

Participation as Medium of P.E.A.C.E Paradigm in Community Development

Bro. Jose Arnold L. Alferez, OCDS, Ph.D.

Program Head, Peace and Development
Graduate College, Cotabato City
State Polytechnic College
jalfer511@yahoo.com

Abstract: This paper elucidates the relationship between approaches of community development, participation and P.E.A.C.E paradigm. Participation and P.E.A.C.E. paradigms are important concepts of community development. The final goal of community development is empowering the communities and improving the quality of their lives. But, it is impossible to achieve this goal without participation and involvement of the community in particular projects. On the other hand, there are many definitions, types and models of participation. Thus, the questions are: what type of participation that leads to empower the people in the community? Do every type and model of participation leads to community development? This paper emphasizes on participation as medium of P.E.A.C.E. paradigms. It will try to demonstrate that which types of this participation that can lead to the development of the community. Since in participation the people directly involve in the project and they can take the control of decision affecting on their lives, it is concluded that participation as medium of P.E.A.C.E paradigms would lead to the community development. Furthermore, there are many approaches in community development, namely top-down, bottom-up and partnership. Finally, this paper concludes that P.E.A.C.E. paradigms and type of participation as an end in bottom-up approach of community development will be high, and consequently the particular community will access to a sustainable development

Keywords: Participation, P.E.A.C.E paradigms, bottom-up approach, top-down approach, partnership approach, community development.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper attempts to demonstrate the relationship between community development approaches, participation and P.E.A.C.E. paradigms. Participation and P.E.A.C.E. paradigms are key concepts of community development. Community development is an approach in development programmes that aims to improve the living conditions of people in a particular area. It is also a strategy for reaching and involving tribal villages and communities in the process of building their own life, which consequently would contribute to the national progress. It also is a movement linked to local governments to promote better living conditions for the whole community with active participation, and possible initiatives of the community (Frances 1990). Community development is also concerned with the creation of improved social and economic conditions through emphasis on voluntary cooperation and self-help efforts of the communities. Participation is a vital component of the self-help process and (community development). In other words, people must be involved in those decisions that affect their lives, thus gaining confidence, self-esteem and knowledge, and developing new skills (Javan 1998). The major emphasis in community development is upon helping communities to change and develop in ways which they themselves desire, and with material aid of which they are willing to make effective use. Success in community development programmes demands that the people emotionally identify themselves with these programmes. Such identification gives community development the character of a movement providing strength and a sense of purpose to the current of change over a whole country. It is important to note that community development has two basic goals (two basic purposes): first, to improve the quality of life of all members of the community, and second, to involve all members of the community in the process. Furthermore, sustainability and effectiveness of community development depends on the level of people's participation and concerned agencies. This paper assumes that the type of approaches of community development will determine the level of participation and empowerment of community.

2. THE P.E.A.C.E PARADIGMS- A DEVELOPMENT MODEL

Renewed interest in adopting non-traditional development model has gained momentum in the field of research especially in Mindanao. The P.E.A.C.E paradigm viewed as a modern development initiative emanating from the grassroots hopes to deliver resources to the poor in order to empower and reduce poverty. Its approach towards empowerment and poverty reduction is grounded on the conviction that the poor themselves are invaluable partners of development.

The paradigm is a harmony of five distinct yet interrelated components geared at creating a just and human society. Toh (1987) explains that the P.E.A.C.E grounds development policies that are:

Participatory – The grassroots become invaluable partners for development. Nobody has more at stake in reducing poverty than the poor themselves. Participation provides awareness for knowledge, talents, and indigenous capacities to flourish rather than ignored. They are given the opportunities to identify their own problems, concerns and implement solution according to their needs. This concept advocates the poor are no longer the objects but the subjects of development.

Equitable – Social, political, economic and cultural structures and other resources must be equitably distributed within and among the people in the community. As a social virtue, equitable distribution of goods is grounded on human dignity where every person and family regardless of social status is considered and respected. Everyone is considered part of the human family where resources are shared to realize his/her human potential;

Appropriate – The programs introduced and implemented in the community must be appropriate to the needs and concerns of the people. Hence, appropriate methods and proper use of technology must uphold the values and respect for others and the environment.

The people can maximize the use of the local materials and other resources for economic benefits provided other systems in the community must be preserved and enhanced;

Critically empowering - Autonomy, self-confidence, self-confidence, and self-worth can be manifested in the empowerment capacity of the poor. Development initiative therefore, must embody the process of empowerment and conscientization where the poor and oppressed understand the causes of their poverty and peacelessness thus, liberating themselves towards freedom, justice, control over resources and decisions and uphold accountable social institutions that affect their lives;

Environmentally sound – Underlying grass-root-oriented development is the preservation of the environment for peace and sustainable development. Programs and projects introduced and implemented in the community must include environmental education where deeper understanding of environment, inspiring the people to take personal responsibility for its preservation and restoration. This is indispensable for it is where long-term human survival depends.

However, (Linao, 2004) states the modernization paradigm, in its bid to modernize falls short to meet the basic needs of the community. In this case, modernization is seen as an infringement for it does not show respect for other sector in the community. Moreover, it becomes the root cause of disintegration, community fragmentation and environment degradation. Williamson as cited by Linao (2004) identifies four different approaches used by various organizations throughout the history of community development. The following are:

Top-down – There are two elements under this category. First is “do development to the people” which means that the priority is for capital and technical investment to introduce development. In this aspect, however, people as seen as separate from the development process. Second is “do development for the people”. The local people are considered as the recipient of the development but not as active players;

The Bottom-up approach – This approach considers people as important in the process for achieving development, but still orchestrated outside the community;

The cooperative approach – This approach makes local people participate with the communities as necessary partners in development; and

Community empowerment approach – This focuses on developing local capacity for self-development. For the first time people are seen as the primary focus and owners of the development process (Linao, 2004). Recently, the “community

empowerment approach” is seen as the most popular and viable among civil societies as their thrust to poverty alleviation through community development and organization.

3. PEACE AND DEVELOPMENT

Galtung (1990), points out that peace and development are in a sense the same thing. The only difference he adds, “the problem of peace in narrow sense is what the rich countries are worried about, and the problem of development is what the poor nations are worried about, with elites in both cases being concern with the narrow meanings and hungry people with a broad meanings.”

Whatever concerns maybe, peace and development is a modern parlance in peace studies and researches that calls for a just and humane society. Building peace means pursuing development. It means pursuing justice for all peoples and nations. It means recognizing a moral order in the universe, and guiding our choices and action accordingly. It means that citizens of the affluent nations in the history of the world must use effectively their most important tool, which is their citizenship. Good direction to a national policy for foreign aid, for overseas development, for world hunger, for availability and management of loans, for trade and terms of trade must be fostered.

Development is not just a matter of economic and material goods. It involves the whole person: economics, politics, culture, and religion. Hence, the Rights Based Approach (RBA) to the development is considered one of the most comprehensive approaches. This approach covers the entirety of the human dignity. It views every person with inherent dignity and that his/her rights must be respected.

The universality and the individuality of rights, non-discrimination, best interest of men, and participation are the thrust of RBA. This approach to development is non-discriminatory because rights are inherent in the human person regardless of age, status, income, gender, place, educational attainment, race or citizenship. Human interest is respected and promoted.

Gandhi, on the other hand elucidates his own view of development. Ostergaard (1990) in his article “A Gandhian Perspective on Development,” states that for Gandhi “without any violence, development should proceed from below and not be directed by the state (p.206).” Gandhi’s view comes from the concept of *swaraj* (self-government) where comprehensive programs for human development are designed by ordinary people. This is what he calls “development from below” to which the end goal is “*sarvodaya*” society – a stateless society that formally abolishes political and legal authority. Thus, relations among people are governed by moral authority.

After his assassination, congress did not approve his proposal. While his followers tried to apply this concept, the real *swaraj* has never been attained. Today, without downplaying Gandhi’s perspective of *swaraj*, greater emphasis on peace and development with similar concept is in progress.

One driving force in the pursuit of peace and development is education for peace where every individual, every organization and nation must undertake.

4. APPROACHES IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Before going to the definition of participation, it’s necessary to pay attention to approaches which used by community development. There are many approaches of community development, such as grassroots approaches (bottom-up) and top-down approach; or from expert approach to multiple approaches and inner approach; and from conflict to technical help, self-help and empowerment approach. However, Conyers (1986) classified community development into three types based on the approach - "top-down", "bottom-up" and "partnership". In top-down approach of community development, main activity of development is initiated by the government or authority. In fact, in this approach everything is managed by government, and the community’s members are passive. The top-down approach emphasizes central planning. Meanwhile, the bottom-up approach to community development is initiated and managed by the community for the community. Government and service providers play merely a supportive role as facilitators and consultants. In other words, the active role in the process of development is played or initiated by the community itself. When the development attempt is combined or initiated by both the government and the community, it is called the partnership approach of community development. Each approach can be applied in different ways and in different condition of community. When people are able to define their own problems and having ability and capacity to solve it through organizing and participating themselves, the bottom-up approach of community development could be developed. According to Finger (1994), the bottom-up approach emphasizes community participation, grassroots movements and local decision making. It

argues that community participation and grassroots initiatives which promote participatory decision making and local self-reliance ultimately pay dividends (Panda 2007). But, when people are lack of ability and capacity to make and to take action in developing their community, government and agency concerned should take over the process of development in some period of time in order to upgrade their awareness, knowledge and skill needed for self-reliant, thus the top-down approach of community development could be developed. The partnership approach of community development could be initiated when an attempt of government authority united with those of people to promote better living for the whole community with the active participation of the individuals of community. However, community development is much closer to bottom-up or change from the below rather than the other approaches.

5. THE CONCEPTS OF PARTICIPATION

Participation, as a concept within community development, is widely and commonly used. It is a central concept in, and foundation principle of, community development. Economic Commission for Latin American (1982) defines participation as a voluntary contribution by the people in one or another of the public programmes supposed to contribute to national development. Meanwhile, according to Cohen and Uphoff (1977), participation includes people's involvement in decision-making processes, in implementing programmes, their sharing in benefits of development programmes and their involvement in efforts to evaluate such programmes. The real meaning of popular participation is the collective effort by the people concerned to pool their efforts and whatever other resources they decide to pool together, to attain objectives they set for themselves. In this regard participation is viewed as an active process in which the participants take initiatives and actions that are stimulated by their own thinking and by deliberations over which they exert effective control.

The idea of passive participation which only involves the people in actions that have been thought out or designed by others and controlled by others is unacceptable (ACC Task Force on Rural Development 1978). Most important agencies of development emphasis on participation as a key concept on development, and they believe that without participation sustainable development wouldn't be achieved. Meanwhile, participation occupies a central place in development thinking and practice. Governments, funding agencies, donors, and civil society actors including NGOs and multi-lateral agencies like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund have all arrived at a near consensus that development cannot be sustainable and long-lasting. The focus of this paper is on the Cohen and Uphoff's definition, because the definition is much close to objectives of this paper.

(a). Participation as a Mean

In this interpretation, participation is seen as the means of achieving a set objective or goal. In other words it is a way of using the economic and social resources of rural people to achieve predetermined targets. The results of the participation in the shape of the predetermined targets are more important than the act of participation. Those results may indeed lead to a welcome improvement in the physical environment and may well coincide with local needs as perceived by those people. Government and development agencies responsible for providing services and with the power to control resources see participation as a means of improving the efficiency of their service delivery systems. Participation as a means is essentially a static, passive and ultimately controllable form of participation. It is the form of participation more commonly found in rural development programmes and projects. It is seen there, however, as a temporary feature an input required if objectives are to be achieved. It is only rarely that a longer-term view is taken. It is rightly argued that rural development projects would benefit from more direct participation by the local people, but it is also important to ensure that such participation is not merely a way of facilitating attainment of the project's objectives (Oakley 1989). The mobilization of people in this form of participation is to get things done based on a fixed quantifiable development goal (Moser 1989) which can be state-directed or externally-directed activities, the 'top-bottom' (or directive) approach to community development. In such phenomena participation turns into passive and static events which can then be induced or even coerced participation (United Nation 1981) or a compulsory participation (Oakley 1989), or manipulative participation (Midgley 1986) by the government or other external bodies.

(b). Participation as an End

In participation as an end, emphasis is laid on participation as a process in which confidence and solidarity among rural people are built up. Participation as a process is a dynamic, unquantifiable and essentially unpredictable element. It is created and moulded by the participants. It is an active form of participation, responding to local needs and changing circumstance. More generally, participation as an end in itself presupposes the building-up of influence or involvement

from the bottom up wards. As a result this form of participation has come to be associated with development activities outside the formal or government sector and is concerned with building up pressures from below in order to bring about change in existing institutional arrangements (Oakley 1989). Asnarulkhadi (1996) has mentioned that participation as an end in itself focuses on participation as a process in which people are directly involved in shaping, deciding, and taking part in the development process from the bottom-up perspective. Here, the development goal is of secondary importance, but the process whose outcome is an increasingly meaningful participation in the development process (Moser 1989), direct participation (Richardson 1983), or active participation (Gilbert and Ward 1984) from people emerges where their confidence and competence are built up. In this situation, participation becomes a process of achieving greater individual fulfilment, personal development, self-awareness and some immediate satisfaction (Richardson 1983)

6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This paper reviews two types of participation: participation as a mean and participation as an end. Based on possibility of empowerment - if power can change, empowerment will be achieved or otherwise it's impossible. On the other hand, as mentioned in illustration of participation as a mean, people are passive and they haven't any control over their lives. They also, can't take power. But in participation as an end people directly involved in the process; they will get power and control over decision affecting on their lives. Thus, it is participation as an end that leads to empowerment. Many scholars have approved indirectly these situations. Pretty et al (1995) viewed participation along a spectrum with passive participation at one end and self-mobilisation at the other end. Passive participation is where people are told what to do. On the other end is self-mobilisation where the local people themselves are in total command. At one end of the spectrum, passive participation, and people's control is almost non-existent while at the other end, self-mobilisation, and people have almost total control over the processes while the role of outsiders is at best minimal. So, it is concluded that participation by manipulation and passive participation can't empower community, but both interactive participation and participation by self-mobilisation can be highly empowering. Rakodi (1991) and Friedmann (1996) have been mentioned that a different paradigm sees empowerment as the true end of participation, although this is closely related to a paradigm in which participation is seen as an end in itself (Lyons, Smuts et al. 2001). Abott (1996) also has showed that empowerment will be achieved through participation as an end. Because, where participation is used primarily as a means to conscientization, its role is largely as a political tool, and it involves a significant reduction in the number and quality of development issues which can be addressed. This paper is also interested to determine the relationship between approaches of community development, participation and empowerment. As have been mentioned earlier, in top-down approach, the development agency has the upper hand and controls the community in its development efforts. The development agency, whether it is a government agency or a nongovernment organization, tries to develop the community according to its own purposes, whether the community wants it or not. People don't involve in the projects. So, they wouldn't get skills, knowledge, etc. and then community will be dependent to government and other agencies. Since the philosophy of community development is independent from external agency, so this approach could not lead to empowerment and sustainable development. From the development view this approach may be useful in some poor countries or in certain areas; but, it's a short-term period and cannot lead to empowerment. On the other hand, the features of this approach are similar to participation as a mean because in both of them, people don't have power, could not take control and are passive in the process. In partnership approach or cooperative, community works together with government or another agency. However, they can participate in the project at the medium level. In this approach, sometime community has more control than government and vice versa. People can learn some skills, knowledge, and so on. So, this approach will lead to moderate level of empowerment. In the bottom-up approach, everything is managed by community for community. Community's members involve in the whole of process, from decision-making till evaluation. The community has more power and control over the decisions. Since the people can do everything to improve the quality of their lives, they will become independent and will empower. This development will also sustainable because the community can meet their need beyond the government assistance. This approach is very close to participation as an end, because in both of them people get power and control and also directly involve in the development process. Some scholars and theories assert that empowerment will be achieved at the bottom-up approach. According to Abbott (1996), empowerment thus involves action at the grassroots level, creating self-awareness and the transformation of society, leading to a negotiated power-sharing in, for example, urban management.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbott, J. (1996). *Sharing the City: Community Participation in Urban Management*. London, Earthscan.
- [2] ACC Task Force on Rural Development (1978). *Report of the Third Meeting of the Working Group on Programme Harmonisation*. Rome.
- [3] Asnarulkhadi, A. (1996). *People's Participation in Community Development and Community Work Activities: A Case Study in a Planned Village Settlement in Malaysia*, University of Nottingham. Phd.
- [4] Cohen, J. and N. Uphoff (1977). *Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design, Implementation and Evaluation*, Ithaka, Cornell University.
- [5] Conyers, D. (1986). "Decentralization and Development: A Framework for Analysis." *Community Development Journal* 21(2).
- [6] Economic Commission of Latin America (1982). "popular participation in Development." *Community Development Journal* 8(2): 77-9.
- [7] Finger, M. (1994). *NGOs and transformation: Beyond social movement theory. Environmental NGOs in world politics: Linking the local and the global*. T.Princen and M. Finger. London, Routledge: 48-66.
- [8] Frances, O. (1990). "Some Reflections on Community Development Experiences in Brazil." *Community Development Journal* 25(4).
- [9] Friedmann, J. (1996). " Rethinking poverty: empowerment and citizen's rights." *International Social Science Journal* 148: 161–172.
- [10] Gilbert, A. and P. Ward (1984). "Community Action by the Urban Poor: Democratic Involvement, Community Self-help or Means of Social Control." *World Development* 12(8): 178-183.
- [11] Ife, J. and F. Tesoriero (2006). *Community Development*. Australia, Pearson Education Australia.
- [12] Javan, J. (1998). *Empowerment for Community Development: A Multivariate Framework for Assessing Empowerment at the Community Level*. Department of Psychology, North Carolina State University
- [13] Lyons, M., C. Smuts, et al. (2001). "Participation, Empowerment and Sustainability: (How) Do the Links Work?" *Urban Stud* 38(1233).
- [14] Midgley, J. (1986). *Community Participation: History, Concept and Controversies*. Community Participation, Social Development, and the State. J. Midgley and et al. London, Methuen.
- [15] Moser, C. O. N. (1989). "Community Participation in Urban Projects in the Third World." *Progress in Planning* 32(2).
- [16] Oakley, P. (1989). *Community Involvement in Health Development: An Examination of the Critical Issue*. Geneva, WHO.
- [17] Panda, B. (2007). "Top Down or Bottom Up? A Study of Grassroots NGOs' Approach." *Journal of Health Management* 9(257).
- [18] Pretty, J. and et al (1995). *A Trainer's Guide for Participatory Learning and Action*. London, IIED. Participatory Methodology Series.
- [19] Rakodi, C. (1991). "Developing institutional capacity to meet the housing needs of the urban poor: experience in Kenya, Tanzania and Zambia,."
- [20] Rappaport, J. (1987). "Terms of Empowerment? Exemplars of Prevention: Toward a Theory for Community Psychology." *American journal of community psychology* 15(2): 121-148.
- [21] Richardson, A. (1983). *Participation*. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- [22] Staples, L. H. (1990). "Powerful Ideas About Empowerment " *Administration in Social Work*.

- [23] Tricom, (1998). Depending the Land, Lumad and Moro Peoples' struggle For ancestral domain in Mindanao by Tri-People Consortium for Peace, Progress and Development of Mindanao. Anti-Copyright 1998, Ricom, SMU, ICCO and AFRIM.
- [24] Toh, S.H. (1995). Enculturation of peace: A journey of healing and Solidarity. Paper presented at the UNESCO Second International Conference on a Culture of Peace, Manila.
- [25] Torres, A.T. (1993). Environment, Society and development: Philippine Report on social science perspective and sustainable development, A country paper presented at the Tenth Biennial Conference of the Association of Asian Science Research Council, Kawasaki City, Japan, Sept. 5-12.
- [26] Tope, L.R.R. (1991). Cultures of the world: Philippine, Singapore. Times Books International.
- [27] United Nations, Report on the International Conference for Ministers Responsible for social Welfare (New York, 1968), p. 56
- [28] Villarin, T.S. (1996). People Empowerment. A guide to NGO-PO partnership with local government, kaisahan tungo sa kaunlaran ng Kanayunan at repormang pansakahan.
- [29] Vivian, J.M. (1992). Foundation for sustainable development: Participation, empowerment and local resources management, Grassroots environmental action by Dharam Ghai and Jessica Vivian. Routledge. London and New York.
- [30] Yonoriza (1998). From shifting to Sedentary cultivation. The responsiveness of shifting cultivators towards environmental changes and its implications for participatory development in Southeast Asia. A paper presented during the s/w or Participatory Development in Southeast Asia.