإمكانيات المتطلبة لتنفيذ مسار المشروع / البرنامج حسب ما يرتونه مناسبًا.

110. قد يكون مشكلة بالنسبة لنا إذا استلم المجتمع المحلي المشروع / البرنامج وكان لديه الإمكانيات لتغييرات في مسار المشروع / البرنامج.

111. قد يكون مشكلة بالنسبة لنا إذا استلم المجتمع المحلي المشروع / البرنامج وكان لديه الإمكانيات لمثل هذه التغييرات في مسار المشروع / البرنامج حسب ما يرتونه مناسبًا.

112. قد يكون مشكلة بالنسبة لنا إذا استلم المجتمع المحلي المشروع / البرنامج وكان لديه الإمكانيات للتنفيذ تغييرات في مسار المشروع / البرنامج.
القسم الثاني
معلومات عامة

الرجاء الإجابة على كل الأسئلة التالية:

ما هو اسم مؤسستك/ برنامجك التي تعمل به؟

113. ما هو مصدر تمويل المؤسسة/ البرنامج؟ (الرجاء أن تضع دائرة حول كل الإجابة التي تتطابق على مؤسستك/ برنامجك.

1. مؤسسات غير حكومية أوروبية
2. مؤسسات غير حكومية أمريكية
3. الحكومة الأمريكية
4. بلد أو أكثر من الحكومات الأوروبية
5. بلد أو أكثر من البلاد الإسلامية
6. بنوك إسلامية
7. الاتحاد الأوروبي
8. الأمم المتحدة
9. القطاع الخاص
10. تبرعات فردية
11. مصادر محلية
12. مصادر أخرى، الرجاء أن تحدد إجابة

ما هو نوع الخدمات التي تقدمها مؤسستك/ برنامجك؟ (الرجاء أن تضع دائرة حول كل الإجابات التي تتطابق على مؤسستك/ برنامجك)

1. تدخل مجتمعي، حد رجاء
2. تدريب، حد رجاء
3. تأهيل، حد رجاء
4. ارشاد نفسي و/ أو اجتماعي، حد رجاء
5. خدمات أخرى، الرجاء أن تحدد طبيعتها

ما هي الفئة المستهدفة للخدمات في مؤسستك/ برنامجك؟ (الرجاء وضع دائرة حول كل الإجابات التي تتطابق على مؤسستك/ برنامجك)

1. نساء
2. أطفال
3. فئات شبابية
4. ذوي الاحتياجات الخاصة (اعاقة جسدية)
5. مسنين
6. ذوي الاحتياجات الخاصة (اعاقة عقلية)
7. مجتمعات محلية
8. عائلات
9. أي فئات أخرى، الرجاء أن تحددها

ما هي المناطق الجغرافية التي تغطيها خدمات مؤسستك/برنامجك؟ (الرجاء أن تضع دائرية حول كل الإجابات التي تنطبق على مؤسستك)

1. كافة مناطق الضفة الغربية
2. كافة مناطق قطاع غزة
3. منطقة جنين وضواحيها
4. منطقة نابلس وضواحيها
5. منطقة رام الله وضواحيها
6. منطقة القدس وضواحيها
7. منطقة بيت لحم وضواحيها
8. منطقة الخليل وضواحيها
9. مناطق أخرى، الرجاء أن تحددها

هل قمت بالإشراف على تدريب داخلي مؤسستك أو برنامجك أو خارجها له علاقة بموضوع مشاركة المتفقين/المتعينين والمعتمدين في برامج التنمية والخدمة الاجتماعية؟ (الرجاء الإجابة بنعم أو لا)

1. نعم
2. لا

إذا كانت أجابتك على سؤال 119 بنعم، فإن الإجابة الإجابة على الأسئلة 120، 121، 122 التالية، إذا كانت أجابتك لا فانقل فورا إلى سؤال 123

الرجاء أن تعدد المواضيع المحددة للتدريب، ومدى تكرار التدريب

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>موضوع التدريب:</th>
<th>عدد المرات التي يتم عقد التدريب خلال السنة السابقة:</th>
<th>هل كان التدريب جزء من عمل الإشراف في مؤسستك/برنامجك؟</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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بشكل عام هل كان التدريب مفيد لعمالك المباشر؟ (الرجاء أن تضع دارة حول إجابة واحدة فقط)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>كل الوقت</th>
<th>معظم الوقت</th>
<th>بعض الوقت</th>
<th>قليل من الوقت</th>
<th>بنيتا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

بشكل عام، هل كان التدريب له صلة مباشرة بعملك؟ (الرجاء أن تضع دارة حول إجابة واحدة فقط)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>كل الوقت</th>
<th>معظم الوقت</th>
<th>بعض الوقت</th>
<th>قليل من الوقت</th>
<th>بنيتا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

هل كان هناك أي تقييم من قبل الممولين تم فيه التقييم بشكل مباشر مدى مشاركة المنتفعين/المتلقين أو المجتمعات المحلية في مؤسستك/برنامجك؟ (الرجاء الإجابة بنعم أو لا)

1. نعم
2. لا

الرجاء أن تعرف حسب رأيك ما هي مشاركة المنتفعين/المنتقحين في البرنامج/المؤسسة؟

.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................
.................................................................

الجنس؟

1. ذكر
2. أنثى

ما هو تخصصك العلمي؟

1. توجيهي.
2. درجة دبلوم، التخصص...
3. درجة بكالوريوس، التخصص...
4. درجة ماجستير، التخصص...
5. درجة دكتوراه، التخصص...
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ما هي وظيفتك الحالية في المؤسسة؟

هل أنت مسؤول/ في عملك عن أشخاص آخرين يقومون بالرجوع إليك في عملهم؟ (الرجاء الإجابة بنعم أو لا)

(1) نعم 
(2) لا

إذا كانت إجابتك على سؤال 128 "نعم"، كم عدد الأشخاص الذين أنت مسؤول/ عنهم؟ شخص

كم عدد السنوات التي تعمل بها في هذه المؤسسة/البرنامج؟ سنوات

كم عدد سنوات الخبرة كأخصائي/ ئ اجتماعي/ ؟ سنوات

هل أنت في موقع في مؤسستك/برنامجك تؤثر بها في صنع القرارات والسياسات والقوانين؟ (الرجاء أن تجب بنعم أو لا)

(1) نعم 
(2) لا

هل أنت جزء من أي لجنة إدارية في مؤسستك/برنامجك؟ (الرجاء الإجابة بنعم أو لا)

(1) نعم 
(2) لا

إذا كانت إجابتك على سؤال 133 "نعم"، الرجاء أن تعدد مستويات هذه اللجنة/ اللجان؟

1
2
3
4
5

شكراً لك على مساعدتك القيمة
APPENDIX H

SPECIFIC DIRECTION, SPECIFICATION, AND PARAMETERS THAT WERE GIVEN TO THE FIELD TEST GROUP TO TEST THE CONTENT VALIDITY OF THE ARABIC VERSION OF THE INSTRUMENT
Specific direction, specification, and parameters to the field-test group
to help them make their judgment regarding content validity of the
research instrument.

Dear Sir, Madame,

You are asked to give your feedback on the research instrument. The aim is to establish
a content validity of the instrument. Please notice the following guidelines that should be
taken into your consideration while judging the instrument.

- Review the survey’s content and comment whether it includes everything it should and
does not include anything it shouldn’t. Please comment on the clarity of the instrument,
wording, thoroughness, ease of use, and appropriateness of the instrument
- Is the content of this instrument representative of the universe of the concept People’s
participation?
- Rate the instrument as a whole for appropriateness and relevance to the issue of People’s
participation. Give 1 to the instrument when it is most appropriate and 5 when it is less
appropriate.
- Review the items for relevance to and focus on the variables of interest.
- Rate each item for appropriateness and relevance to the issue of People’s participation.
Give 1 to the item when it is most appropriate and 5 when it is less appropriate.
- Please list any area that are pertinent to People’s participation but not covered in the
questionnaire.
- For the local panel, please comment on the language and cultural appropriateness.
APPENDIX I

APPROVAL FOR THE RESEARCH STUDY FROM THE “OFFICE OF RESEARCH RISKS PROTECTION” HUMAN SUBJECTS INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD OF THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
Research Involving Human Subjects

ACTION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

- Full Committee Review
- Expedited Review
- Original Review
- Continuing Review
- Amendment

With regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research protocol:

0280210 CONCEPTUALIZATIONS, DEFINITIONS, PRACTICES, AND ACTIVITIES OF PEOPLES’ PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF FUNDING NORTHERN NGOs AND THEIR LOCAL PALESTINIAN PARTNERS, Maria C. Julia, Eman Y. Abu-Sada, Social Work

THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES HUMAN SUBJECTS IRB HAS TAKEN THE FOLLOWING ACTION:

- Approved
- Disapproved
- Approved with conditions *(Conditions stated by the IRB have been met by the investigator and, therefore, the protocol is approved.)
- Waiver of written consent granted

- No procedural changes may be made without prior review and approval from the IRB.
- You are reminded that you must promptly report any problems to the IRB.
- You are also reminded that the identity of the research participants must be kept confidential.
- It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least three (3) years beyond the termination of the subject’s participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subjects IRB for the required retention period.

Date: October 4, 2002 Signed: [Signature]

(Chairperson)

HS-025B (Rev. 2/94)
RESEARCH PROTOCOL

02B021 CONCEPTUALIZATIONS, DEFINITIONS, PRACTICES, AND ACTIVITIES OF
PEOPLES' PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS FROM THE
VIEWPOINT OF FUNDING NORTHERN NGOs AND THEIR LOCAL PALESTINIAN
PARTNERS, Maria C. Julia, Eman Y. Abu-Sada, Social Work

was presented for review by the Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB to ensure proper protection of the rights and
welfare of the individuals involved with consideration of the methods used to obtain informed consent and the
justification of risks in terms of potential benefits to be gained, the IRB action was:

_____ APPROVED  _____ DEFERRED

X  APPROVED WITH  DISAPPROVED
    CONDITIONS  *

_____ NO REVIEW NECESSARY

* Research cannot begin until conditions have been met.

* CONDITIONS/COMMENTS:

Subjects were deemed NOT AT RISK and the protocol was unanimously APPROVED WITH THE
FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

NOTES:
1. The committee granted a waiver of written consent for this study in accordance with 45 CFR 46,
   section 46.116(d). The research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects. The rights
   and welfare of the subjects are protected. The first phase is conducted by e-mail. The second
   phase involves a questionnaire that is mailed. Subjects have the opportunity to choose whether
   they want to participate. The research could not reasonably be carried out without the waiver.

CONDITIONS:
1. Revise Appendix #2 (letter of presentation to NGO director or administrator) as follows, and
   provide a copy to the IRB.
   • Print the form on OSU departmental letterhead stationery.

2. Revise Appendix #3 (letter of presentation to participants) as follows, and provide a copy to the
   IRB.
   • Provide instructions for persons who do not wish to participate or those who do not think they
     meet the qualifications for participation.
   • Print the form on OSU departmental letterhead stationery.

See next page
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3. Provide assurance that you will submit a copy of the final version of the questionnaire for review before it is sent to directors in the West Bank and Gaza Strip. If the questionnaire will be administered in a language other than English, submit both an English language version and a version in the other language.

4. Provide assurance that you will submit a copy of the cover letter that you will send with the questionnaire, when it becomes available. If the letter will be written in a language other than English, provide both an English language version and a version in the other language. Print the letter on OSU departmental letterhead stationery.

If you agree to the above conditions, PLEASE SIGN THIS DOCUMENT IN THE SPACE PROVIDED BELOW AND RETURN THE DOCUMENT WITH ANY ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REQUESTED to the Behavioral and Social Sciences Institutional Review Board, 310 Research Foundation, 1960 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1053, within three weeks of the date shown at the top of the form. Upon such compliance, the approval form will be mailed to you.

Date: 10/11/02

10/11/2002

Signature of principal investigator and all co-investigators

Revised July 2001
Research Involving Human Subjects

ACTION OF THE INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

Full Committee Review  X  Expedited Review  X  Original Review
Continuing Review  Amendment

With regard to the employment of human subjects in the proposed research protocol

2002B0210 Conceptualizations, Definitions, Practices, And Activities Of People’s Participation In Social Development Projects From The Viewpoint Of Funding Northern Ngo’s And Their Palestinian Partners, Maria C. Julia, Eman Y. Abu-Sada, Social Work

the Behavioral and Social Sciences IRB has taken the following action:

X APPROVED

DISAPPROVED

APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS *
* Conditions stated by the IRB have been met by the investigator and, therefore, the protocol is APPROVED.

WAIVER OF WRITTEN CONSENT GRANTED

EXPEDITED REVIEW CATEGORY (When applicable)

- No procedural changes may be made without prior review and approval from the IRB.
- You are reminded that you must promptly report any problems to the IRB.
- You are also reminded that the identity of the research participants must be kept confidential.
- It is the responsibility of the principal investigator to retain a copy of each signed consent form for at least three (3) years beyond the termination of the subject’s participation in the proposed activity. Should the principal investigator leave the University, signed consent forms are to be transferred to the Human Subjects IRB for the required retention period.

Data: September 26, 2003  Signed: Thomas E. Nygren, Chair

HS-025B (Rev. 2/94)
APPENDIX J

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITIES OF PARTICIPATION -FACTOR LOADINGS-MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD EXTRACTION-ORTHOGONAL ROTATION: VARIMAX WITH KAISER NORMALIZATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation, Follow up and Sustainability</th>
<th>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Administration and Coordination</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project design: policy formulation for the project</td>
<td>.846</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project design: strategy formulation for the project</td>
<td>.906</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification of the direction for the project</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community</td>
<td>.514</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.524</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Generating ideas for the project</td>
<td>.602</td>
<td>.478</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Prioritizing the local needs</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Assessing the success of activities</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project</td>
<td>.642</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.587</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.799</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td></td>
<td>.322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR THE IMPORTANCE OF ACTIVITIES OF PARTICIPATION- FACTOR LOADINGS- PRINCIPAL COMPONENT EXTRATION- OBLIQUE ROTATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
<th>Needs Assessment Phase</th>
<th>Evaluation, Follow up</th>
<th>Beneficiaries’ Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Administration and coordination</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project design: policy formulation for the project</td>
<td>-.948</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project design: strategy formulation for the project.</td>
<td>-.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification of the direction for the project.</td>
<td>-.849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td>-.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>-.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.</td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>.622</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Assessing the success of activities.</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ACTUAL ACTIVITIES OF PARTICIPATION-FACTOR LOADINGS- MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD EXTRACTION-ORTHOGONAL ROTATION: VARIMAX WITH KAISER NORMALIZATION.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Beneficiaries’ Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Evaluation and Monitoring</th>
<th>Project Design and coordination</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Project design: policy formulation for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.654 .794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.516 .501 .648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.575 .615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identification of direction for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.696 .781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Project design: strategy formulation for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.820 .956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.391 .398 .361 .483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.620 .678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assessing the success of activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.420 .605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.856 .844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.635 .561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.511 .536 .685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.489 .614 .700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.477 .419 .558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives.</td>
<td>.432</td>
<td>.662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.678 .730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Generating ideas for the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.668 .633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.357 .265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.351 .219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.523 .440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ACTUAL ACTIVITIES OF PARTICIPATION MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD EXTRACTION WITH OBLIQUE ROTATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Project Design and coordination</th>
<th>Evaluation and Monitoring</th>
<th>Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Beneficiaries' Resource Contribution</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Formulating strategies for putting selected options into effect.</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Generating ideas for the project.</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Prioritizing the local needs.</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Making decisions about the best alternatives to follow.</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Identification of the local needs through formulation of options and alternatives</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Selection of beneficiaries.</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Identification of the target group mostly in need in the community.</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Disseminating information in the community about the aims and activities of the project and the NGO, to ensure that those in need are reached.</td>
<td>.315 .301</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluating the impact of the project on the community.</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Assessing the success of activities</td>
<td>.881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Evaluating the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Evaluation: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the evaluation of the project.</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Providing inside information for the staff of the project on local problems and constraints affecting the project.</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Monitoring that the project is following the planned design.</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Controlling the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Follow up: The involvement of the beneficiaries in the follow-up and ensuring sustainability of the project.</td>
<td>.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Resource contribution of the beneficiaries in the project (e.g. through provision of labor, cash, and material goods and information).</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Project design: strategy formulation for the project</td>
<td>-.988</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Identification of direction for the project</td>
<td>-.809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Project design: policy formulation for the project</td>
<td>-.724</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Involvement in administration of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards</td>
<td>-.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Monitoring the implementation of the project and its effects</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Involvement in coordination of the project as members of various project advisory or decision-making boards</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR DEFINITIONS OF PARTICIPATION-FACTOR LOADINGS-
MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD EXTRACTION –ORTHOGONAL ROTATION: VARIMAX
WITH KAISER NORMALIZATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
<th>Practical and Voluntary Needs Assessment</th>
<th>Ongoing process</th>
<th>Voluntary</th>
<th>Communal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to increase the capability of the communities to participate in the project.</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It is not our responsibility to adopt practices intended specifically to remove the obstacles that hinder beneficiaries from participation.</td>
<td>.731</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is no possibility that participation in a development project could lead to a comprehensive empowerment of the beneficiaries</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. People’s participation is manifested in its better form when beneficiaries provide practical contribution of labor, time, and effort or/and money/property during the implementation of the project.</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. People’s participation is voluntary involvement of the target groups in the project/program</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People’s participation in the projects is very important characteristic of the project that contributes to its success</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. People’s participation in its best form is making sure that during implementation of the project, the right decisions are being taken.</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People’s participation in the life cycle of the project is an ongoing process.</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. People’s participation best form is collaborating between beneficiaries and Staff.</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. People’s participation is to assure that the needs of the community are considered when implementing the project</td>
<td>.758</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People’s participation in its best form is about exchanging ideas between the staff and the community during needs assessment.</td>
<td>.578</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People’s participation is a short-term activity in the project that ends at some point while the project still goes on.</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries contribute financially to the project</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. People’s participation in its best form is when beneficiaries volunteer with labor to the project.</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX O

FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR PRACTICES OF PARTICIPATION-FACTOR LOADINGS-
MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD EXTRACTION-ORTHOGONAL ROTATION: VARIMAX WITH
KAISER NORMALIZATION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries inform practices of the project/programme</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries inform decisions of the project/programme.</td>
<td>.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries inform polices of the project/programme</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation of beneficiaries in the decision-making in our project/programmes is minimal.</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is rarely that the beneficiaries are consulted in the planning phase of the project/programme</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly hold focus group discussions to listen to the needs of community members/target groups</td>
<td>.930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hold public hearings and community meetings</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The decisions in the project are a result of negotiation between community members and professionals in the organization</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take some responsibility in the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.861</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After the organization defines the agenda, we try to convince the community to take part in the activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.690</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We provide members of the community with information about the project at a late stage of planning for the projects</td>
<td></td>
<td>.471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are not trained enough to conduct participatory activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.427</td>
<td>.402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we held public meetings, we listen to beneficiaries' opinions, but usually our staffs are the ones who lead the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We invite clients' opinion so as to consult with them, but staff usually makes the decisions regarding how to run the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We consider the situation of the marginalized groups in our practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.433</td>
<td></td>
<td>.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our funding source/s determine our services and the areas that we should work on from the beginning, so beneficiaries have not much say</td>
<td></td>
<td>338</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We try to increase participation of the marginalized groups (such as women) in the project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Communality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We hold regular meetings with the community to discuss the implementation of the projects with them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.402</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We regularly change our practices based on beneficiaries’ feedback.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td></td>
<td>.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We try to adopt practices in the projects that protect the needs and the interests of the vulnerable and the most marginalized, and the poorest of the poor.</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>-.423</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We conduct beneficiaries’ attitude surveys to get opinions about the services we provide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.751</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We differentiate the target groups by the criteria of gender, social stratification, age, and ethnicity, to make sure that the marginalized are included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.546</td>
<td></td>
<td>.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the planning stage of the project we seek the community’s feedback and their opinions of the kind of services they need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The donor organizations don’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.780</td>
<td></td>
<td>.746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administration in our organization doesn’t put any value on the need for the beneficiaries to be involved except as recipients of services</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.626</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We make it as a usual procedure to consult with our beneficiaries about what they think of the project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>