Chapter 1 : blog.quintoapp.com - CHCCDE - Support participative planning processes

Participatory Processes (PP) are specific methods employed to achieve active participation by all members of a group in a decision making process. The approach can be used for most issues and should give equal opportunities for everybody involved.

Learn how to use an approach that allows everyone who has a stake in the intervention to have a voice, either in person or by representation. What is a participatory approach to planning? What are the advantages of a participatory planning approach? What are the disadvantages of a participatory planning approach? What are the levels of participatory planning? When is participatory planning appropriate? When is participatory planning not appropriate? Who should be involved in a participatory planning process? What do you have to do to get a participatory planning process up and running? Often, when the story is told, it becomes clear that the well-intentioned professionals in charge had totally misunderstood or ignored some fundamental fact about the community or the target population. Since they assumed they knew what was needed, they planned the whole thing themselves When an organization decides to take on a community intervention - whether a full -fledged service program or a one-time campaign to accomplish one specific goal - it can often increase its chance of success by using a participatory planning process. In its simplest terms, a participatory approach is one in which everyone who has a stake in the intervention has a voice, either in person or by representation. Staff of the organization that will run it, members of the target population, community officials, interested citizens, and people from involved agencies, schools, and other institutions all should be invited to the table. The reality may often be quite different. The planning process may be a rubber stamp for ideas that have already been developed. In some of these situations, a participatory process can cause as many problems as never involving people at all. The important thing to remember here is the word participatory. Everyone actually gets to participate in the planning process, and has some role in decision-making. This is an extremely important point. Many low-income or minority individuals and groups feel that they have no voice in the society, that they are not listened to even when they are asked for their opinions. True participation means that everyone has a voice which must be acknowledged. All too often, low-income or minority members of a planning team or governing board are treated with reverse condescension, as if anything they say must be true and profound. A truly participatory process would include not only everyone being heard, but also everyone thrashing out ideas and goals, and wrestling with new concepts. In order for this to happen, those with less education and "status" often need extra support, both to learn the process and to believe that their opinions and ideas are important and worth stating. All of this takes time, but the rewards are great. Participation carries with it feelings of ownership, and builds a strong base for the intervention in the community. If people are integral to the planning of a community intervention, then that intervention will be theirs. They have a stake in it not only as its beneficiaries or staff or sponsors, but as its originators. It ensures that the intervention will have more credibility in all segments of the community because it was planned by a group representing all segments of the community. Bringing a broader range of people to the planning process provides access to a broader range of perspectives and ideas. A participatory planning approach avoids pitfalls caused by ignorance of the realities of the community or the target population. Long-time community members will know what has failed in the past, and why, and can keep the group from repeating past mistakes. It involves important players from the outset. It can provide an opportunity for often-disenfranchised groups to be heard, and teach the community that they have important things to say. It teaches skills which last far beyond the planning process, and can help to improve the community over the long term. People learn to run meetings, to analyze data, to construct strategic plans - in short, to become community resources and leaders. It can bring together and establish ties among community members who might normally have no contact. Such relationships - between low-income people and business leaders, for instance - are not only supportive of the intervention, but may help to create long-term relationships and break down barriers in the community. A participatory planning process builds trust, both between your organization and the community and among the individuals involved. This trust can serve as a foundation for future community development and community action. A participatory

planning process generally reflects the mission and goals of grass roots and community-based organizations. With its underpinnings of collaboration, inclusiveness, and empowerment, a participatory approach embodies the ideals that form the foundations of most grass roots and community-based organizations. It implies respect for everyone in the community, and thus sets a standard for community participation and empowerment that other organizations - and the community at large - may feel compelled to follow. Logically, a participatory planning approach should be effective. The fact that it includes the views and perspectives of everyone affected by the intervention should work to assure that all assets and needs are identified and addressed, and that unintended consequences are minimized. Finally, it does things the way they should be done. By empowering the community, and particularly the target population, rather than just superimposing its own ideas on a social structure that already exists, your organization can give substance to its ideals. In the final analysis, some level of participatory approach is almost always the most ethical way to plan a community intervention. A participatory process takes longer. A diverse group always takes longer to make decisions and come to conclusions than does an individual or small group. Members of the target population or the community may not agree with the "experts " about what is needed. Members of the target population and the community may not have important technical knowledge or experience, and may need to understand some theory or past practice in order to see what the organization is trying to do. Some may need new skills in order to participate fully in the planning process. The organization, on the other hand, may need to learn more about local culture, political issues, and community history in order to tailor the intervention to the community and avoid past errors. Handling this situation can take both tact and toughness. It may be difficult to assure that all the right people get to the table. Some key people may simply not want to participate. Factions in the community, a history of failed attempts at communication or at dealing with problems, ignorance of which groups or individuals are important, or just basic mistrust may complicate the task of creating a participatory planning process. Overcoming this barrier, however, can have profound positive consequences in the community over the long term. People have to maintain their commitment over time, remain civil while discussing issues about which they may have strong feelings, and be willing to compromise. A few misplaced words, or one or a small number of key people losing interest can upset the whole process. While these disadvantages present potential or real challenges to the success of a participatory planning process, overcoming them may tremendously increase the possibility of designing and carrying out an effective community intervention. There are a number of ways to consider participatory planning. As demonstrated in the discussion above of advantages and disadvantages, this kind of process always presents, even at best, a trade-off between efficiency and inclusiveness. Time pressure, the needs of the community, the skills and experience of those participating, and the nature of the intervention, among other factors, all help to dictate the actual shape of the planning process. So what are the possibilities? Just how participatory do you want to be? David Wilcox, in his excellent " Guide to Effective Participation ," sets out the following as a model of the different possible levels of participation: Information - The least you can do is tell people what is planned. Consultation - You offer a number of options and listen to the feedback you get. Acting together - Not only do different interests decide together what is best, but they form a partnership to carry it out. Supporting independent community initiatives - You help others do what they want - perhaps within a framework of grants, advice and support provided by the resource holder. Each of these levels may be appropriate in different circumstances, or with different groups, although only at "deciding together" and above do they really begin to be fully participatory in the sense that the term is used in this section. Information-only may be appropriate when: Being asked for an opinion and then ignored is much more insulting and infuriating than never being asked in the first place. Deciding together may be appropriate when: The trick is to balance participation and time restraints, and to try to use the highest level of participation possible under the circumstances. Acting together may be appropriate when: Forming such a relationship, even in circumstances where everyone truly desires it, is not a quick or easy task. It takes time, commitment both to the process and the end product the partnership , and the willingness to air and work through disagreements and philosophical differences. Supporting local initiatives may be appropriate when: There is a commitment to community empowerment The community has the desire and at least some of the tools to start and run a successful

intervention There is a commitment to provide training and support where needed Your organization can only provide support, or can only run an intervention for a short time As you try to determine what level of participation is right for your situation, consider this: A participatory planning process has the potential to become a charade meant only to convince the community that a participatory process is going on. An adult educator related a conversation with his father-in-law, who worked in a factory of one of the big Detroit automakers. The company had initiated Total Quality Management, and had reorganized the factory workers into teams. Each team included workers from each step in the car manufacturing process, and was meant to be responsible for the building of a whole car from start to finish. Furthermore, each team was supposed to be able to change its procedures to make them more efficient or easier, and thus to improve production through the knowledge and skill of team members. Knowing that his father-in-law was a longtime union activist and socialist, the younger man said, "That must be great. The workers actually have some control over production. There are also some general guidelines for when a participatory planning process may not be appropriate at all, including: A grant may have to be written immediately, for instance, or a situation - youth violence, perhaps - may have reached such crisis proportions that it must be addressed immediately. In such a circumstance, it may be possible to do some participatory planning after the fact, either to adjust the intervention before it begins, or to plan its next phase. When the target population is simply not interested in participating, and just wants the organization to take care of it. One goal may be to get them interested, but that may have to be part of the intervention, rather than part of the planning process. When there is no trust between your organization and the community. This may be because the organization is new and unproven, or because of past history. In the latter circumstance, it is important to reestablish trust, but it may not be possible to do this before the intervention needs to be planned. You may be talking about thousands of people, too many for an effective planning process.

Chapter 2 : Participatory Research Methods - Participate

Participative processes This is a resource file which supports the regular public program "areol" (action research and evaluation on line) offered twice a year beginning in mid-February and mid-July.

Participation is key to all successful democratic enterprises. One of the clearest definitions of democratic leadership comes from John Gastil. His article, "A Definition and Illustration of Democratic Leadership" for the Human Relations journal remains relevant to private industry and the free market. Gastil, a professor at Penn State University, has written extensively about jury selection and democratic participation in the deliberations process. His succinct definition of democratic leadership explains that it is conceptually distinct from positions of authority. Locke, a professor emeritus of leadership and motivation at the University of Maryland, offers an expanded definition of democratic leadership by adding participative to the equation. The key to letting subordinates take part in decision-making is to build mature teams with experienced and cooperative people. It empowers employees to have a strong hand in managing organizations. Based on interviews with business leaders and employees, Lewin, Lippitt and White concluded that the democratic leadership style was the most popular among subordinates. Successful democratic leaders differ from autocratic and laissez-faire leaders in two important ways. Unlike autocrats, democratic leaders expect people who report to them to have in-depth experience and to exhibit self-confidence. Unlike the laissez-faire style, which delegates authority to experts, democratic leaders are involved in the decision-making process. Organizations that incorporate the democratic style still need strong leaders who know how to avoid the pitfalls that can trip up collaborative teams when they lose their compass. Apple Apple was a successful company from to , before it almost failed in the mids. Then it became enormously successful again -- precisely because it faltered. In other words, Apple had a vision. Apple lost its vision. Apple regained its vision. In the mids Gateway, Microsoft, Sun Microsystems and other companies reportedly zeroed in on Apple as an acquisition target. Years later, many of those brands disappeared. Apple survived because Steve Jobs learned how to adapt. He hired other experienced leaders and entrusted them to excel. He let them make key decisions. Most of these presidents exhibited traits that reflected a variety of leadership styles. Unlike commanding troops during the American Revolution, Washington was notably democratic when guiding the U. He showed early signs of his democratic leadership style by appointing strong leaders to his staff. His decision not to serve a third term exemplified a democratic leader who knows when to pass the torch. As president, Jefferson was both an authoritarian and democratic leader. As primary author of the U. Declaration of Independence in , Jefferson left no ambiguity about his devotion to democracy: Often considered the epitome of a democratic leader, Lincoln was autocratic in his decisions throughout his presidency. Although his character and principles were democratic in nature, Lincoln was an autocratic leader as president out of necessity. The Civil War demanded decisiveness. Patton, Eisenhower was a strategist and consensus builder. A charismatic leader at heart, Kennedy displayed characteristics of laissez-faire and democratic leadership styles. In other cases, he showed autocratic leadership tendencies, such as his quick decisions during the Cuban Missile Crisis. He surrounded himself with some experienced staff, but he often deferred to inexperienced subordinates when acting authoritatively would have been a better choice. The participatory style works best with experts who know their jobs and carry out their responsibilities under minimal supervision. This is true for: Pharmaceutical companies have educated chemists who work well in collaborative teams on development projects. Such companies also require autocratic leaders who supervise subordinates in automated assembly-line operations. Hospitals and healthcare testing facilities call for a blend of leadership styles. Hospital administration â€" from personnel and accounting departments to facilities maintenance and insurance billing â€" requires autocratic leadership to ensure consistency and accountability. Many are startups with engineering and software development teams that work collaboratively under democratic leaders. In successful cases, these firms evolve from laissez-faire startups to democratic-led enterprises to mature autocratic companies. Companies that reflect democratic leadership principles Most successful companies evolve, and their leaders display a mix of leadership styles. Founders Sergey Brin and Larry Page developed their Internet search

engine while pursuing their doctorates at Stanford. After obtaining initial financing, they did something unusual. Brin and Page followed the advice of experienced entrepreneurs and hired Eric Schmidt to jump-start their company. A pioneer in the discovery and development of restriction enzymes to develop biological drugs, Genentech was started by Robert Swanson and Herbert Boyer. They faced competition for financial resources and talent when they launched the company in Recombinant DNA technology was a mystery to all but a few forward-looking biologists and chemists. William Mayo and his family, the hospital, healthcare and research facility attracts some of the most brilliant minds in the medical field because it gives them opportunities to work collaboratively among peers on democratic teams. When it launched, Amazon was known for selling books. It started as a laissez-faire company, with Jeff Bezos as final arbitrator of all key decisions. Today, Amazon sells everything imaginable, including cloud services and big data security storage. Amazon is necessarily autocratic because of its commitment to timely customer service. At its core, however, the company retains its democratic values among C-suite executives, division heads and project directors. The participatory leadership style is also well-suited for educational institutions with collaborative environments. She has also made fans of investors with smart divestitures and acquisitions, such as Tropicana, Quaker Oats and Gatorade. Now a professor at Harvard Business School, George says he felt hamstrung by the bureaucratic processes before joining Medtronic. A successful baseball pitcher before coaching, Lasorda bonded with his players. As manager of the Los Angeles Dodgers from to , Lasorda won two World Series championships, four National League pennants and eight division titles. Most managers would not have sent an injured batter to the plate against an ace pitcher. Gibson hit a home run and helped the Dodgers win the series. She has made the tough decisions expected of IBM CEOs, such as selling its profitable but slowing server business and reducing staff. IBM is partnering with healthcare companies, government enterprises and social media firms to leverage its strengths in cognitive computing. He has a reputation for seeking input from others on key decisions. Kent has an inclusive style that reflects his commitment to diversity. The New York-born executive is as committed to improving managerial processes and manufacturing efficiencies as he is to teamwork. As CEO, Kent built collaborative management teams to address slowing sales growth and tackled challenges from global competitors, reflecting a blend of autocratic and democratic styles. Democratic leaders seek participation from a wide range of people, including women. Many of them blended different leadership styles or evolved to adopt the characteristics of democratic leaders. Here are some quotations that reveal their devotion to democratic and participatory leadership: There has to be a business, and the business has to make sense. You do it because you have something meaningful that motivates you. Squeeze too hard and you kill it, not hard enough and it flies away. And also from the man who makes the same mistake twice. Twitter It should come as no surprise that a company devoted to instantaneously spreading the word about anything and everything in characters or less has a reputation for being collaborative. Twitter, which has seen fits and starts since its founding nearly a decade ago, has a shared leadership style that starts at the top. It remains so today. Dorsey, who has been called "the real core co-founder," never wavered from his vision of Twitter as a text-messaging service that would change the world as we know it -- or as the young Dorsey knew it when he started coding Twitter two decades ago. Dorsey is both a democratic and a laissez-faire leader. A consummate multitasker, his family and peers know him as a utilitarian hipster with fashion sense. He dislikes all waste and cherishes his haircuts. He grew up listening to C-band radio dispatches of emergency personnel responding to crimes and fires, false alarms and deadly events. Although Dorsey has returned in the role of executive chairman, Twitter remains minimalist and collaborative. Like Dorsey, Twitter has taken several years to find its compass. Brevity is imperative in the new world of social media.

Chapter 3 : Advantages and Disadvantages of Participative Management

Participative decision-making (PDM) is the extent to which employers allow or encourage employees to share or participate in organizational decision-making (Probst,). According to Cotton et al. (), the format of PDM could be formal or informal.

April 23, by Kathy Murdock If you are the leader of an organization or company, you probably have a dominant leadership style. Theories and studies have been done for years on types of leadership styles and what works best within an organization. Some studies have reported participative leadership is the most effective style, while others have shown inconclusive results. Since leaders often need to change the way they solve problems based on that specific problem, situation or setting, a good leader will need to use a variety of leadership styles. Our students learn how to develop their own leadership style, and the benefits of each, by taking our course Developing Your Leadership Style. Understanding the different types of leadership styles and how each works in a company is important. You may find that you need to evoke more of an authoritative leadership style in one instance, while participative leadership would actually move the team forward better in another. At times you may have more information or knowledge about a situation than your team; at others, you might find involving your team brings to the table ideas you might not have considered. What it is So what exactly is participative leadership? In participative leadership, the leader turns to the team for input, ideas and observations instead of making all decision on his or her own. Participative leadership involves the entire team. This is a leadership style in which the leader works closely with team members, focusing on building relationships and rapport. On the flip side of this leadership coin you have the autocratic leadership style, in which the leader tends to be more issue-focused and makes most decisions without input from the team. Building your leadership brand is essential for all types of businesses. Why does participative leadership work well in certain situations? Allowing the team to assist in the decision making process, to give input and to share ideas, increases the teams involvement as a whole. They feel that their skills are being acknowledged and their opinions are being valued. The team members feel they add worth to the company when the leader is asking for input and listening to suggestions. Along with this, participative leadership lends a multitude of solutions and ideas to problems and other questions that come up in a company or organization. Having a team of people considering options for how to handle marketing a new product, for instance, lends itself to a number of ideas that might not have been on the table at all had the leader been the one to think of ideas and make the final decision with no additional input. Participative leadership should not be confused, however, with laissez-fair leadership. In laissez-fare leadership, the leader gives the power of decision making to the group, along with the materials needed to make that decision. While this type of leadership style might work in certain situations, such as when a decision must be made about something the leader is not familiar with, in many instances participative leadership works better. The Benefits of Participative Leadership Because participative leadership relies heavily on input from the entire team, a variety of benefits can be found when it is used to elicit new ideas or introduce different methods for solving problems. For a visual, imagine ten people seated around a table. One person is the leader in charge. Nine people are members on the team. The leader in charge has determined a particular product at the company is not selling well. The leader would like input on ideas that can be used to make that product sell better so the company can make more money. The team is asked to come up with a variety of strategies and potential solutions to make that product sell better. Now you have nine team members who are each looking at this problem in a unique way. Each team member possesses a certain skill or set of skills that could move that product. Team Member Number One has a strong background in marketing and suggests a particular marketing strategy â€" taking that product out onto the streets as people leave their offices for the day. Team Member Number Two has a strong background in writing. He recommends changes in pricing that might make the product more appealing to the consumer. If you elicit ideas from an entire team of people you are honing in on their strengths and then using those strengths to collectively drive creative decision making for the company. This is true in any type of company and situation. Your problem might be something different â€" issues with parking spaces at the office,

problems with employee morale, inability to gain new customers despite marketing efforts. If you take that problem to the table and discuss it with the team, you are engaging a wide range of strengths, abilities and skills to help solve the problem. This makes sense considering gathering everyone together for strategy meetings can be a time consuming event. If something happens that requires a quick response, participative leadership would not be the best style to follow in most cases. This type of leadership works really well in creative environments, too. Consider the multitude of unique ideas that might arise during a meeting for a solution to a problem that requires different perspectives. The problem you have might require a set of solutions, and not just one overall solution. Involving a team of problem solvers can help create a list of potential fixes. There are cases when participative leadership may not be the best leadership style to follow. We mentioned above that when time is of the essence and a decision needs to be made STAT, participative leadership can be a problem. If you are new to leadership, the Transition to Leadership course is designed to teach you how to succeed in a leadership role. Along with this course, sign up for our leadership tools class , and create your own User Manual for leadership.

Chapter 4 : Participatory budgeting - Wikipedia

Art-Led Participative Processes: Dialogue and Subjectivity within Performances in the Everyday Jay Koh. To Yoke Lin, in loving memory to Juline and Sajan, for the joy.

Participative The different styles are explained further in the SlideShare presentation below: Likert found participative leadership to improve the teamwork, communication and overall participation of achieving objectives. The style engaged the whole organization or the specific team, with the responsibility of achieving objectives being spread across. He concluded the style to be the best in terms of long-term benefits to organizations. Gary Yukl made similar findings in Yukl highlighted the different levels of participation and how behavior affects the effectiveness of leadership. Autocratic â€" The leader makes the decisions and there is no consultation from the subordinates. Consultation â€" The leader asks for opinions, but makes the decisions. Joint Decision â€" The leader invites ideas from subordinates and includes them in the decision-making process. Delegation â€" The leader allows the subordinates to make the decisions. All of the above include a different level of participation from the subordinates, expect for the autocratic model. The modern context From the above basic concepts and findings, the theory of participatory leadership began emerging. Therefore, participative leadership can take many shapes and this has meant the clear definition of the model remains elusive. The methods used and the forms of participation illustrate the multidimensional qualities of this concept. Therefore, focus of the theory has shifted to the decision-making style of the leader. Essentially, the different styles can be showcased on a spectrum, with the focus shifting from no participation to high participation. The spectrum can be further divided into four major types of participative decision-making. Collective, which can be found towards the end of the spectrum of high participation. In this decision-making style, the leader and the subordinates make all the decisions as a group, with the accountability divided among each member. Democratic or participative leadership refers to a decision-making style that encourages input from subordinates, but the ultimate decision-making power lies with the leader. The leader has a responsibility to explain the decisions to the subordinates and resolve any objections as a group. Autocratic participative leadership is found closer to the no participation part of the spectrum. The decision-making power is in the hands of the leader, although the subordinates are listened to as part of the process. Consensus decision-making falls on the high participation end of the spectrum. The leader lets the group make the decisions, which are usually a result of a majority vote. The above highlights well the amount of flexibility the leadership model can offer. Nonetheless, participative leadership always entails input from the leader and the subordinates. As well as understanding the different spectrum of decision-making at current participatory leadership model, research has also identified different groups based largely on the cultural tradition of leadership. On the other hand, participatory management is a style dominating the United States. Under this style, the subordinates are part of the decision-making process to an extent. But this only refers to decision-making in the smaller level, such as sharing responsibility with immediate supervisors, instead of the full leadership of the organization. Six dimensions of participative leadership As we discussed in the above section, there are different variations in terms of participation within participative leadership. The participative systems can be further divided into six types, which shall be introduced below. The six dimension of the leadership type were first introduced in , as a result of studies by John L. Cotton and his colleagues. A participative leadership system can include more than one of the below dimension or it can be based on a single system. Participation in work decisions The first dimension typically leaves the decision-making in terms of organizational objectives for the leader. The subordinates are only included in decisions regarding the work. The participation in work decisions may include consultation or an actual power shift to the subordinates, depending on the wider system in place. The style is identified as formal participatory structure and it is considered to be a long-term objective of the business. Furthermore, it uses a framework of direct participation. The leader would discuss the project with the subordinates and the team as a whole would decide on how and when certain objectives shall be done and who will be in charge of doing specific tasks. Under the dimension, the ultimate decision-making power would remain in the hands of the

leader, but subordinates would be able to provide their opinions before the decision is made. Again, consultative participation is identified as a formal and long-term objective of an organization. The difference to the above dimension is the lower level of influence in decision-making processes. In a workplace, this could involve the introduction of a new operating system. Subordinates would be able to provide their opinion regarding the different software alternatives and talk about their ideas in terms of the implementation. After the consultation, the leader would make the decision and report his or her reasoning back to subordinates, who might be able to respond to the decision before it is finalized. Short-term participation Organizations could also implement short-term participation strategies. Under this dimension, subordinates are only temporarily included in the decision-making process. While the timeframe is limited, the participation often has a higher impact on the actual results. Short-term participation is a formal structure and it utilizes the direct participation framework. Therefore, compared to the consultative participation, short-term dimension has more active role in decision-making, despite not being a long-lasting aspect of the organization. For example, an organization might introduce a new project and ask for the team to influence how the project is implemented. This could be a short-term period for determining the processes and objectives, after which the power of decision-making would return to the leader. Informal participation Participative leadership can also appear in a more informal framework. Under informal participation, there are no operational channels for subordinate participation in decision-making, but there can be specific situations in which this type of activity occurs. A typical informal participation framework has no set rules or procedures, but everything is set on the go. Employee ownership Under employee ownership, the subordinates will be able to participate in some decision-making, but the activity depends on the role of the employee. Employees in lower positions tend to have fewer options for participation compared to their higher positioned colleagues. Furthermore, the participative leadership framework is formal, but it encourages an indirect model of behavior. Employee ownership could manifest in the subordinates having a stake in the organization, yet not have many channels for influencing how the company operates. Only major decisions might be ran through the subordinates. Representative participation The final dimension deals with representative participation. The model sees a three-level participation framework. There is the leader, the representatives and the employees. The representatives have the consultative power and certain influence in decision-making, representing the wishes of the employee. They act as mediators between the leader and the subordinates. This kind of participation requires a formal structure. Furthermore, it is characterized by an indirect notion of participation. An organization often has the so-called middle managers, who act as messengers between the higher ranked leader and the employees. Before a decision, the representative might consult employees and then make a decision together with the leader. In certain cases, there might not be official consultation, but rather the representative aims to provide input through experience and understanding of the employees and their wishes. Six-parts to operation Another key characteristic of participative leadership is the operational structure it tends to take. Again, you must be aware that the different participative dimensions might influence the implementation of the below steps. Nonetheless, the framework is commonly present in a participative leadership model. Facilitating conversations Under the framework, the leader is the person starting the conversation around a specific decision. For example, the leader might set rules and procedures ready for regular team meetings where different issues are discussed. In certain circumstances, these might later be decided together as the group. But the initial responsibility of starting the discussion and ensuring the participative process runs smoothly relies on the leader to facilitate it. Sharing information and knowledge Furthermore, the responsibility of sharing information is on the leader. The more participative the framework, the more knowledge the leader should provide for the subordinates. Unequal levels of knowledge can be detrimental for making the right decisions and therefore this is a crucial part of participative leadership. Encouraging idea collaboration The following step includes the encouragement of opinions in order to nurture collaboration. The leader plays a crucial role in creating an environment, which is engaging and open. Ideas are best shared in groups, as this means the opinions and suggestions can be immediately dissected and analyzed. But in certain situations, it might be valuable to encourage discussion privately with the leader as well. One way to do this is by using brainstorming sessions with your team. Synthesizing the available information Once the collaboration period

is over, the leader must collect the information and start analyzing it. The leader should spend some time exploring the suggestions and understanding the pros and cons of the ideas. The leader can at this point let go of ideas, which seem implausible. Making the right decision When the leader feels they have enough data available to make the right decision, they can do so. In this step, the decision-making process can drastically differ, depending on the participation dimension. A more autocratic model will simply have the leader pick up the best option from the consultation he or she had with subordinates. On the other hand, the decision-making might be a shared process with the subordinates, in which case the team comes up with the right solution through consensus. Communicating the decision to others Depending on how the decision was made a leader alone or the group together , the final element in participative leadership framework deals with the communication of the decision. The leader generally explains the decision to subordinates and provides the reasons behind the resolve. At this point, the subordinates can voice any concern or further suggestions they might have, although it must be clear the decision has already been made. This might seem surprising since the style generally makes decision-making easier, as the leader might share responsibilities with subordinates.

Chapter 5 : Participative processes

What are participatory processes? "Participation is a way of viewing the world and acting in it. It is about a commitment to help create the conditions which lead to significant empowerment of those who at present have little control over the forces that condition their lives".

Procedure[edit] Most broadly, all participatory budgeting schemes allow citizens to deliberate with the goal of creating either a concrete financial plan a budget , or a recommendation to elected representatives. In the Porto Alegre model, the structure of the scheme gives subjurisdictions neighborhoods authority over the larger political jurisdiction the city of which they are part. Neighborhood budget committees, for example, have authority to determine the citywide budget, not just the allocation of resources for their particular neighborhood. There is, therefore, a need for mediating institutions to facilitate the aggregation of budget preferences expressed by subjurisdictions. The adoption of PB has been required by the federal government in nations such as Peru, while there are cases where local governments initiated PB independent from the national agenda such as Porto Alegre. Representatives of the divided districts are either elected or volunteered to work with government officials in a PB committee. The committees are established with regularly scheduled meetings under a specific timeline to deliberate. Proposals, initiated by the citizens, are dealt under different branches of public budget such as recreation, infrastructure, transportation, etc. Participants publicly deliberate with the committee to finalize the projects to be voted on. The drafted budget is shared to the public and put for a vote. The municipal government implements the top proposals. The cycle is repeated on an annual basis. History[edit] Participatory budgeting has been practiced in Porto Alegre since While there were several early experiments including the public budgeting practices of the Brazilian Democratic Movement in municipalities such as Pelotas [9] , the first full participatory budgeting process was implemented in , in the city of Porto Alegre, Brazil , a capital city of the state of Rio Grande do Sul, and a busy industrial, financial, and service center, at that time with a population of 1. By , more than cities in Brazil had implemented PB, while in , thousands of variations have been implemented in the Americas, Africa, Asia and Europe. This institutional arrangement has created a separation between the state and civil society , which has opened the doors for clientelism. The influential clients receive policy favors, and repay elected officials with votes from the groups they influence. For example, a neighborhood leader represents the views of shop owners to the local party boss, asking for laws to increase foot traffic on commercial streets. In exchange, the neighborhood leader mobilizes shop owners to vote for the political party responsible for the policy. Because this patronage operates on the basis of individual ties between patron and clients, true decision-making power is limited to a small network of party bosses and influential citizens rather than the broader public. The result is one example of what we now know as Participatory Budgeting. Outcomes[edit] A World Bank paper suggests that participatory budgeting has led to direct improvements in facilities in Porto Alegre. The number of schools quadrupled since Health and sanitation benefits accumulated the longer participatory budgeting was used in a municipality. Participatory budgeting does not merely allow citizens to shift funding priorities in the short-term â€" it can yield sustained institutional and political change in the long term. Although it cannot overcome wider problems such as unemployment , it leads to "noticeable improvement in the accessibility and quality of various public welfare amenities". Since its emergence in Porto Alegre, participatory budgeting has spread to hundreds of Latin American cities, and dozens of cities in Europe , Asia , Africa , and North America. In some cities, participatory budgeting has been applied for school, university, and public housing budgets. In France, the Region Poitou-Charentes is notable for launching participatory budgeting in its secondary schools. Annual spending on fixed expenses, such as debt service and pensions, is not subject to public participation. Around fifty thousand residents of Porto Alegre now take part in the participatory budgeting process compared to 1. Participants are from diverse economic and political backgrounds. Each February there is instruction from city specialists in technical and system aspects of city budgeting. These large meetingsâ€"with participation that can reach over 1,â€"elect delegates to represent specific neighborhoods. The mayor and staff attend to respond to citizen concerns. In the following months, delegates

meet weekly or biweekly in each district to review technical project criteria and district needs. City department staff may participate according to their area of expertise. The main function of the Municipal Council of the Budget is to reconcile the demands of each district with available resources, and to propose and approve an overall municipal budget. The resulting budget is binding, though the city council can suggest, but not require changes. Only the Mayor may veto the budget, or remand it back to the Municipal Council of the Budget this has never happened. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. June Learn how and when to remove this template message The first recorded Participatory Budgeting process in the United States of America is in the Rogers Park neighborhood of Chicago , Illinois. Winning projects included one hundred healthy trees, twenty laptops for a community center, bilingual books for children learning english, a public bathroom in Central Square, bike report stations, and free public wifi in six outdoor locations. Districts hold neighborhood meetings to collect ideas for community improvement projects. Idea collection is focused particularly on hard-to-reach communities, such as immigrants with limited English proficiency, youth, senior citizens, and public housing residents. Volunteers then research community needs and work with city agencies to turn ideas into concrete proposals. The proposals are put to a community vote, which is open to any resident of the district over the age of City agencies implement the winning projects. This inspired the launch of a three-year pilot of PB at the ward-level in Toronto, beginning in In the months of May and June the city will begin debating what to do with PB at the municipal-level, following annual evaluations of the pilot. As part of a platform for democratizing and improving access to public housing, CVH has advocated for developing a kind of participatory system tied together by PB. CVH also advocates for a gradual increase of money being allocated through PB as residents become increasingly familiarized with the process. In response, HACLA launched a "values driven participatory budgeting process" developed and coordinated by a consultant. This was a six-week process, consisting of "resident consultation" that fed into decisions ultimately made by administration and management. Participatory elements of the process were "a resident survey" and "resident review of site specific budgets. Coupled with a lack of technical support, any kind of resident-focused collective deliberation or evidence of resident influence on the outcome of the process, the Collective deemed the process "participatory in name only. The process included a combination of one-on-one and door-to-door outreach with deliberation through meetings and assemblies of residents. Today the process allows persons aged between 12 and 25 years old to decide how to allocate one million dollars. Voting was not over allocating money to specific project proposals, but rather to determining exact allotments to four broad distinct budget categories: The average for each category was taken and a preliminary set of results was disclosed. Seventy percent of the student body voted in the process, with the money allocated towards building a new recreation room.

Participative budgeting is a budgeting process under which those people impacted by a budget are actively involved in the budget creation process. This bottom-up approach to budgeting tends to create budgets that are more achievable than are top-down budgets that are imposed on a company by senior.

The general view of most current writers is that action research is necessarily participative. It depends upon where you decide to draw the boundary around action research. Action research is whatever we define it to be. However, I think there may be advantages at least in considering a different view about participation. I propose that we regard the issue of participation as offering the researcher, and perhaps the participant, a choice about participation levels. It can vary along a number of dimensions. On each of those dimensions it can be absent, or substantial, or any point in between. At any point there may be further choices about how the participation will be achieved. Sometimes the choice is for partial participation through representation. Further choices then arise about how the wider body of people will be kept informed. The choices can depend on the desired outcomes, and the approach to participation which will best achieve them. Those outcomes are likely to include both action and research, though their relative priority may vary. As well, there may be outcomes which are decided by values. For example, I think it is appropriate for a researcher to decide that participation has a value in its own right. Sometimes this value may be high: Yet even here there are choices to be made. For that matter, how much choice do they have in participating? Dimensions of participation There are a variety of dimensions of participation. For present purposes I wish to distinguish seven. Four of them relate to the content of the situation: Another two are part of the research process: The seventh may be about process, or content, or both: On each of these dimensions, there is a choice: To develop this further, the first of these questions turns out to have two parts. First, there is likely to be some body of people who are able to contribute. For example, some people are equipped to provide data because they have relevant information. Second, it may not be feasible to involve all potential participants. You may have to choose some smaller number of these people to involve. In other words, when full participation is not possible, you may choose representation instead. A smaller number of participants are chosen to speak in some way for the rest. It may also be that different people will be involved to different extents. For example, you might interview a small number of people, on several occasions, in depth. Others might be interviewed only once. Yet others may respond briefly to a written survey or the like. The information from the interviews may be interpreted by a working party or reference group which is broadly similar to the community of stakeholders. Participants as informants In most studies, at least some participants are likely to be involved as informants. This is minimal participation though participating as recipients is even less. It may occasionally be possible to obtain data through observation, or from documents. But in change programs, this is unusual. To achieve research outcomes, this is often a very important form of participation. The selection of participants often proceeds in three steps. The first step is to identify those people who are likely to have information or an attitude or opinion about the situation being researched. The second step is required when it is not possible to involve everyone as informants. Your task then is to compile a sample which will canvass all views, and be small enough to be managed within the constraints of time and budget. In general, your best option is to aim for a "maximum diversity" sample. You may then get good results by collecting information until new information ceases to emerge. As with action research generally, the emerging information determines the sample size. The third step is to decide what information is needed, and how it can best be gained. Again, action research methods allow you the luxury of being able to change your mind about this in the light of your early experience. The criterion for selection is: Who has the information needed to define the situation? This is not as simple as it sounds. Obviously, you will usually include members of the system being studied. Depending on the desired outcomes, you may well want to include outsiders with special knowledge. Participants as interpreters A common form of this is where participants first contribute information, and are then asked to comment on its meaning. In other words, each participant becomes her 6 own interpreter. In the process for focus groups that I have described elsewhere, a phase of information collection is followed by a phase of

interpretation. On other occasions, different participants are used as informants and interpreters. Interpretation may be done, for example, by a small working group which takes overall responsibility for the study. It is common for a group sometimes know as a "reference group" to be set up with the express purpose of helping to interpret the information provided. It may have other duties too. Other variations are possible. In some forms of unstructured interviewing, for example, I may ask later informants to comment on the information arising from earlier informants. The criterion for selection of interpreters is: Participants as planners There are many techniques used in fields such as community development and organisation development. Many practitioners who work directly with a clientele have specific procedures for working with participants. Such techniques and procedures very often involve the same people in providing information, interpreting it, and turning that interpretation into action plans. For example, consider those forms of team building which work by improving role relationships. The members of the team first define their roles as they currently exist. They may then identify the problems and opportunities for improvement. Finally, they decide how they will change their roles to better manage their interdependencies. Processes such as search a technique for developing a shared vision are more informative, in some respects. In team building, participants too easily resolve their issues by creating difficulties for those who are not present to speak for themselves. So techniques such as search may take more care to identify all groups who have some information to give, or some stake in the outcomes. In other respects, they are similar to team building. They, too, typically move from information exchange to interpretation to planning. The point is this Techniques such as role negotiation and search and many others generate and interpret information. For the most part they are used primarily to bring about change. They can also be pressed into effective service as tools for action research. When used for action research, more care is usually taken to validate the information and interpretation. They then also become more effective tools for change. The selection criterion for planners is: Who is best placed to convert the understanding of the situation into plans for change? All else being equal, my own usual answer is: Sometimes, as before, you may decide to include outsiders with special knowledge. You may then also have to decide if they are to be full participants, or advisors to those more directly affected. Much of the time you can use them effectively by allowing them to offer information, but leaving the planning to the stakeholders. Here the choice is usually relatively easy. The simple criterion is: A more effective criterion is: So far, the participants have been involved only in the content of the study. In addition, you may decide to do what you can to share the research responsibilities -- to make co-researchers of them. Participants as facilitators Some common applications are to use local informants as interviewers, or facilitators for some of the group-based methods of information collection and interpretation. Some processes are robust enough that it is not difficult for members of the client group to facilitate them. Structured interviews are an example. Local informants are often more acceptable to the members of the client group than you are. They are often able to judge when a process needs fine-tuning to suit the local customs. Language or dialect may make facilitation difficult for you.

Participative Management refers to as an open form of management where employees are actively involved in organization's decision making process. The concept is applied by the managers who understand the importance to human intellect and seek a strong relationship with their employees. They.

Job performance and organizational performance Organizational profits By sharing decision-making with other employees, participants may eventually achieve organization objectives that influence them Brenda, Outcomes[edit] The outcomes are various in PDM. In the aspect of employers, PDM is evolved into decision quality and efficiency that influenced by multiple and differential mixed layers in terms of information access, level of participation, processes and dimensions in PDM. Research primarily focuses on the work satisfaction and performance of employees in PDM Cotton et al. Different measurement systems were applied to identify the two items and the relevant properties. Do not have strong relationship with performance. Because even with full participation, participants may not explore their skills and knowledge in identifying problems, which is likely to weaken the desires and motivation then influence performance. It is not only attributed to the skills and knowledge could be explored but also the innovative ways employees can provide and generate. Positive to performance but not likely to enhance satisfaction. If the solutions generated are not acknowledged by the employees who are absent at the previous stage, the satisfaction could lessen. Positive and strong relationship with both performance and satisfaction. Participants are given the possibility to affect on the achievement of a designed plan. Weaker relationship with performance, but positive relationship with satisfaction due to the future benefit. This section needs more links to other articles to help integrate it into the encyclopedia. Please help improve this article by adding links that are relevant to the context within the existing text. September Learn how and when to remove this template message One of the primary risks in any participative decision-making or power-sharing process is that the desire on the part of the management for more inclusive participation is not genuine. In the words of Arnstein This difference is brilliantly capsulized in a poster [available for viewing in her article] It allows the powerholders to claim that all sides were considered, but makes it possible for only some of those sides to benefit. These can be anything from social pressures to conform to group domination, where one person takes control of the group and urges everyone to follow their standpoints. With ideas coming from many people, time can be an issue. The meeting might end and good ideas go unheard. Possible negative outcomes of PDM are high costs, inefficiency, indecisiveness and incompetence Debruin, With participation comes dilemmas. According to him there are ten such dilemmas and the only way to deal with them is to use foresight. Participation as the answer and as the problem The involvement of the actors The level of ambition of the initiators, the context and the participants. Representation and legitimization â€" participation works best in a situation where it is not needed, i. A PDM style includes any type of decision transfer from a superior to their subordinates Sager, PDM may take many forms and can run the gamut from informal suggestion systems to direct high involvement at the policy and administrative level. Most researchers agree that participative decision-making is not a unitary concept. High involvement PDM entails power and information sharing, as well as advanced human resource development practices. PDM can be broken down into four sub-types: Researchers have found that this leadership style is usually one of the most effective and leads to higher productivity, better contributions from group members, and increased group morale Leadership Toolbox. The democratic leadership style involves facilitating the conversation, encouraging people to share their ideas, and then synthesizing all the available information into the best possible decision. The democratic leader must also be able to communicate that decision back to the group to bring unity to the plan is chosen Cherry. The democratic leader delegates authority, encourages participation, and relies on personal power expert and referent power to manage subordinates. The subordinates with democratic leadership: Will have positive feeling with this style of leadership. Will perform well even when the leader is absent McHenry When the workplace is ready for democratic leaders, the style produces a work environment that employees can feel good about. Workers feel that their opinion counts, and because of that feeling they are more committed to achieving the goals and objectives of the organization

Money-Zine. Autocratic[edit] In an autocratic participative decision-making style, similar to the collective style, the leader takes control of and responsibility for the final decision. The difference is that in an autocratic style, members of the organizations are not included and the final outcome is the responsibility of the leader. This is the best style to use in an emergency when an immediate decision is needed. Everyone must agree and come to the same decision. This might take a while, but the decisions are among the best since it involves the ideas and skills of many other people. Teamwork is important in this style and brings members closer together while trust and communication increase. In such situations, the decision maker delegates full or partial responsibility of decision-making for a particular area of concern, to the expert on the team for best management outcomes. The participative leader retains the responsibility of final compilation of the draft responses from all. Such delegation is work specific and singular. It depends on the decision maker to compile the expert reports for the final response. Advantages of this type of decision-making process makes the group members feel engaged in the process, more motivated and creative. Expertise brings focused and result oriented solutions for BATNA Best alternative to a negotiated agreement as and when necessary. Best management outcomes are obtained by utilizing this strategy. An authoritative decision maker would have a higher rate of success than the Democratic decision maker. This strategy would be a disaster, when applied incorrectly or inappropriately is a major disadvantage. In , it was indicated that six dimensions of PDM had been recognized and analyzed Cotton et al. Those six dimensions are as follows: Participation in work decisions: Characterized as formal, long-term and direct participation. The content in this dimension focuses on work, e. Same to the previous one except it has lower level of influence in decision-making. It is recognized as formal and direct. Could happen in interpersonal relationships between employers and employees. Usually no fixed rules and specific contents are decided in advance. Formal and indirect participation. Although subordinates have the chance to participate in decision-making, usually the typical employees cannot. Measured as formal and indirect. In organizations, the degree of the influence is medium as representatives playing a role that mediate between typical employees and superior. Decision Issues Includes 4 aspects: Degree of Involvement Different level of involvement generates differential outcomes. Decision Process Contains five processes: Additionally, employee outcomes can also be evaluated according to six criteria Brenda, No distinct relationship with performance. Informal PDM encourage job satisfaction, likewise higher level of commitment and motivation Cotton et al. The greater influence enhances work satisfaction. Whereas the power range of indirect PDM could vary from partial to decisive. Foresight[edit] Some important constraints van der Helm, Foresight is a personal skill and so repetition should involve the same individuals not institutions , which is not compatible with the people rapidly moving within and between organizations. Foresight is often still a voluntary or peripheral job i. This may be done once, but not at a regular basis. Foresight is often made at particular moments in time, which may help to converge the general attitude of the network. According to Ziegler as cited in van der Helm, , long-term vision is developed at critical historical moments the year , the ecological crisis, the re-organization of a business, etc. Obviously, these are not very likely to be formalized. The results of a foresight are very often only indirectly visible in the follow-up in policy and management Tijink, as cited in van der Helm, Especially in a large exercises it is very unlikely that individuals will find justice done to their ideas unless a serious consensus is reached. Furthermore, because of the representation dilemma, it is unlikely that binding conclusions will be drawn from any similar activity. Hence, participants will not find any direct feedback and may lack the motivation to invest a second time. Critical thinking is important for all group members in order to come up with the best possible solution to the decision. Four questions that should be asked: Analyze the problem â€" What needs to be fixed? Think of objectives â€" What are we trying to accomplish with this decision? Discuss choices â€" What possible choices can be used? Evaluate â€" After coming up with choices, what are all of the positive and negative aspects of each? Role of information[edit] To make a good decision, there needs to be a good amount of information to base the outcome on. Information can include anything from charts and surveys to past sales reports and prior research. When making a decision primarily based on the information you are given from your organization, one can come to a conclusion in four different ways. Decisive â€" Little amount of information and one course of action. Decisions are made fast, direct, and firmly.

Chapter 8 : A Basic Understanding of Participative Management

One of the characteristics of collective leadership is that during the decision-making process the group must develop clear lines of authority that define the responsibilities of each member. Democratic or participative leadership encourages participation of all members, but the final decision is taken by the leader.

Participatory change processes enable people to thrive in a situation of constant open-ended change, building optimism and trust, commitment, confidence and competence. Participatory change processes nurture future liberating leaders. Command-and-control political leaders often claim that they are willing to consult the people they lead. They do so with a variety of techniques such as polls, surveys or focus groups, by running question and answer session at public meetings, receiving delegations or inviting written submissions to specific proposals. Other forms of consultation favoured by more progressive command-and-control leaders include Community Forums, Stakeholder Conferences, Community Planning and joint working parties. The agendas of these processes are usually closely controlled, responsibility for their design and implementation is usually delegated to relatively junior staff, their budgets are niggardly and their impact on core strategies virtually nil. Command-and-control leaders rarely, if ever, take part in them and invariably reserve the right to ignore or veto their outcomes if they are not to their liking. Liberating political leaders will devote major resources to participative change processes in terms of adequate budgets, high-level expertise and, crucially, their own presence and credibility. Moreover, participative change processes will be the principal means by which core-operating strategies are shaped and monitored by people-power, at every level from the neighbourhood to the society as a whole. By integrating participative change processes with soft-systems methodologies, the quality of the resultant shared understanding between the participants will be immensely enriched. In practical terms, participative change processes may take just a few hours, a few days or a day a week spread over several months. It could be an open-ended series of processes that go on for years. The number of participants can vary from a small team, to a few dozen to a few hundred, to a few thousand to a few tens of thousands, to - with the help of network and cable TV - hundreds of thousands. It may be rotated between the members of the group if they have sufficient confidence, trust and cohesion. A typical small-group session lasts about an hour. The general pattern of the process is for the outcomes of all the groups to be openly reviewed at a plenary session in which there are opportunities for further reflection and clarification. The plenary may then break up into another group session and the participants may go back to their original group, or they might randomly re-arrange themselves to form new groups. Different groups might call for specialist advice on some aspect of the system they are re-configuring. They might call for the production of additional data to clarify a particular issue. If the process is integrated with a soft-systems methodology, the groups might talk about and draw pictures of the systems or sub-systems that need to be changed. In this way, as the participants think, act and learn together, their shared understanding of the existing situation, and of how to change it for the better, will become ever more precise. Whether there are fifty or five hundred or five thousand or five hundred thousand participants, liberating leaders will devote the time, skills and resources needed to ensure that the participative change processes arrive at good decisions. Such decisions will genuinely reflect the shared information and understanding of the direct participants and their fellow citizens. At first, many people find such processes confusing and even chaotic. They seem to produce far more energy, information and ideas than can ever be contained and directed effectively. Margaret Wheatley addresses such worries as follows: Because they stem from shared purposes and principles, the changes arising from participative change processes are usually more comprehensive, radical and sustainable than those which arise from the non-participative change strategies imposed by command-and-control leaders and their enforcers. Moreover, people-power ensures that the changes are implemented much more quickly, easily and economically. The implementation of the changes flows on from the participative process in a natural and unforced fashion. Because they encourage dialogue, participative change processes are quite revealing for everyone involved. They provide a multitude of opportunities for citizens to demonstrate their potential as the kind of liberating leaders that Gaian democracies need. In effect their fellow-citizens will

identify and encourage them because of the qualities, knowledge and skills they have shown when they were all thinking, acting and learning together.

Participative management is defined as a management style in which leaders place emphasis on employees' involvement in the management process. This management method is also known as employee involvement or participative decision making, and it presents many potential benefits to the companies that choose to encourage it.

When would you use participatory evaluation? Who should be involved in participatory evaluation? How do you conduct a participatory evaluation? Experienced community builders know that involving stakeholders - the people directly connected to and affected by their projects - in their work is tremendously important. It gives them the information they need to design, and to adjust or change, what they do to best meet the needs of the community and of the particular populations that an intervention or initiative is meant to benefit. This is particularly true in relation to evaluation. We consider the topic of participatory evaluation important enough to give it a section of its own, and to show how it fits into the larger participatory research picture. One of the best ways to choose the proper direction for your work is to involve stakeholders in identifying real community needs, and the ways in which a project will have the greatest impact. What is participatory evaluation? Evaluation actually needs to be an integral part of any project from the beginning. Participatory evaluation involves all the stakeholders in a project - those directly affected by it or by carrying it out - in contributing to the understanding of it, and in applying that understanding to the improvement of the work. Involving everyone affected changes the whole nature of a project from something done for a group of people or a community to a partnership between the beneficiaries and the project implementers. Rather than powerless people who are acted on, beneficiaries become the copilots of a project, making sure that their real needs and those of the community are recognized and addressed. Respecting individuals and the knowledge and skills they have will go a long way toward promoting long-term trust and involvement. The other necessary aspect of any participatory process is appropriate training for everyone involved. Some stakeholders may not even be aware that project research takes place; others may have no idea how to work alongside people from different backgrounds; and still others may not know what to do with evaluation results once they have them. The real purpose of an evaluation is not just to find out what happened, but to use the information to make the project better. In order to accomplish this, evaluation should include examining at least two areas: The process of a project includes the planning and logistical activities needed to set up and run it. Did we do a proper assessment beforehand so we would know what the real needs were? Did we use the results of the assessment to identify and respond to those needs in the design of the project? Did we set up and run the project within the timelines and other structures that we intended? Did we involve the people we intended to? Did we have or get the resources we expected? Were staff and others trained and prepared to do the work? Did we have the community support we expected? Did we record what we did accurately and on time? Did we monitor and evaluate as we intended? Project implementation is the actual work of running it. Did we do what we intended? Did we serve or affect the number of people we proposed to? Did we use the methods we set out to use? Was the level of our activity what we intended e. Did we reach the population s we aimed at? What exactly did we provide or do? Did we make intentional or unintentional changes, and why? Did our work have the effects we hoped for? Did it have other, unforeseen effects? Were they positive or negative or neither? Do we know why we got the results we did? What can we change, and how, to make our work more effective? Many who write about participatory evaluation combine the first two of these areas into process evaluation, and add a third - impact evaluation - in addition to outcome evaluation. Impact evaluation looks at the long-term results of a project, whether the project continues, or does its work and ends. Rural development projects in the developing world, for example, often exist simply to pass on specific skills to local people, who are expected to then both practice those skills and teach them to others. Once people have learned the skills - perhaps particular cultivation techniques, or water purification - the project ends. In order for these areas to be covered properly, evaluation has to start at the very beginning of the project, with assessment and planning. In a participatory evaluation, stakeholders should be involved in: It could be simply to convince children to eat more fruits, vegetables, and whole grains. It could be to get them to eat less junk food. It could be to

encourage weight loss in kids who are overweight or obese. It could simply be to educate them about healthy eating, and to persuade them to be more adventurous eaters. The evaluation questions you ask both reflect and determine your goals for the program. Is that still better than not eating the healthy foods? Why would you use participatory evaluation? Some of the major advantages of participatory evaluation: Those implementing the project and those who are directly affected by it are most capable of sorting out the effective from the ineffective. It results in a more effective project. The consequence is a project that addresses the appropriate issues in the appropriate way, and accomplishes what it sets out to do. Participatory evaluation gives those who are often not consulted - line staff and beneficiaries particularly - the chance to be full partners in determining the direction and effectiveness of a project. It can provide a voice for those who are often not heard. By involving them from the beginning in project evaluation, you assure that their voices are heard, and they learn that they have the ability and the right to speak for themselves. It teaches skills that can be used in employment and other areas of life. In addition to the development of basic skills and specific research capabilities, participatory evaluation encourages critical thinking, collaboration, problem-solving, independent action, meeting deadlines It bolsters self-confidence and self-esteem in those who may have little of either. This category can include not only project beneficiaries, but also others who may, because of circumstance, have been given little reason to believe in their own competence or value to society. The opportunity to engage in a meaningful and challenging activity, and to be treated as a colleague by professionals, can make a huge difference for folks who are seldom granted respect or given a chance to prove themselves. It demonstrates to people ways in which they can take more control of their lives. Working with professionals and others to complete a complex task with real-world consequences can show people how they can take action to influence people and events. It encourages stakeholder ownership of the project. It can spark creativity in everyone involved. To those who have taken part in evaluation before, the opportunity to exchange ideas with people who may have new ways of looking at the familiar can lead to a fresh perspective on what may have seemed to be a settled issue. It encourages working collaboratively. For participatory evaluation to work well, it has to be viewed by everyone involved as a collaboration, where each participant brings specific tools and skills to the effort, and everyone is valued for what she can contribute. Collaboration of this sort not only leads to many of the advantages described above, but also fosters a more collaborative spirit for the future as well, leading to other successful community projects. It fits into a larger participatory effort. When community assessment and the planning of a project have been a collaboration among project beneficiaries, staff, and community members, it only makes sense to include evaluation in the overall plan, and to approach it in the same way as the rest of the project. In order to conduct a good evaluation, its planning should be part of the overall planning of the project. Furthermore, participatory process generally matches well with the philosophy of community-based or grass roots groups or organizations. With all these positive aspects, participatory evaluation carries some negative ones as well. The significant disadvantages of participatory evaluation include: It takes more time than conventional process. Because there are so many people with different perspectives involved, a number of whom have never taken part in planning or evaluation before, everything takes longer than if a professional evaluator or a team familiar with evaluation simply set up and conducted everything. Decision-making involves a great deal of discussion, gathering people together may be difficult, evaluators need to be trained, etc. It takes the establishment of trust among all participants in the process. It will take time and a good deal of conscious effort before all stakeholders feel comfortable and confident that their needs and culture are being addressed. All too often, "participatory" means the participation of an already-existing power structure. Most leaders are actually that - people who are most concerned with the best interests of the group, and whom others trust to represent them and steer them in the direction that best reflects those interests. Sometimes, however, leaders are those who push their way to the front, and try to confirm their own importance by telling others what to do. By involving only leaders of a population or community, you run the risk of losing - or never gaining - the confidence and perspective of the rest of the population, which may dislike and distrust a leader of the second type, or may simply see themselves shut out of the process.. They may see the participatory evaluation as a function of authority, and be uninterested in taking part in it. Working to recruit "regular" people as well as, or instead of, leaders may be an important step for the

credibility of the process. You have to train people to understand evaluation and how the participatory process works, as well as teaching them basic research skills. There are really a number of potential disadvantages here. Another is the question of what kind of training participants will respond to. Still another concerns recruitment - will people be willing to put in the time necessary to prepare them for the process, let alone the time for the process itself? You have to get buy-in and commitment from participants. Given what evaluators will have to do, they need to be committed to the process, and to feel ownership of it. You have to structure both the training and the process itself to bring about this commitment. The least tilt to one side or the other - a sick child, too many days of rain in a row - can cause a disruption that may result in an inability to participate on a given day, or at all.