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ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to determine whether our participatory process of curriculum development for vocational technical schools in Honduras was successful. This study analyzed program documents and correspondence to answer two questions: a) How did individual stakeholders perceive and negotiate the participatory process? and b) What factors -- individual and environmental-- promoted and impeded the participatory process of development in this project?

Participatory development concepts applied to Human Ecology Theory guided this research. Qualitative methodologies were utilized to develop the curriculum—Phenomenology-- and to evaluate the process of development—Grounded Theory and Matrix Analysis. An analysis of individual counterpart contacts revealed that stakeholder organizations moved through 3 phases from project inception to completion. First, the team established an egalitarian and participatory philosophy of development. Second, they moved through a sequence of learning and teaching exercises prior to forming partnerships and developing projects. Third, the team focused on counterpart “fit” and relationship development as essential factors in successful partnering and participatory development.

The process was a success in the following respects: 1) Our team valued, respected and facilitated the needs and desires of local agencies working in the field; 2) Our participatory process was informed, iterative and voluntary, and 3) Overall participation by our primary stakeholders were consistent and significant. Our process could have been improved by involving primary beneficiaries earlier in the project cycle.

Although this analysis was qualitative and is therefore limited in its generalizeability, several lessons learned may be transferred to others interested in planning for a participatory
development process. Individual development workers, the group dynamic and philosophy, and the process of development are equally important in successfully facilitating a participatory project. Supporting factors were a decentralized decision-making structure, key host-country based employees and recognition that socialization and play cement relationships that are an essential base for participatory processes. Impeding factors were a lack of time and funds dedicated to support relationship development and counterpart input.
INTRODUCTION

In March of 2002 world leaders converged in Mexico at the World Poverty Summit sponsored by the World Bank and challenged rich nations to increase aid to the world’s poor. After a steady decline in development aid since WWII, most nations agreed, at least in principal to increase their overseas assistance. The United Nations called on countries to double aggregate aid to $100 billion US annually to meet the Millennium Summit goals (CNN, 2002). It remains to be seen if more aid is the answer, particularly after decades of poor results in poverty reduction in the developing world (CNN, 2002).

The history of the international development movement since WWII clearly shows that traditional approaches to providing aid have not worked to reduce poverty in the long run (cf.; Long, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995). Although seemingly contradictory, it is becoming accepted that additional financial aid alone will not reduce poverty in developing countries. An increase in material wealth is only one component of the contemporary ‘development’ paradigm, and possibly not even the most important component (Clark, 1990; Crewe & Harrison, 1998). What is needed is an approach that is effective in empowering the poor with experiences, capacities and skills that will allow them to improve their situation long after development donors have gone (Ariyaratne, 1977; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Freire, 1970; Hussein, 1995; Long, 2001; Narayan, Chambers, Shaw & Petesch, 2000).

The current thinking is that the development paradigm that accomplishes capacity building and sustainability is one that is ‘participatory’ in nature (Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Long, 2001). There are a plethora of groups promoting their unique version of the participatory development paradigm (Ariyaratne, 1977; Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Freire, 1970; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Mies, 1983); and there is some
agreement on what ‘participatory development’ looks like and what it does (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Long, 2001). In spite of this, it is generally accepted that participatory development is rarely practiced, particularly in initiatives carried out by large governmental aid donors. It is also generally accepted that when it is practiced, it is not practiced consistently throughout the life of the development project (Long, 2001). Various reasons are posited for this dearth of participatory practices, having to do with the functioning of administrative bureaucracies, the difficulties of working between continents and cultures, and the impediments to true partnerships and empowerment created by Western actors and their empiricism and egocentrism (cf.; Ariyaratne, 1977; Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Escobar, 1995; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Nelson & Wright, 1998). Thus, researchers and practitioners are examining past international aid projects where participatory development practices were utilized in order to study the environmental components or processes that made such projects successful or unsuccessful.

I was a member of a research team from the Louisiana State University Agricultural Center (LSUAC) that was involved in a forest sector development project in Honduras funded by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). We structured the project process to be as ‘participatory’ as possible-- at least within our understanding of the term-- from the initiation of our partnerships, to project ideation, execution, and evaluation. Functioning under the regulations of two bureaucracies (i.e., USAID and LSUAC) made the actualization of the participatory process challenging. In addition, our commitment to ensure that the project was participatory and inclusive, created uncertainty and a degree of uneasiness for the project team. Finally, working in a location physically and culturally distant from Louisiana made communication and project execution slow and often frustrating. The outcome of one of the
forest sector projects that I describe in this dissertation—the development of a Human Ecology curriculum for students in vocational secondary schools—was within the team’s area of expertise. My research examines whether our attempt at a participatory approach was successful.

To understand whether our participatory development process was a success I posed the following fundamental questions as a foundation for this dissertation research: How did individual stakeholder groups negotiate and perceive the participatory development process? What factors, individual and environmental, promoted and impeded the participatory process of development in this project?

In chapter 1, I review the history, evolution, practice and the challenges of participatory development. In chapter 2, I discuss the theory used to conceive this project and develop a conceptual framework. In chapter 3, I explain the qualitative philosophy under which we first approached this process, the qualitative methodologies used to evaluate it, research questions, and data and project limitations. In chapter 4, I discuss the project background, including the country setting, counterpart background, and the project history and chronology. In chapter 5, I review my findings, including our partnership process, whether participation was meaningful, and which factors facilitated or impeded the participatory process. In chapter 6, I discuss the findings relative to past research and practices, and thereafter, the implications of this research.
CHAPTER 1. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Participatory Development

History of the Participatory Development Movement

It is important to understand that the participatory development movement is a reaction to the macroeconomic and mechanistic approach to post-war development led by the developed world through its lending and granting institutions. The shift to a participatory model from a unidirectional donor-to-recipient approach was a reversal of thought initiated by practitioners in the field and the poor with whom they worked, that eventually filtered up to the institutions of the developed world. Ultimately, it was these institutions that responded and revised their approaches and philosophies. This shift to participatory practices is evolving and continues to challenge established bureaucracies, financial realities and world views in which donor agencies and their employees operate. These historical underpinnings and the context in which institutional donor organizations operate continue to contribute to the failures occurring today in international development projects in developing countries (Arja, 2000; Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995; Haidari & Wright, 2001; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Long, 2001; Lyons & Stephens, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995; Shortall & Shucksmith, 2001).

The contemporary history of the development movement began shortly after WWII in great part with the creation of the World Bank-- the largest contributor and voting member of which is the United States (World Banka). At that time, the goal of development domestically and abroad was to introduce economies to capitalism through modernization and industrialization. People were seen as the objects of a national or macro program of development, and their participation, at most, was seen as responding to the stimuli or opportunities put into place by national bureaucracies (Curtis, 1995; Nelson & Wright, 1995).
This Western-centered, deterministic concept of development has its foundation in social evolutionist paradigms, which assume that society progresses through stages, each one better than the next (Crewe & Harrison, 1998). Development was characterized by a transition from tradition to modernity, from rural subsistence economies to economically growing and trading societies, and from communism or socialism to capitalism (Crewe & Harrison, 1998). It was assumed that development was motivated by rational self-interest, based on the concept of acquisitiveness (Curtis, 1995; Nelson & Wright, 1995); the end goal was to engineer an increase in material or economic wealth (Clark, 1990; Crewe & Harrison, 1998).

Although, participatory processes of development were being instituted in the developed world as a consequence of public protest and the institution of new laws, colonial and post-colonial governments in the developing world were particularly disinterested in inviting participation from the populace. Even a little power was seen as too much to lose (Curtis, 1995; Escobar, 1998; Nelson & Wright, 1995). In most contexts, village institutions, traditions and peasants were considered backward (Curtis, 1995). Participation from locals often came from local elites who benefited from the disintegration of institutions for personal gains, such as the breakdown of public lands for private opportunities (Nelson & Wright, 1995).

Even in the face of societal pressures to preserve the status quo, indigenous actors were at work promoting participation in development. One of the most influential of these actors was Paulo Freire, a Brazilian literacy educator. He rejected the passive approach of aid or charity and focused on the active involvement of the poor in defining their own realities and problems. His educational techniques were published in the *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), which was eventually translated and introduced to Western audiences (Curtis, 1995; Freire, 1970; Long, 2001).
The advent of the concept of participation as a transformation germinated by Freire’s work ushered in a multitude of techniques promised to structure the context of development into an event of equals (Archer & Cottingham, 1996; Ariyaratne, 1977; Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Fals-Borda & Rahman, 1991; Fetterman, Kaftarian, & Wandersman, 1996; Nelson & Wright, 1995). Several of these practices focused on methods for the poor to identify challenges and solutions (Archer & Cottingham, 1996; Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Fetterman et al., 1996; Nelson & Wright, 1995). Others relied upon community building strategies to coalesce peasants so that they could participate in collective development efforts (Archer & Cottingham, 1996; Sarvodaya, 1977). All shared a common understanding as to what participatory evaluation and development techniques accomplished. They empowered local, sometimes poor and illiterate people to analyze their own problems and to be in control of solving them (Archer & Cottingham, 1996; Ariyaratne, 1977; Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Fetterman et al., 1996; Long, 2001); and they enabled development initiatives to be sustainable in the long-term, long after the development donor was gone (Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Long, 2001). Additionally, they stressed the need for reversals in attitudes and power structures, valuing indigenous beliefs as the source of development efforts (Crewe & Harrison, 1998). Moreover, they called upon institutions to reorient their practices from dominating to facilitating behaviors, and upon development workers to commit to changing the lives of poor people (Narayan et al., 2000).

Dissemination of the work of these new development actors occurred through workshops and the publication of case studies and manuals by scholars and development practitioners from a host of disciplines, including education, anthropology, sociology, and rural and urban community development (Chambers, 1993; Chambers, 1997; Crewe & Harrison, 1998; Escobar,
Further dissemination occurred through the propagation of institutes, organizations and universities committed to people-centered development, particularly after the proliferation of websites and publications on the Internet (cf.; Deliveri; Eldis; IDR; IDS; IIED; PRIA).

In the midst of these events, two World Bank initiatives had an impact on the acceptance and promulgation of participatory practices by even the most intractable institutional aid organizations. Both initiatives were instigated by an autonomous group of NGOs, which established their own advocacy goals and agitated for change through collaboration and dialogue with the Bank (Long, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995). First, they convinced the Bank to concentrate funding on non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and away from the state as an attempt to change their development focus to be more people-centered. Second, they facilitated a research group that eventually published the Bank’s *Sourcebook* (1996) which identified participatory practices as the means of achieving development for the poor and marginalized (Chambers, 1997; Nelson & Wright, 1995; World Bank, 1994 as cited in Nelson & Wright, 1995).

At approximately the same time, The United States Agency for International Development (USAID) began to change its practices as a response to these external forces and significant political internal stimuli. By 1993, USAID had launched a complete reform process of the agency to re-orient itself toward, and hold itself accountable for results that its customers -- the poor-- valued (LaVoy & Charles, 1998 as cited in Long, 2001). Joining the ranks of other governmental agencies (cf.; DFID; IADB; FAO; UNDP, 1997; World Bank, 1996) they published their participatory manual, entitled, *Participatory Practices: Learning from Experience*. In it, participation is defined as a means to “actively engage partners and customers
in sharing ideas, committing time and resources, making decisions, and taking actions to bring about a desired development objective”. The manual focuses on local USAID missions and their experiences trying to engage primary beneficiaries as partners. Participant partners are defined as a host of actors on the development ladder such as NGOs and other local organizations that act as proxies for the poor, as well as the poor. The manual goes onto define participation as a process engaged in with the long-term goal of “promoting democratic processes” and “enduring economic and social progress” (LaVoy, 1999). This two-pronged definition, describing the practical and philosophical goals of the paradigm, is widely used in the development literature and frames the way that participatory development is evaluated (Long, 2001).

The Practice of Participatory Development

Academics, bi-lateral and multi-lateral NGOs, Southern and Northern NGOs agree that ‘participation’ is important but rarely practiced. Even when participation occurs, the quality or level of participation is not what it should be (Long, 2001). Most suggestions on how to remedy this lack of participation rest on changes that would have to be made internally or structurally in large donor organizations (Arja, 2000; Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995; Haidari & Wright, 2001; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Long, 2001; Lyons & Stephens, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995; Shortall & Shucksmith, 2001).

To determine whether participatory practices occur, it helps to identify what level of practice occurs, by which stakeholder group, and at what stage during the project cycle (Long, 2001; Uphoff & Cohen, 1980). This approach has been adopted by the World Bank (Long, 2001; World Bank, 1996).

There are six possible levels of participation categorized from least to most stakeholder involvement. The first three levels are considered means-oriented: practices put into place in
order to facilitate the goals of the project. The last three are considered ends-oriented: those that engender the capacity of participants (LaVoy, 1999; Long, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995).

The levels of participation are, first, information sharing, which involves dissemination of materials to the local population through public meetings. Second, are consultations, which involve field visits (Long, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995). Third, are joint assessment mechanisms, which involve beneficiary assessments through surveys or interviews. Fourth, are shared decision-making assessments, which involve workshops that help groups come to joint decisions. Fifth, are collaborative mechanisms, which involve joint working groups that hand over primary responsibility for implementation to stakeholders. Sixth, and most participatory, are empowerment mechanisms. These involve capacity building, project management delegation, and support for new, spontaneous initiatives by stakeholder organizations (World Bank, 1994, cited in Long, 2001). These later process-oriented participatory programs are considered more transformational and therefore more significant than product-oriented participatory approaches (Botes & van Rensburg, 200; Long, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995).

In analyzing whether these levels of participatory practices are used, each phase of the project cycle is examined. The phases of a project cycle are: identification, design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation (Long, 2001). The identification phase is the information gathering phase, when the donor organization or their representatives outline a project and assess how it will impact the local population. The design phase is when the project is developed into a project proposal by the donor or other representative parties. The implementation phase is when the actual project is carried out, and occurs after the project is agreed upon and the money has been disbursed. Finally, the evaluation phase occurs after completion of the project, and is done in light of the project’s goals and results. Included in the
category of evaluation is project monitoring, which should be done on an on-going basis so that corrections can take place during the life of the project (World Bank cited in Long, 2001).

Very little meaningful participation actually occurs in all four major phases of the project cycle; although, some participation occurs in the implementation phase (Long, 2001; World Bank, 1996). Almost no participation occurs in the identification phase and little in the planning phase, where many of the fundamental decisions are made regarding the overall thrust of the project. Involvement by stakeholders in creation and design is acknowledged to establish trust and create a sense of ownership so that the project is sustainable (Long, 2001; World Bank, 1996). However, development workers state that involving beneficiaries in project design creates expectations that they later cannot fulfill if the project is not funded (Long, 2001). By the implementation phase, most development organizations involve the poor. Instrumentally, it is seen as a way to spread project costs, particularly if money is short. However, involvement may not be meaningful in the way that it could have been if it was initiated up-front (Long, 2001). There is little participation in the project evaluation phase. It is a struggle to get decent project evaluation and monitoring out of administrative or aid agencies let alone out of the poor recipients. Impact evaluation, which is an effort to evaluate projects years down the road for sustainability and importance is rarely done by anyone at anytime (Long, 2001).

Challenges to Implementing Participatory Practices

All of this amounts to a general lack of meaningful participatory practices along the project cycle. This is due to the fact that project cycles were never meant to provide accountability to clients or project beneficiaries. As a general rule, the project cycle provides accountability to donors, and timetables and standards which help staff demonstrate their job performance to superiors (Long, 2001).
In fact, the lack of participatory practices may be due, in large part, to the bureaucracy of development institutions and the management of development initiatives (Arja, 2000; Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995; Haidari & Wright, 2001; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Long, 2001; Lyons & Stephens, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995; Shortall & Shucksmith, 2001). Project cycles respond to institutions and their requirements to plan and report (Shortall & Shucksmith, 2001). Deadlines and project goals lead to the emphasis of product over process (Botes & van Rensburg, 2000) and rushed conclusions where the poor can be overlooked (Long, 2001). Project teams exist among multiple organizations, languages and cultures so that there is often little common understanding about processes, particularly participatory ones (Haidari & Wright, 2001; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Nelson & Wright, 1995). Racism, sexism, and socioeconomic and ethnic stereotypes exist in the management of international initiatives just as they do in the host cultures of the development actors (Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995; Haidari & Wright, 2001; Maher, 1995; Maher, 1995); Development administration is often conducted in urban areas, where the poor do not have the money or transportation to travel (Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995; Maher, 1995). Development workers often invite the most visible, vocal and articulate groups to be partners in development, without a serious attempt to identify less obvious partners such as women and the poor (Botes & van Rensburg, 2000). Although thing-centered development is being replaced by people-centered development, bridges still need to be built and often participation isn’t solicited on technical projects (Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995).

These institutional factors are complicated by the difficulties of working with development beneficiaries. Various interest groups within communities vie for attention and finances, which creates conflict, competition and difficulty in ascertaining and completing
project goals. Some local elites act as gatekeepers, effectively blocking participation by the poor because it threatens their power base (Nelson & Wright, 1995).

Sometimes the beneficiary group refuses to participate because of prior experiences where expectations were not met or promises upheld (Botes & van Rensburg, 2000).

The discussion above informs the questions for this dissertation. First, how did individual stakeholder groups negotiate and perceive the participatory development process? What factors—whether they are personal, managerial, structural or project cycle related—contributed to or impeded the success of this project? Was the participatory process successful? And how should success in this project be determined—perhaps in terms of level of participatory practices engaged in or by and through participants’ comments. If these questions can be answered in a range of development contexts, then it is more likely that participatory development processes can be structured so that they can reach those who need it (Nelson & Wright, 1995).
CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

The purpose of this research was to explore how project stakeholders negotiated the participatory process and what factors contributed to the success of this social sector participatory development process. The theoretical framework chosen before determining the project was Human Ecology Theory. An ecological model is appropriate because the effect of a development effort on the stakeholders and beneficiaries depends on the environmental context in which the development effort unfolds. Just as Human Ecology Theory, as applied to families, can analyze relationships among the family and actors in various levels of the environment, the participatory development framework itself looks at the relationships among specific development actors in various levels and contexts of the development environment. In this study, we are analyzing the effects of the environment on two stakeholder groups of development actors. The first group is composed of the students and employees of the vocational institutes, and the organization that develops their curricula and certifies them, the Center for Human Resources Development in Honduras (CADERH). Administrators from the U.S. and Honduras who were employed by LSUAC constitute the second group.

Participatory frameworks rely on inclusion of the actors in all project cycle phases from identification to evaluation, and in the total spectrum of development participation, from most cursory to personal responsibility. Both of these concepts can be conceptualized in a Human Ecology Theory model that is composed of each level of development actors and how each participates in and perceives the project cycle phases and spectrum of development. In addition, in determining the project itself— a Human Ecology curriculum for at risk youth in vocational schools—Human Ecology Theory was used in determining the content of the materials and
which of the micro and macro environments to cover as we analyzed the issues these adolescents faced in their everyday lives.

Human Ecology Theory

Human Ecology Theory conceptualizes the family or individual and their relationships and interrelationships with their near and far environments. The term “ecology” has its origins in several disciplines, particularly the biological research of Charles Darwin and his principle of natural selection. A key to this survival process is the concept of the adaptation of the organism to the environmental inputs. This concept was borrowed by Human Ecology theoreticians and remains as a central concept in the theory today. Haeckel (1869) a zoologist was one of the first to conceptualize ecological theory as it related to and was interested in an organism’s relationship to its organic and inorganic environments (Klein & White, 2002; Buboltz & Sontag, 1993). He articulated the concept that the organism was more than just a sum of its parts (Klein & White, 2002).

The concept of human beings and their well-being as a function of their relationship with their environment achieved a heightened interest during the later part of the 19th Century during the Industrial Revolution when families and individuals moved from farming communities to urban areas and were sometimes caught in a web of poverty, isolation, disease, and difficult working environments. At that time, Ellen Swallow Richards, a chemist and a Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) graduate utilized what she then termed as “oekology” as a means for applying the principles, methods and results of science to the improvement of people’s lives and their environment. During the early years of the field of “home economics” as it was later termed, emphasis was placed on the effects of various impacts on the family such as air and
water pollution; sanitation and waste disposal; preservation storage and cooking of food; and clothing and furnishings for the family’s safety, health and aesthetics (Buboltz & Sontag, 1993).

During the 1960s, the environmental movement renewed attention to the theory and the impact of humans on their environment and the environment on humans, as an international audience focused on the issues of worldwide population growth, and the depletion of fossil fuels and other resources. Later pioneers of the theory who focused attention on issues and individuals in the family were Bronfenbrenner (1970) who studied children and their environments, and Deacon and Firebaugh (1988) who applied Human Ecology Theory to a Human Resource Management framework (Buboltz & Sontag, 1993).

Urie Bronfenbrenner at Cornell emphasized a contextual study of children and their relationship to their environments. He conceptualized the Human Ecology Model as being “like a set of nested structures, each inside the other like a set of Russian dolls.” Each of these nested systems comprises four levels of analysis: the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem and the macrosystem (Klein & White, 2002). He placed the child firmly at the center and envisioned the first environment, or center circle surrounding the child as being the microenvironment, which consisted of the child and the family. This initial environment involves the direct and concrete impact on the developing child of significant others. The second circle, or environment, is the meso environment consisting of the school and daycare and their impact on the child. This second environment is conceptualized as being composed of two or more microsystems. The third environment is the exo environment which consists of larger institutions such as the workplace and social networks that indirectly impact the child. This third environment is one which affects the micro and meso environments indirectly but which has no direct impact on the child or focus of analysis. The last environment would be the macro environment, which would
be the surrounding socio-cultural context (Klein & White, 2002). Bronfenbrenner also added another layer, the chronosystem as an outer circle which consists of the life transitions or changes that are visited upon the child or family. Herrin & Wright expanded the concept further in terms of another environmental layer that would consist of different world views or cultural systems (Buboltz & Sontag, 1993).

Deacon and Firebaugh (1988) have a similar but slightly different model which involves the family and the environments that touch the family, which radiate outward from the center. First, at the center is the built environment, then outside of that is the socio-cultural environment, and then, finally, the outermost circle encompasses the natural/physical environment. They applied this basic Human Ecology model or framework to a model of Family Resource Management, which is basically a Systems Feedback Model. First, as an Input, they place the family and their varying characteristics (race, composition, socio-economic status, age, and place in the life course) and the family’s mental frameworks (coping, decision making, and personality) and that family’s relationship with the external environment or inputs. Then they conceptualize the Throughput as being the decisions that the family makes with regard to the Input or energy introduced into the System. Then the Outputs are the actions that occur from the decisions that have been generated. Essentially there is a feedback loop from the Output back into the Input and into the Throughput portions of the model (Deacon & Firebaugh, 1988). This model, although traditionally applied to family decision-making processes is useful as a conceptual model for other purposes because it conceptualizes the unit of analysis and environments as having an interactive or two-way relationship with each other rather than a static one-way impact of environments on individuals. In portraying the family or unit of analysis as an adaptive system, the model takes the focus off of determinism and places the emphasis on the
varying degrees of control that the individual or unit has relative to the environment (Buboltz & Sontag, 1993).

Stemming from its biological beginnings, one of the core concepts underlying Human Ecology Theory is that of survival (Buboltz & Sontag, 1993). Other core values have been proposed that should drive the theory such as “human betterment” or an increase in what Boulding (1985) calls “the ultimate good”. Four virtues, contribute to the ultimate good, and they are: 1) something more than economic adequacy-- Riches in contrast to poverty, nourishment in contrast to starvation, adequate versus inadequate housing, and clothing, healthcare and other essentials for life; 2) justice and equality in access to work, education and health; 3) freedom in contrast to coercion and confinement; and finally, 4) peacefulness in contrast to war and strife (Boulding, 1985). Other virtues are included such as education, health, loving and nurturing relationships, productive and healthy work and work environments, a sense of meaning and community, and the ability to develop into human beings that are generous, courageous and tolerant (Boulding, 1985; Buboltz & Sontag, 1993). These virtues mesh with the purpose of this USAID social sector project, which was to facilitate a participatory development project for the betterment of the project participants and beneficiaries. These virtues are also congruent with the goal of “development” in general, which is to foster human development, learning and empowerment for the betterment of the general good.

In the applying Human Ecology Theory to any study, it can be challenging to identify which environments are the most important to the individual or group in question. For every person, certainly for every culture, there could be a different set of variables that fit into different environmental constructs, which could then be measured in relationship to the actors and their well being. Without another or additional theory operating in concert with Human Ecology
Theory, it can be very difficult to determine which variables of interest one might choose to measure or analyze.

This difficulty has been ameliorated in this analysis by applying participatory development concepts to the Human Ecology Model (See Table 2.1). Each of the environmental layers can be conceptualized as a layer of development actors impacting the project, the participation level or other question at issue. In this study, the two main units of analysis are, first, the beneficiaries of development; that is, the students and teachers at the vocational institutes and the local non governmental organization (NGO) that represented them, CADERH. The second group is composed of employees from the US and Honduras who were employed by LSUAC. A third level of actors, the tertiary stakeholders, such as the LSUAC administrators, can also be included in parts of the analysis. Each of these groups can be conceptualized in the model. For example, we can look at how the NGO/CADERH administrator in the micro environment, the US and Honduran based LSUAC personnel in the macro environment, and the LSUAC administrators in the exo environment influenced the project process. In addition, we can look at implementing actors, both LSUAC and CADERH employees and how they interact with one another, and perceive and negotiate the development process. Through the use of qualitative methods, notably phenomenology, grounded theory and matrix analysis, I can listen to the voices of the actors themselves to discern the impact of various development approaches and processes.

Finally, this study meets the criteria for family ecological research. Three criteria have been proposed that would define whether a scientific line of inquiry qualifies as family ecological research: 1) research should take into account individual family members’ as physical/biological and social/psychological organisms in interaction with each other and
organized as a family system; 2) individuals in the family system should be analyzed in relation to the totality of their environment, and; 3) research should include the mutual interactions between the family and their environments. These criteria are meant to apply to an entire thread of research over the life of the researcher, not necessarily to one piece of research at one period of time (Buboltz & Sontag, 1993).

This project analyzes how the beneficiaries negotiate and perceive this development process. The primary beneficiaries of this process are the CADERH administrator and the vocational technical teachers and students. These students are often from at-risk families and tend to live at these vocational schools with the support and guidance of the vocational school itself and the CADERH administration. They are literally children of these technical secondary schools. Thus, their microenvironment as can be conceptualized as the school environment itself, including the curricula in that environment.

**Theory of Development**

**Human Ecology Theory**

![Diagram of Human Ecology Theory](image)

*Model: Bronfenbrenner (1979)*
CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND FRAMEWORK

Appropriate Circumstances for Qualitative Methods of Evaluation

Qualitative methods are the best approach to analyze participatory development processes. The focus is on the process and what occurs during that process that promotes or hinders development. In addition, the focus is perceptions or how participants define successful participatory development practices in the context of the project.

Qualitative methods are used to generate in-depth and detailed information on a limited number of people, cases or situations (Patton, 1990). They measure the reactions of a great number of people, as to a limited number of items, which facilitates comparisons, aggregations and the generalizeability of results. They identify and describe the complexity of social problems and the human experience. They focus on the “process” of how something happens, rather than the outcomes of what are attained by the process (Patton, 1990). Finally, they can focus on the meaning of a phenomenon to the individuals involved (Marshall et al., 1999; Patton, 1990).

Qualitative methodologies often focus on fieldwork. Methods can be totally uninformed by the pre-identification of theory, and unconstrained by the development of categories or questions. This approach requires that the researcher be open to new ideas, insights and theories that will emerge directly from the people or the experience (Leedy, 1993). The validity of the work comes from the researcher, who is the instrument (Marshall et al., 1999; Patton, 1990). A loss of rigor can come from variations in the instrument or instruments due to differences in personality, energy level, outlook and expertise. These threats to validity are compensated for by the flexibility and insight that can be achieved through this methodology (Marshall, et al., 1999; Patton, 1990). Information discovered from qualitative research may be applied by analogy to
other situations; however, the detailed and limited focus of the inquiry prohibits the results from being generalized to other populations (Patton, 1990).

Donor organizations are beginning to accept qualitative evaluation techniques advocated by social scientists and other academics (cf.; Cernea, 1985; Edwards & Hulme, 1996; Escobar, 1995; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patton, 1990). Evaluations based on linear cause and effect, economic models, quantitative analyses and outside assessments are being called into question (Fowler, 1996). Increasingly advocated are qualitative, stakeholder evaluations based in ethnography, phenomenology and ethnomethodology (Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Patton, 1990). The World Bank studies alternative evaluation techniques within the context of their social development initiative. For example, there is an effort to measure the pluses and minuses of social capital accumulation and its effects. In addition, there is an effort to determine the effects of participatory development on the empowerment of those involved in the development process (World Bank Group, 2003).

Qualitative methodologies are an appropriate means to evaluate this development process. We used participatory development techniques to identify and plan a project. We used the same techniques to develop the modules and evaluate the process. The emphasis of this study is on the participatory development process and what occurs during that process that promotes or hinders development. This study does not evaluate outcomes or the impact of development product, which might be better addressed by a quantitative study. The focus is on the participants and how they perceive and negotiate the participatory development process. Subjective perceptions are effectively addressed by in-depth conversations, whether verbal or written, which document the effects of the program on the people who are experiencing it.
Getting the Essence of the Data Right: The Phenomenological Method

As a philosophical approach, phenomenology was the best perspective in which to ground this project, particularly during the initial, exploratory phase when we were first traveling to Honduras. Specifically, the phenomenological concept of epoche best describes the team’s open and unbiased frame of mind going into this project. Our approach shaped our experiences with local people and agencies, and led to a true partnership with the Center for Human Resources Development in Honduras (CADERH). Additionally, the phenomenological concepts of intentionality, reduction and communalization apply to the creation and analysis of data involving secondary stakeholders, or the memos and the e-mail correspondence of the LSUAC team, of which I was a part.

Phenomenological inquiry in the social sciences is a philosophical orientation for studying human beings and how they view the world (Husserl, 1962; Strasser, 1963; von Eckartsberg, 1996; von Eckartsberg, 1998). Meaning of a phenomenon is understood through experience, perception, cognition and language. It is constructed through the individual’s constant, every day interactions with the environment and other humans (von Eckartsberg, 1996; von Eckartsberg, 1998).

Edmond Husserl is considered the father of phenomenological thought. He begins inquiry into the phenomenon by using an approach he calls “epoche,” from the Greek word for reduction. This technique utilizes “bracketing” which requires the researcher to place all of his or her assumptions about the matter under study into abeyance (Husserl, 1962; Husserl, 1964; Husserl, 1977; Husserl, 1990; Husserl, 1999; von Eckartsberg, 1986). The approach is intended to allow the researcher to view the phenomenon from an unbiased position (Husserl, 1962; Husserl, 1964; Husserl, 1977; Husserl, 1990; Husserl, 1999). Through this process, things are
described not in terms of what we already know about them, but in terms of our awareness of things exactly as they presents themselves to us (von Eckartsberg, 1986).

A later step is called transcendental-phenomenological reduction, which results in a description of the phenomenon according to how all parties involved in the experience see it. The researcher describes what is seen and what is experienced in the act of being with the phenomenon itself (Moustakas, 1994). The description may include perceiving, thinking, remembering, imaging, judging, each of which contains a definite content (Husserl, 1962). The description is shown to others who have experienced the phenomenon, which allows for rechecking of the phenomenon relative to the self, and more self-reflection and self-correction, a process called communalization (Husserl, cited in Moustakas, 1994; von Eckartsberg, 1986). This intertwining of subjective and objective knowledge was central to Husserl’s thinking (cf.; Moustakas, 1994; Schultz, 1967; von Eckartsberg, 1986). The things that Husserl attempted to understand were not studied in order to determine their objective form. There was no “real world,” just the world created by U.S. (Schultz, 1967; von Eckartsberg, 1986). The observers and the actor were implicated in the creation of meaning. Essential meanings were attempted to be understood through the many perceptions and views of those who lived them (von Eckartsberg, 1986).

Phenomenology was an appropriate philosophical approach in which to ground this effort for a number of reasons. We sought to determine the perceptions of the development experience from those who live the experience in the most unbiased, open minded and organic manner possible. We were not seeking to utilize a predetermined method from which we attempted to create the development product. We did not intend to measure or count the physical results of the development program. Although a loose theoretical context was envisioned before the
development initiative took place—under human ecological and participatory development paradigms—theory, at least with rigidly predetermined categories or constructs was not identified prior to the inception of the study; nor were constructs envisioned at the outset under which to measure the results of the study. Rather, theory development occurred as a result of the analysis of the data.

Materials used to analyze the participatory development experience, such as meeting notes and email records, were chosen after the project was completed. If viewed from a phenomenological perspective, e-mail records in particular, were seen as appropriate materials under which to view the development process. They are often less structured and censored, and reflected the day-to-day life of the participants as they are living it (Fetterman, 1998). A portion of the email records were written to and from this researcher, which is appropriate under phenomenological theory, as all parties were constructing reality, both the researcher and the researched. Thus, the process of development, determining what data to use, and interpreting the data itself, were all inductive and open in nature, just as phenomenology is inductive and open in nature.

Theory Generation from Qualitative Data

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine how participants negotiated and perceived the participatory development process; and to discover what factors promoted and impeded the participatory process of development in this project. The qualitative technique that was used to answer these questions is Grounded Theory Analysis. In order to visually display my analysis and the findings generated there from, a data display method called Matrix Analysis was used. These two approaches yielded rich results for the reader as they explain how conclusions were
reached from both written and visual perspectives. Grounded theory analysis relied on the written word and textural analysis. Matrix analysis was a visual process that displayed findings from various avenues depending on the way that the constituent parts were grouped.

**Grounded Theory**

Glasser and Strauss (1967) elaborated a method for developing theory from the data itself, called “grounded theory.” As with qualitative methods in general, and phenomenology in particular, grounded theory is approached best without preconceived theory that dictates, prior to the research, relevancies in concepts or hypotheses.

Glasser and Strauss utilize a technique called Comparative Analysis to develop theory applicable to and from the particular data. Comparative analysis is a systematic method of comparing social units of any size, ranging from “men or their roles, to nations or world regions” (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). It is not a technique that focuses on the verification of an existing theory, or on getting the evidence right. It moves beyond these purposes to generate theory that is applicable to the data or situation. There is no emphasis on knowing the whole field as well as those who live it, or in generating a random sample of all of the data. Rather, the goal is to sample carefully selected cases to generate conceptual categories and their properties, which are then confirmed through more careful sampling. From these categories and properties hypotheses are generated and theory is created. The technique places a heavy emphasis on *theory as process*. The theory is not perfected, but is ever developing by the present researcher, and by the next researcher that comes along. The two basic types of theory that can be developed are substantive and formal theories. The focus of the theory development for this dissertation is on substantive theory, that is, a theory of what factors promoted the participatory development process and how that process was perceived by participants.
Generating Substantive Theory. With the focus on a substantive area, the generation of theory is achieved by a comparative analysis among groups within the same substantive area (Glasser & Strauss, 1967). Thus, in this case, the participatory development process among various levels of participants is compared. In comparing individuals in these groups, similarities and differences are noted. Through this process, theory is written or created through the development of categories and their conceptual properties, and then by generating hypotheses between the categories and properties.

Glasser and Strauss (1967) state that categories should be analytic and sufficiently generalized. They should designate the characteristics of concrete entities, not the entities themselves. They should also be sensitizing, that is, yield a meaningful picture, aided by rich illustrations that enable the reader to grasp the reference in terms of the researcher’s experience. A related grouping of categories and properties should be sufficiently developed, or saturated, by the researcher, before moving on to collecting data in another potential category.

Once categories and properties are explored, established and saturated, hypotheses between these categories and properties will emerge. Once this happens the researcher moves from a passive receiver of impressions to an active generator and verifier of hypotheses through more comparison groups. In the beginning, hypotheses may seem unrelated. However, once they become developed and become more abstract, they become related and the interrelations actually become the core of the emerging theory. The theory actually becomes integrated.

Theoretical Sampling. Glasser and Strauss (1967) state that “theoretical sampling is a process of data collection for generating theory, whereby the analyst collects, codes and analyzes the data, and decides what data to collect next and where to find them, in order to develop theory as it emerges.” Theoretical sampling is done in order discover categories and properties and their
interrelationships, which leads into theory. This is not statistical sampling, which is done in order to obtain accurate evidence on distributions of people among categories to be used in descriptions or in verification. Statistical sampling may naturally follow theoretical sampling. Theoretical sampling is controlled by the emerging theory, whether substantive or formal. In this case, data were collected after the project was completed and therefore new data collection, in terms of generating additional samples, was not possible. Additional data were extracted, as necessary, from the volume of materials archived and collected as a result of this project.

The basic criterion for determining the selection of comparison groups for discovering theory is their theoretical relevance for furthering the development of emerging categories. Therefore, the next step in the research is determined by the last step. In fact, theory development is severely limited by pre-selecting groups. Therefore, the researcher cannot cite the number and types of groups from which he collected his data until the researcher is over! In this study, comparison groups (of participants) were chosen that had the most potential for furthering the development of categories based on the data available in the historical record.

For theory development, groups are chosen that will generate as many properties of the chosen categories as possible and so that diverse evidence can be compared. Minimizing differences among comparison groups can be useful to establish a set of conditions under which a category exists. With these comparisons, the differences in similar groups will emerge, thereby directing the research toward other different comparison groups. Maximizing differences increases the probability that different data will be collected on a single category, while finding similarities among groups. The fullest possible development of theory is achieved by comparing any group, as long as the data applies to a similar category or property, no matter how different.
The varied experiences of US and Honduras participants were chosen post hoc due to the various perspectives they represented and their potential for generate rich categories and properties.

**Saturation Point.** Theoretical sampling continues until the research reaches the saturation point. Saturation means that no additional data are being generated that expounds upon the categories and properties. Glasser and Strauss (1967) comment that after an analyst has coded incidents for the same category a number of times, he or she looks to see if the new incident sheds new light on the category. If not, then, the incident is not coded, as it will not add anything to the theory. A sample is considered adequate if it widely and diversely saturates categories and properties, according to the type of theory that the researcher uses. In an inadequate theoretical sample, the theory is usually thin, not well integrated among its constituent parts, and has too many obvious unexplained exceptions. However, the researcher does not have to thoroughly describe and investigate everything about the particular phenomenon. As the research progresses it becomes easier to compare many groups, as not everything about a group needs to be compared, just those things that relate to the defined categories and properties.

**Coding.** Once theoretical sampling begins, coding and analyzing occurs. In comparing incidents applicable to each category (also known as “data”) the analyst codes each incident into as many categories of analysis as possible. Incidents in each category are compared with all other incidents within the same category to see how the incident is similar or different. The constant comparison starts to generate the properties, and the range and dimensions of the category.

As Glasser and Strauss (1967) point out, at the time when a category has been coded three or four times, the researcher will inevitably become confused and conflicted in his or her thinking. This is the time when the analyst should stop coding and write an analytic memo on the
category and these conflicting ideas. The memos essentially provide a thick or rich content for the categories. The rule for memo writing is that a single incident can only be used to illustrate one category. If the incident is also an example for another category, the researcher must find another example of it to use as an illustration for that category.

Integrating categories and their properties occurs as coding and short memos continue to be created. During this process the comparison units naturally change from incident to incident, to each incident compared to properties of the category that resulted from the initial comparisons. In addition, categories become integrated and connected. These related categories eventually become theory. When gaps are discovered, the researcher seeks to fill those gaps and creates new categories and properties that fill out the theory.

Once the theory becomes more developed, it is the job of the researcher to delimit the theory. Glasser and Strauss (1967) say that theory is delimited on two levels, the categories and the theory. Major modifications to the theory take place as categories and their properties are compared, logic is clarified, irrelevant properties are removed, properties are placed in the appropriate categories and reduction of categories occurs. Categories are reduced when categories and properties that are similar are combined under a higher-level concept. Terminology is reduced by using generalized language, rather than specific language. Eventually categories are cut according to the boundaries of the theory that has been developed, which in turn, limits the phenomenon or items that the researcher considers. The goal is to saturate categories. The goal of a good theory is to develop parsimony in variables and generality in scope of applicability.

At the point in the analysis where the data is coded, a series of memos have been written, categories and properties have been saturated, and theory has been developed, theory should be
written. Memos should be collated on each category. They should be reanalyzed in light of the theory. Theory should be revised, if necessary, and categories should be summarized and used as major themes of the theory to be presented. Coded data can be revisited, if necessary to pinpoint data behind a hypothesis, to fill gaps in the theory and to provide illustrations.

**Data Display Method**

A Data Display Method was used to visually display the theoretical categories and properties determined from the Grounded Theory technique. A data display describes then explains what happened in a particular project at hand. First, you tell a story (what happened), then you construct a map of what happened (using key variables) then you display the theory or a model that explains what happened (e.g., how are the variables connected and how did they influence one another) (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

By “display” Miles and Huberman (1994) mean a visual format so that the information is displayed systematically, so that the reader or researcher can see how valid conclusions can be drawn there from. This is much different than unreduced, poorly ordered, chronological reports dispersed over many pages. A full data display basically arranges the data systematically to answer the questions at hand. It consists of a full range of persons, events and processes under study. It should be arranged so that patterns and themes can be detected. It can be in a matrix format.

These display formats can be generated before the project is initiated or the data collected. However, with qualitative data, the data evolve as the study or project progresses. Analysts do not march through a project, but they scout around and develop their projects or analyses as their project matures. In addition, not just one display might be appropriate for the data at hand, but many. Each display can illustrate something different about the data. And each
display becomes more detailed and sensitive to the data as time progresses. Thus, although
displays or formats can be roughly generated before the project is started considering a particular
conceptual framework; real clarity with qualitative data comes later when the project begins to
take shape (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

If matrices are used, then the data coded from raw notes or interviews can match a
particular row and column headings of the matrix. It is important to keep a precise record of
actual criteria and decision rules used to code the data. Typical decision rules cover how
judgments or ratings are determined, or how input, participation, and reports from various people
are categorized. It is not necessary to use the same report for the final report that is used for the
analysis. It is important to make sure that the readers can see for themselves how the conclusions
were reached.

Displays and matrices were not determined before this dissertation was conceived. They
were developed during the analysis of the project materials. These data have been time ordered,
grouped according to activity, and when and between whom the activity occurred during the
project. They have been grouped into role ordered matrices according to the presence of
conditions that supported participatory partnering. They also have been grouped according to the
participant, and scaled according to the strength or existence of participation along the project
cycle (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

**Project Data**

Project materials documented the *process* over months of time of team building between
the CADERH administrator and LSUAC participants in the US and Honduras responsible for
carrying out the project to completion. Project materials also documented the interactions among
all potential counterparts and LSUAC participants, and the eventual partnering process that
resulted. Materials documented the development of relationships at each institution and divisions within institutions, and the level of participation of all concerned throughout the life of the project. These materials are the e-mail communications and notes of meetings, trips and workshops made as a part of the on-going development of the project. The following materials were used in the analysis:

1. As this project was one carried out between participants in two countries, the US and Honduras, and among participants at various locales in both countries, much of the communication was conducted via email. All of the email conversations pertaining to the CADERH module and to the relationship development among participants (approximately 700) were saved by this researcher and were used as a part of the data used in the analysis.

2. Trip Reports were written after every trip by all LSUAC participants and were included in the data analyzed. After workshops were given by LSUAC personnel, Activity and Post Workshop Reports were written with recommendations on follow-up projects, which were also used as a part of the data analysis.

3. After meetings of import, meeting notes were written by this researcher and others involved in the project either from notes taken in or after meetings, or from transcriptions of tapes and were used as a part of the data analyzed.

**Research Questions**

This research was motivated by my desire to understand whether our participatory development process conducted between continents and cultures was a success. Thus, I posed the following fundamental questions as a foundation for this dissertation research:
1) How did individual stakeholders perceive and negotiate the participatory development process?

2) What factors promoted or impeded successful participatory practices?

**Study Limitations**

The project materials analyzed were predominately from reports written by our LSUAC Forestry and Forest Products Team. No other internal documents or materials were solicited from other stakeholder groups, including LSUAC administrators and our primary counterparts. All emails analyzed were from my personal files and were either addressed, copied or forwarded to me. I did not analyze project emails that other participants received or archived. I analyzed materials that were a part of a project I was highly invested and engaged in, which may have biased my analysis or findings. I analyzed the perceptions, beliefs and processes of people of another culture, which may have compromised the validity of my findings. Finally, this was an analysis of one specific development project and was conducted using qualitative techniques therefore the findings that resulted from this research are limited in their transferability to other projects and populations. The potential biases described herein were counterbalanced by the detailed and analytic methodologies of Grounded Theory and Matrix Analysis used to analyze these data.
CHAPTER 4. PROJECT BACKGROUND

Setting

Introduction

Our social sector project was funded to assist in the reconstruction of the forestry sector in Honduras. We partnered with a vocational school center that developed instructional materials to train at-risk youth for employment in timber-related and other industries. The academic arm of our forestry team was Louisiana based. However, the funding agency, the other half of our team, counterpart agencies and the people they represented were all in Honduras. In order to understand the context in which our project was conducted it is important to understand basic country demographics on geography, economy, family, poverty and education. Additional background information is provided on our main counterpart.

Honduras

Honduras is a country of over 6 million people of Spanish European and indigenous Indian descent. The majority of people are Roman Catholic and the predominant language is Spanish. Most of the populace is rural even though there has been an increasing trend of urban migration over the last decade. Approximately a million people reside in each of the metropolitan areas of Tegucigalpa, the capital, and San Pedro Sula (CIA, 2002).

Honduras is the size of Louisiana and is situated in Central America, nestled between Guatemala, Nicaragua and El Salvador. It is mountainous, subtropical in the lowlands and temperate in the highlands. Due to geography and a lack of volcanic activity, only fifteen percent of the land is arable. Despite a shortage of productive land, a significant part of the economy is based on agriculture (Department of State, 2001).
However, traditional agricultural livelihoods are threatened by expanding urban populations, soil erosion from improper land use, deforestation from clearing land for agriculture, water pollution from mining, and natural disasters. Services and industry—some newly introduced such as maquiladoras or textile factories—comprise the remainder of the country’s economic base (CIA, 2002).

Honduras is one of the poorest and least developed countries in the Western Hemisphere. Poverty estimates range from 53 to 80 percent and disproportionately impact women and children (CIDA, 2002; Department of State, 2001; USAID, 2000). Poverty rates are high in female headed households (CIDA, 2002; FAO, 1996) where the struggle for survival is exacerbated by a culture that generally discriminates against women in all social and economic activities (FAO, 1996). Women have little access to credit, education, training and land, which contributes to the feminization of poverty (CIDA, 2002). Youth ages 15 to 25 comprise more
than 60 percent of the country’s unemployed, which resulted in increased gang activity and youth perpetrated crimes (UNICEF, date unknown). As a whole, the economic condition is dominated by two extremes, the extremely wealthy that are the land owners and the extremely poor that are not. A lack of running water and sanitation, and a high infant mortality rate plague the rural populace (Rowlands, 1994).
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**Figure 4.2: Honduran Family**
Richard P. Vlosky, Photo

Poverty and education levels tend to be associated. The literacy rate is 74 percent, with literacy defined as “age over 15 who can read and write” (CIA, 2002). Compulsory education is six years, from ages 7 to 13 (Department of State, 2001). However, less than 50 percent of the adult workforce has completed primary school and only one-third of primary school graduates can find middle school placement in grades 7 through 9 (USAID, 2002). Attendance in primary school is high, around 70 percent. However, attendance at the middle school level drops to just 16 percent (Department of State, 2001). Cultural values, early pregnancy and marriage, and high
rates of sexual and physical abuse impede girls from attending secondary school (CIDA, 2002; UNICEF, date unknown).

Education is a luxury for children living in poverty. Many families do not have the financial resources to send their children to school, or they rely on their children to assist them in supporting the family by working. Girls as young as four commonly have to take care of their younger siblings (CIDA, 2002). It is estimated that between 8 and 12 percent of all children and youth below the age of 18 are working and/or living in the streets (World Bank³, date unknown). A majority sell items in city streets or markets and live with their families, however, about 25 percent literally live in the streets and have little family contact (CIDA, 2002; World Bank, 2000). Approximately 30 percent of the former group and 8 percent of the latter attend school (World Bank, 2000).

![Honduran Children in front of the Cathedral in Tegucigalpa](image)

**Figure 4.3:** Honduran Children in front of the Cathedral in Tegucigalpa
Richard P. Vlosky, Photo

Education is a luxury for children living in poverty. Many families do not have the financial resources to send their children to school, or they rely on their children to assist them in supporting the family by working. Girls as young as four commonly have to take care of their younger siblings (CIDA, 2002). It is estimated that between 8 and 12 percent of all children and youth below the age of 18 are working and/or living in the streets (World Bank³, date unknown). A majority sell items in city streets or markets and live with their families, however, about 25 percent literally live in the streets and have little family contact (CIDA, 2002; World Bank, 2000). Approximately 30 percent of the former group and 8 percent of the latter attend school (World Bank, 2000).
This latter group of homeless children had increased eight times in Tegucigalpa by the year 2000 (World Bank, 2000) and by 2002, it was estimated that they numbered around 50,000 country-wide. They suffer from physical violence and arrests, and can become hardened criminals, engage in prostitution or sniff a glue-like substance called Resistol (Casa Alianza, 1999; World Bank Group, 2000). Interventions at the family level or through educational opportunities are considered strategies to change the course of these children’s lives (World Bank Group, 2000).

**Vocational Education: Our Counterpart**

One very important participant in workforce training and development for adolescents was the Center for Human Resources Development in Honduras (CADERH). CADERH was established with the financial support of USAID in 1984 by the private sector and trade professionals to address perceived inadequacies in the government’s training program. A non-
profit consulting center, they develop competency-based, hands-on, self-paced instructional materials in 27 areas for use in 31 independently run, private vocational schools throughout the country. Each school has its own administration, with direction, training, technical and administrative assistance, teaching methodologies, written educational materials, certification, and accreditation programs supplied by CADERH.

Educational programs are 1 to 2 years in duration, and range from auto mechanics to computer applications. Teachers support and coach students as they work through the modules. Each program culminates in a two-part exam. Students have to pass a written test, and produce a piece of work that demonstrates they have achieved competency in their trade. In 2002, 5,000 students enrolled, 25 percent of which were women, and 2,500 graduated. In 2003, the projected enrollment was 8,000 students. CADERH claims an 80% job placement rate for graduates with their nationally recognized certificate.

Figure 4.5: Woodworker at Valle de Angeles
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Many of these vocational school students are considered “at-risk” due to poverty-related factors such as food insecurity, illness, a lack of family stability and homelessness. Students range in age from 14 to 18 years of age and are referred to CADERH and participating schools by community and religious leaders if they show promise and sufficient academic competence. Some of these schools also house, clothe and feed students. Some schools are supported and run by the Catholic Church, including one of the schools that worked with us in developing the Human Ecology Module.

The ALIANZA-LSUAC Forest Sector Development Project

History of USAID Intervention

In October of 1998, Honduras suffered the impact of Hurricane Mitch, one of the most devastating Category 5 hurricanes in Central American history. Heavy rains for nearly a week created severe flooding, which caused whole towns and crops to be washed away by walls of water and mud. Over 5,600 people died, 8,000 people were classified as missing, and nearly a half a million people were placed in temporary shelters. The infrastructure in major cities, including Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras, was devastated. Specific to this project, there was extensive damage to the Caribbean coast and to the forests and forestry sector, in general (World Bank).

The damage caused by the hurricane set back the development efforts of the country by years. As the then President of Honduras, Carlos Flores stated, “Overall what was destroyed over several days took us 50 years to build” (Scheibe, 1998). The foundation of the country and the infrastructure that serves as a basis for development were destroyed. Much of the nation’s social infrastructure, including schools, was also damaged and required replacement to buttress the
other economic development efforts. Total economic losses were estimated at $4 billion US; agricultural losses were estimated at nearly $1 billion, 8 percent of Honduras’ Gross Domestic Product and 70 percent of their exports. Their economic growth was near zero in 1998 and 1999, from an annual growth rate in previous years of around 6 percent. Poverty hovered at around 65 percent (USAID, 2000).

As a response to this disaster in Honduras, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) funded a technical transfer project through the Louisiana Alliance/Presidential Program for Investors in Honduras (ALIANZA) administered by MetroVision, the international division of the New Orleans Chamber of Commerce. The project involved three Louisiana universities including Louisiana State University.
Chronology of LSUAC Participation in the ALIANZA

Team Composition and Project Guidelines. The following chronology is an abridged version of an analytic memorandum developed from my email correspondence and all team project documents such as meeting notes, transcribed meeting tapes, trip summary reports and project reports. Sections are referenced later in this dissertation to reflect that certain findings and figures were drawn there from. The forestry and forest products sector of this project was carried out by the Louisiana State University AgCenter (LSUAC), School of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries, and the School for Human Ecology, administered by the International Programs Division at the LSUAC. The project component executed by the LSUAC forestry team specified that it would focus on forest products utilization and processing, economic and rural development, marketing and business development, value added processing and the social dimensions underlying these areas (Chavez, Dunn, Monroe, et al, 2001).

Dr. Richard Vlosky (Rich), a Professor of forest products marketing was appointed to direct the team by the Director of the Office of International Programs, Dr. Lakshman Velipullai
Lakshman also established the LSUAC-Alianza office in Tegucigalpa, the capital of Honduras, and hired Mr. Arturo Chavez, MBA (Arturo), a business/economic consultant, administrator and translator as the LSUAC liaison employee stationed there. Rich assembled a team of researchers and Louisiana Cooperative Extension experts from the School of Forestry, Wildlife and Fisheries that initially comprised Dr. Mike Dunn (Mike), an extension Program Leader and forestry/natural resources economist, Dr. Elvin Choong (Elvin), Professor of forest products, specializing in wood utilization, and Dr. Todd Shupe (Todd), Assistant Professor of forest products also specializing in wood utilization. Dr. Shupe also had an Extension appointment. Of this group, Elvin and Rich had extensive international travel experience, and Elvin had prior international development project experience. Rich’s Spanish comprehension and speaking ability was good.

Dr. Pam Monroe (Pam), a Professor in Human Ecology specializing in Family, Child and Consumer Sciences comprised the initial social sector component of the team. Several months after the initial team was assembled, Dr. Choong died while on location in Honduras. Shortly thereafter, I was added to the social sector part of the team as Pam’s doctoral student and research assistant. Melly Perez de Chavez, MD (Melly), Arturo’s spouse and a Honduran physician, was added later as a LSUAC-Honduras consultant to write and edit the nutrition and human sexuality sections of the module which we eventually developed.

Relevant operating guidelines and objectives for the 15-month project were agreed upon in conjunction with USAID Honduras. Notably, these guidelines did not dictate what projects must be accomplished nor the specific alliances that were formed among the host agencies and institutions of interest. The guidelines were as follows:
1. Develop a national group of representatives from the public and private sectors to discuss and identify relevant topics in which the LSUAC can collaborate in the goal of sustainable development of the forest-based sector in Honduras.

2. Develop a plan of action between the AgCenter team and its Honduran counterparts to execute interactive discussions and workshops in the areas that are found to have greatest commonality between stakeholder groups.

3. Develop and initiate applied projects that include areas relevant to sustainable forest development and business promotion, including technical training at host institutions, with an emphasis on partnerships with non-profit organizations (Chavez, Dunn, Monroe, et. al 2001).

Figure 4.8: LSUAC Forestry/Forest Products Team at the Princess Hotel
Richard P. Vlosky, Photo
**Preparatory Site Visits.** Pursuant to the general guidelines, Rich, Lakshman and a Honduran consultant met with potential counterparts in December of 2000. This fact finding trip was coordinated with the help of Lakshman who made some of the initial contacts in advance while setting up the LSUAC-Honduran office in Tegucigalpa in October, 2000. USAID personnel consulted during the October trip were the Agriculture and Natural Resources Director and Assistant Director, and the Forestry Specialist. Also consulted were a Central Bank employee and a Honduran business consultant. At that point in time, Arturo was hired at the LSUAC-Honduras office and helped coordinate the December visit and attended meetings.

![Location of LSUAC Office in Tegucigalpa](image)

**Figure 4.9**: Location of LSUAC Office in Tegucigalpa
Richard P. Vlosky, Photo

During the December visit, potential ideas for joint projects were solicited during meetings with potential counterparts. A survey was distributed during this trip to representatives of stakeholder groups to assess their opinions of what they believed were the major issues
confronting the industry, and what they felt would be the right approach to address these issues. “Personnel training” and “development of human and administrative assets” were two of the problems identified. Government, private industry and LSU were noted as parties that could contribute to capacity building in the forestry profession. The contacts made and meetings held during this first trip were with the following agencies: COHDEFOR, Agenda Forestal (a group rewriting national forestry legislation), InterAmerican Development Bank, FIDE (national multi-sector investment think tank), ANETRAMA (association of secondary wood products manufacturers), AMAHDO (association of primary wood products manufacturers), FONAC (campesino or farmers organization), ESNACIFOR (forestry and forest products university), CUPROFOR (forest products laboratory) and three private forest products business owners.

**Team Fact Finding Site Visit.** Subsequent to the December 2000 site visit, the Forest Sector team of Rich, Mike, Todd, Elvin and Pam made a fact finding visit to Honduras in February, 2001 to look at the forest resource and to meet personally with individual groups with common interests. Their agenda comprised the following visits, in which they asked questions about areas of interest and potential joint project ideas or programs and that might result from a partnership with the forestry team. Stakeholders were consulted during this trip by Rich and Pam for the social sector team.

- Pam explained the Monroe-Vlosky model of development for the social sector in the forest products industry in LA to two social sector employees at USAID. These employees mentioned CADERH and the idea of working with vocational education centers to address work/family related issues. Pam noted that her work identified industry needs and gap analysis assessment. They also met later with USAID’s natural resources director and forestry specialist who suggested that Pam might focus on researching
women’s roles and societal changes in Honduras. The director also mentioned that they would be interested in an analysis of the impact of the forest products industry on families, and that curricula development and proposal writing might be good projects. He also said that he would be interested in the social effects of training programs geared toward women. One USAID employee mentioned that 70 percent of households—-or some astronomical number—-were female headed and when asked by Pam what processes led to this result, the employee indicated that it didn’t matter. Pam noted that it mattered a lot. That employee felt that CARE (Cooperative for Relief and Assistance Everywhere, Inc.) would be the best contact on food security issues and hunger.

- Pam met with the PRONADERS director and an employee; they said they had too many meetings. They wanted to change their development approach from implementation to facilitation by asking rural people what they want, and helping them to manage the forests and develop local capacities consistent with living in the forests sustainability. They mentioned that the law supported local people’s ownership of the forests. In furtherance of the law, they wanted to work on the campesino side to promote responsible ownership, and on the government side to promote accountability. They were reviewing proposals submitted by organizations eager to work with communities and forests.

- Pam and Rich met with the COHDEFOR social forestry person, who explained the concept of small campesino cooperatives of 20-25 people who were trained in forest management and income generating projects that were consistent with sustainable methods of forestry. Most communities had not met with success except for a model community started by the Fins. He indicated that donors were interested in involving
more women as a part of the scope of projects. However, COHDEFOR had just enough program activity in this area to appease donors.

- Pam met with the director of ESNACIFOR at their offices. He indicated that they did not want more workshops; they were inundated with them. They were interested in long-term relationships. Pam had to determine how she might fit in with their programs and goals. Their agency disagreed with government projects that came in, did not involve people, and then left without any benefit. He indicated that they were mainly interested in trees not people. The faculty, on the other hand, stated that the curriculum should involve the social aspect, and that their extension program needed improvement. Faculty members related that people living in the forests believed the forests belonged to them. However, these communities would not work with foresters or the government in forest management as they were not invited to have a voice in the process. Forest dwellers saw the government giving permits to large companies and not to communities, and started fires as vendettas. It was a hostile situation. Faculty recommended that Pam do a case study of 2 or 3 forest-based communities and ask residents about their perceptions.

- Elvin, Todd, Rich and Mike and Arturo met with AMAHDO, ANETRAMA, Wellington Hall Furniture (manufacturer), CONADES and Caoba Honduras (furniture manufacturer.)

- The entire team met with the FIDE director. He mentioned that they were interested in investment and business opportunities that were consistent with “sustainable development, poverty alleviation and protecting the environment”.

- The team met with CUPOFOR and discussed research in lesser-used timber species. Dr. Elvin Choong tragically died on a recreational hike in a La Tigra, national forest during
that visit. Prior to and subsequent to this trip, the team leader, Rich, sent numerous materials to all team members on Honduran social, economic, political and cultural areas of interest.

**Social Sector Presentation Site Visit.** In March of 2001, the core team mentioned earlier, with the addition of this researcher made another trip to Honduras to give seminars as outlined in the initial project guidelines, and to meet with counterparts and potential partners for the ALIANZA project. The following were the activities and meetings on the March trip:

- Todd gave a workshop at CUPROFOR on wood quality, technology and process control. Mike gave workshops at ESNACIFOR on a comparison of LA and Honduras forest sector economies, and the LA Extension and Natural Resources Program.
- Rich, Pam and this writer visited Fundacion Maria and spoke to a staff person about returning on another visit to speak to the First Lady.
- Our social sector team gave two presentations at the Princess Hotel in Tegucigalpa. Pam explained the social dimensions and opportunities in the forest sector/human interface. I presented an alternative model for rural human and economic development. These seminars were attended by approximately 15 people from governmental agencies and NGOs in the social sector. Notably PRONADERS was not represented, although they were invited.

**Further Counterpart Communications.** After the March trip, several email messages were exchanged between Pam and Lourdes, and this researcher and Lourdes, and it was determined that site visits to various CADERH vocational schools in and around Tegucigalpa
Figure 4.10: Pam and Denese with Mary Flores, First Lady of Honduras
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Figure 4.11: Pam Giving a Seminar, Assisted by Arturo
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would be arranged for June. In early June, before the team’s subsequent trip, Arturo met with Lourdes. At this meeting Lourdes voiced her interest in having the forestry team review their curriculum in carpentry and related areas, as well as possibly help with curriculum development in the areas of marketing, sales and accounting so that the students could start their own micro-enterprises. Other social sector projects were not discussed. The June visit was rescheduled for July due to the possibility of a hurricane hitting the Louisiana coast.

**Narrowing Counterpart Focus Site Visit.** In July 2001 Rich, Mike, Pam and I went to Honduras. A central reason for this trip was to visit three vocational schools in and around Tegucigalpa administered by CADERH with their curriculum director, Lourdes. The schools we visited trained students in woodworking, furniture making, electrical training, and industrial metal working and upholstery skills, among other areas. Two of the schools were church run, boarded children that were in chaotic or homeless environments, and did not charge tuition. The children that commuted via public transportation received a stipend to do so and were fed lunch, which in some cases was their only meal that day. Orphans and former gang members were two of the groups that these schools assisted. One school administrator mentioned that they literally scouted around the country for children to approach.

Lourdes discussed the students and some of their challenges, including a lack of experience in how to get along with family and friends, and unwanted pregnancies, to name just two. Pam brought up the idea of our team working together to develop a Human Ecology curriculum which would address many of these issues and which would help students to understand that individuals are a product of their environment. Potentially these ideas and materials would impact home environments as well. Lourdes enthusiastically agreed. Lourdes showed us examples of the format, approach and content of current curricula. We committed to
providing CADERH with a draft of what the curriculum could or might look like as soon as possible.

Figure 4.12: Word Products Made by Vocational School Students
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Rich, Mike, Pam and I met with the following entities on this trip: FIDE, ESNACIFOR, CUPROFOR, Fundacion Maria, PRONADERS and private businesses. In these meetings, the team offered training and project development assistance, with the caveat that the LSUAC Alianza team “did not have a suitcase of money to hand out” and that all costs had to be shared by the host institutions. Project identification, development and execution had to be handled as a collaborative partnership between the LSUAC-Alianza team and the host institution. Team members made an attempt, several times, to approach agencies or institutions that appeared that they would be well-suited to partner with the LSUAC-Alianza team, based on their mission and objectives. Various institutions appeared disinterested in discussing projects further once they heard about our requirement of shared financial assistance and/or other resources. Unfortunately, this included some agencies that appeared as though they would be “natural” partners with the LSUAC-Alianza.
Notably PRONADERS, a government agency that dealt with social forestry related issues was approached more than once with offers of partnership and assistance. During this trip they were contacted by us and given a private seminar at their offices that seemed well-suited to their work. Our involvement in their newly-initiated international bank funded watershed project was discussed. We invited them to contact us to discuss further partnering options. However, that agency declined to do so. We did not approach them again, although we wrote a project description based on our conversations about the watershed project.

**Initial Project Proposals.** At some point after this trip, it was determined that the Forest Products Team had the money to invite our counterparts from Honduras to participate in training and field visits around the LSUAC area. The social sector--Pam and I—wanted to invite both Lourdes from CADERH and Helen Viva from ESNACIFOR. Training would encompass human ecology concepts, social assessment and evaluation (for ESNACIFOR), and certification of vocational programs (for CADERH).

After the July trip we began to put together a draft concept of what the Human Ecology module would look like for CADERH to review. I contacted the principal of the University Laboratory School, a part of the LSU School of Education, and asked if he would consider reviewing the module for pedagogical correctness. Pam arranged for me to visit the LSUAC Extension Human Ecology Specialist, who gave me 4-H materials for middle and high school students that could be adapted for our module.

I met with art instructors at the laboratory school and they agreed that their students would draw pen and ink illustrations for the materials. A resource specialist at the laboratory school contacted an anthropologist and he agreed to give a lecture on Honduran culture to the art students before they began illustrations. I wrote a beginning draft of the module, which Pam
reviewed. It was sent to Arturo so that he could deliver it to Lourdes to review before our meeting; we also asked that Melly Perez de Chavez (Melly), Arturo’s wife and a physician, review it with attention to the nutrition section and issues relating to content and culture.

**Counterpart Project Work Site Visit.** In October, 2001 we made an additional trip where Pam, Rich and I met with Lourdes and she reviewed the draft of the Human Ecology module for content, cultural appropriateness, language, and reading level. She had not reviewed it prior to our visit because Arturo had just delivered it the day before. It was in English at that time. We went through it section by section and made adjustments. Lourdes suggested that we add another section on human sexuality and puberty due to the age of the students and their lack of appropriate sex education. She discussed the children’s lack of good nutrition which gave rise to the idea to add a more involved nutrition section to the module. Pam suggested to Lourdes that Melly join the LSUAC team as a consultant to write the additional module chapters. Hence, we approached Melly and she agreed. We invited Lourdes to Baton Rouge to engage in training at LSUAC with our other counterparts.
During that same trip we met with ESNACIFOR director Miguel Hererra regarding who would come to the LSUAC training. We toured their new conference facility and discussed initiating an exchange program for students similar to the one that they have with other universities. Later, I gave a presentation to 25 participants at the World Vision Tegucigalpa headquarters; it was not particularly well received. The employees wanted data to support the impact of the model I was presenting, which I did not have.

![Figure 4.14: Denese Giving Seminar to World Vision, Assisted by Arturo Richard P. Vlosky, Photo](image)

**Long Distance Project Work.** After returning to Baton Rouge, we worked on finalizing the first draft of the modules. Melly sent me the human sexuality and nutrition sections, which Pam revised. I incorporated the revisions and sent them back to Melly. She was to re-revise, add pictures and citations, and have Lourdes and Arturo review and send them back to us. This process took them longer than expected. Because of time constraints, we sent the materials to be translated into Spanish, which was before our Honduran counterparts could make final comments. Finally, Lourdes reviewed the draft and had many suggestions, which Arturo typed and sent to me. I incorporated these changes. In the meantime, Melly made additional nutrition
section comments which I incorporated as well. Lourdes and Melly were to help me incorporate
the changes into the Spanish versions. There were many reminders and a lot of tension at this
stage. Our timeline was tight, particularly if we wanted to have LSUAC Communications do the
lay-up, cover and binding, as we had to pay before the last date to spend money on our project,
which at that time was December 15. We subsequently found out that it was too late to get
project assistance from the communications office. I would have to do that technical work, which
included the lay-up and cover in a format similar to the one that CADERH used for their other
training materials.

The illustrations were finished by the Laboratory School art students and we arranged for
a viewing date and food for a reception in the art room. Melly was to bring the illustrations for
her sections to Baton Rouge in November. We discussed an extension on our timeline, and if that
was approved, a date for the module testing in Honduras. We made arrangements for our

Figure 4.15: CADERH Carpentry Module

The illustrations were finished by the Laboratory School art students and we arranged for
a viewing date and food for a reception in the art room. Melly was to bring the illustrations for
her sections to Baton Rouge in November. We discussed an extension on our timeline, and if that
was approved, a date for the module testing in Honduras. We made arrangements for our
Honduran counterpart visitors, which now numbered 10, to come in November. The extension came through in late November; therefore we had an additional 3 months to finish the project.

Figure 4.16: Example of Illustrations drawn by LSU Lab School Art I & II Students
Counterpart Training at LSU. In late November and early December our Honduran counterparts came to Baton Rouge for the LSUAC training and education exercise. Specific to our social sector group, Helen Viva from ESNACIFOR, Lourdes Maradiaga from CADERH, and Melly Perez de Chavez, MD came to attend classes on nutrition, research methods, and the certification of vocational programs. We had developed an itinerary which included sightseeing activities. However, most of these prearranged “fun” activities were cancelled as our counterparts had other things that they wanted to do, like shop repeatedly at Wal-Mart! Melly and Lourdes spent time together reviewing the module, and making corrections and comments. They pushed for the testing of the module in Honduras in January. We held an “art show” in the Art room at Lab School for the 80 or so pictures that the students generated for the modules, which our social sector and forest products visitors attended.

**Figure 4.17:** LSU Lab School Art Student
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Long Distance Project Refinement. Subsequent to this trip, we sent Arturo the translated versions in Spanish to modify according to the nutrition and human sexuality comments made by Melly. Melly and Arturo made other grammatical and idiomatic modifications, as well and sent them back for me to insert the art illustrations. We planned for a February testing date. Arturo corresponded with Lourdes regarding the number of modules she needed initially, where the testing would take place and with whom. They suggested the Clarion (formerly the Princess Hotel) as the site of the testing and lunch, as a way to say ‘thank you’ to the participants. Lourdes and Melly met, and Lourdes made additional suggestions on the sex education portion of the module. They revised and printed the modules for testing. Arturo sent me the testing protocol, a survey, who it was to be tested on (10 students and 10 teachers) and where (at the Clarion Hotel). Lourdes and Melly asked Pam if she had a testing strategy she would suggest. Pam communicated that she would leave the testing methodology up to them.

Figure 4.18: LSU Lab School Art Show, Denese and Lourdes with Principal Albert Camburn
Richard P. Vlosky, Photo

Long Distance Project Refinement. Subsequent to this trip, we sent Arturo the translated versions in Spanish to modify according to the nutrition and human sexuality comments made by Melly. Melly and Arturo made other grammatical and idiomatic modifications, as well and sent them back for me to insert the art illustrations. We planned for a February testing date. Arturo corresponded with Lourdes regarding the number of modules she needed initially, where the testing would take place and with whom. They suggested the Clarion (formerly the Princess Hotel) as the site of the testing and lunch, as a way to say ‘thank you’ to the participants. Lourdes and Melly met, and Lourdes made additional suggestions on the sex education portion of the module. They revised and printed the modules for testing. Arturo sent me the testing protocol, a survey, who it was to be tested on (10 students and 10 teachers) and where (at the Clarion Hotel). Lourdes and Melly asked Pam if she had a testing strategy she would suggest. Pam communicated that she would leave the testing methodology up to them.
After much badgering, Arturo sent me the translated version of the form CADERH used to test modules.

Later, Arturo sent me the translated version of the nutrition and human sexuality sections. I inserted these versions into the larger translated version, made various technical changes, and sent the module to Arturo so that he could insert the human sexuality illustrations. Melly added yet another section to the human sexuality chapter that Lourdes asked her to prepare. At that point, the module was composed of the following components: The development of self; the development of relationships with family members and friends; the exploration of adolescence and adolescent sexuality; and the relationship of the individual with the community and the environment.

**Project Testing and Finalization Site Visit.** From our vantage point in the lobby of the Clarion, Pam, Rich and I were pleasantly surprised to see the number of people who came to test The Human Ecology modules—20 or more students and teachers, plus two other moderators from CADERH. Up to that point we had really not known how many would be there or if they would show-up. The students—dressed in their uniforms of white shirts and dark slacks and skirts-- came in a bus from a vocational boarding school in Tegucigalpa, Honduras with their Headmaster, Senor Padre. We had met Mr. Padre previously on a visit to that vocational school the prior summer. He mentioned to us that these students were from very marginal places (very poor) and were the best students he had.

The instructors were from various schools and were dressed in casual to dressy clothes (no jeans). The two moderators from CADERH, a woman in her late 50s named Mary and a tall young man in his 20s named Jose, were both smartly dressed. The teachers and students stood around in the elegant foyer of the hotel and pointed at various things. Lourdes told Arturo earlier
that she was supportive of the venue at the Clarion, rather than at a vocational school, as the locale and the lunch were their rewards for participating. Arturo and Melly and Pam and I escorted them to the room we would be using.

The students and teachers were seated in a conference room around tables in a horseshoe shape. Melly, Arturo, Pam and I were at a head table, which we really never occupied as we walked around or sat in the back where Rich resided with his camera. We were uncomfortable that our name tags conspicuously remained at the head table. In point of fact, before the workshop, Pam asked Arturo if CADERH could run the workshop independently, with our involvement limited to observation only. By occupying a supporting and background position, she wanted to communicate to teachers and students that we wanted their independent and unbiased input. We considered them the experts and wanted to learn from them. However, Arturo explained that from a cultural viewpoint we had to appear to be somewhat in charge, as they were expecting the “doctor” from the United States—Pam-- to have the answers. He explained that it was prestigious for them to have her sanctioning their involvement. Even so, Pam and I stayed in the background, watching and listening most of the time.

Senor Padre, an unmarried deacon in the church, opened the meeting with a prayer – a complete surprise to us. The prayer was in Spanish, and in it he mentioned that they were on this mission for God and Country and the children of Honduras. Arturo then introduced Rich. Rich spoke in Spanish, thanking them for participating. Arturo then introduced us. Then Melly asked the students and teachers to write nametags, first names only, on bright yellow paper to place at their seats.

Finally Lourdes arrived. We were glad to see her as we thought the testing exercise was going to occur without her attendance. Arturo gave an impromptu motivating speech specifically
Figure 4.19: Pam and Denese at the Head Table Module Testing Workshop
Richard P. Vlosky, Photo

Figure 4.20: Vocational School Teachers and Students Module Testing Workshop
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mentioning the purpose of the module and how important it would be for students to learn information on how to be better human beings, not just information on technical subjects. Then, he presented a plaque to Lourdes for participating in the module project; and she said a few words. She was obviously very pleased with the plaque, and clutched it to her chest and blushed. She later told us that she was going to have to send our module to other vocational schools because they had complained that they did not get to participate in the evaluation process.

In the testing process designed by Lourdes and Melly, students and teachers received a copy of the module one week prior to the testing exercise. They were told to read the module and comment on an evaluation sheet about the problems they found or corrections they suggested. The participants were split into two groups of about 10 apiece, one headed by Jose and one by Mary. Each group had 3 or 4 students in it, with the instructors comprising the remaining seats. The teachers looked extremely young. We were told earlier by Lourdes that many of them were “self made” people, some with only a 6th grade education. Melly recorded the conversations on her VCR. Lourdes walked around to observe participants and get a “read” on their feelings about the module in general. She repeatedly came back to me, saying, “They really like it!” She left to go to a meeting shortly thereafter and did not return until lunch.

As time progressed we were struck by how much more conversation was happening in Mary’s group with teachers and students, and conversely how much more Jose was dominating the conversation in his group. Through observation and translation what appeared to be going on was that Jose was opposed to the sexual and reproduction education information in the module. He believed that these students were too young to be given this kind of information and thought that they should only be exposed to the information when they were 15 and older. He believed that the material should be more religiously oriented. He had one student who vigorously
supported his statements who said that he knew all of the information in the module, but that some kids did not. He also said that children get their sexual education off the street, and yes, that some young girls do get pregnant. (Earlier Arturo had told us that many of these kids don’t associate the sexual act with getting pregnant). He also said that if students were presented with this information they would just laugh. Jose also said that maybe students and teachers should be surveyed to see if they wanted this kind of information taught in the schools.

Mrs. Tica and students thought the reproductive health section was very necessary. They said they had students from age 14 on in the schools and that the information was very appropriate for those age groups. Mary did say that she thought that the instructors were not educated enough in the subject area to teach the material. She thought that the human reproduction materials should be in a separate book, taught by a doctor or some other specialist. She believed that this would relieve the pressure on vocational education teachers who might feel uncomfortable teaching sexually related topics.
At around this time, Pam, Melly and I, started discussing splitting the module into 4 parts, particularly putting the adolescent, reproductive health, and sexual education section in a stand-alone format, and also about sending the instructors sex education books in Spanish purchased out of our USAID money. Melly was concerned about the controversy: As a Catholic was not sure how the church would view the curriculum, although she thought that the information was important to teach. She kept saying, “I’m going to be ex-communicated.” Arturo reassured her that what she was doing was preventative medicine and was important to the children of Honduras.

In time, I noticed that a woman, one of the only women in Jose’s group, was not talking. She was sitting down at the end of the row, just listening and looking away. So, I mentioned this to Melly or to Lourdes and one of them went over and repositioned her next to Jose. This did not seem to change her participation level, however.

Both groups became so bogged down on the sexual and reproductive health sections that we had to break for lunch. And that was only section 1 of the 3-section module. The lunch was in a room next door – with white tablecloths, china and silver. They served a nice lunch and huge desert. The students got recharged, were laughing and obviously having a great time. Senor Padre showed up again and had lunch with us. Right before he got there he spoke to and told him he liked the module and that it as necessary. Melly overheard this information and was relieved.

Before we broke for lunch, Arturo had the idea that the two groups should work on different sections when returned to the module review. Mary’s group worked on Section 2—the longer one; and Jose worked on Section 3, the shorter version.

Once they got back from lunch and began reviewing less controversial materials, they worked rather quickly. We walked around each group, listening and urging them on. At times,
when they would finish a subsection or page they would clap and we would clap and I’d yell, “Yay!” Finally, they finished. We asked for their modules and individual evaluation sheets. We decided on the spot to keep the two groups’ work separate because wanted to see the detailed responses. We also wanted to see the differences between the individual responses and what came out in the master sheet for the group.

After the meeting, Melly told Lourdes about the role that Jose played in his group. She said that he was specifically instructed not to lead the students and to only record their responses. To our surprise, Lourdes confronted Jose with our beliefs and then brought him to see Pam, Melly and me. She related that Jose said that he was “all for” the module, and that it was the
“others” who were providing him with the alarmed comments, which he just wrote down. Later Melly and Arturo and I had a discussion about Jose, and we all agreed that he did not tell Lourdes the truth. We also commented that he might have taken Senor Padre’s prayer to heart—thinking that he was on a mission from God to protect the children of Honduras.

Thereafter, Arturo, Melly, Pam and I collected the written comments and made all the changes in Arturo’s office that were suggested that were feasible and scientifically sound (for example, we did not insert giant pictures of grotesque genitals diseased with STDs as some students recommended). After we left, Arturo kept the modules and continued formatting the changes, which he then sent to us to be printed. I deliver the module CD to Brett in International Programs and he continued with correcting formatting glitches and made arrangements to have copies printed to be sent to CADERH in Honduras to pilot test. Pam and I sent thank you letters to participants.
Figure 4.24: Human Ecology Modules
CHAPTER 5. FINDINGS

Introduction

Recall that the questions posed by this research were: How did individuals in stakeholder groups perceive and negotiate the participatory development process? What factors promoted and hindered successful participatory practices? To answer these questions I first addressed preliminary issues related to the partnership process. The participation of individuals and agencies was not predetermined from the outset of the project, therefore I investigated which factors led us to partner with CADERH and why. More specifically, I analyzed the stages and factors that appeared to precede our partnership, and the nature and circumstances surrounding our contact with each stakeholder group. Once we partnered with CADERH, I analyzed the nature of the participation of all stakeholders relative to the Human Ecology Module project. From these analyses, I developed a model of how our partnership process for participatory development transpired. Later, I explored the administrative factors and the individuals that furthered or hindered the partnership process.

Three Phases of Partnering for Participatory Development

Introduction

To explore our partnering process I conducted an analysis of all project documents by summarizing them in one document in chronological order, a shortened version of which is in the Chronology of LSUAC Participation in the Alianza, in Chapter 4. I also conducted a matrix analysis of project emails that documented contacts between LSUAC and potential counterparts, which can be found in the Timeline in Appendix I. These analyses revealed that the participatory partnership process was divided into 3 phases. Phase 1 was the solidification of the team’s philosophy of development at the project’s inception. Phase 2 constituted the necessary
precursors to finding appropriate partners. Phase 3 involved the 4-part formula for developing and sustaining a successful partnership. Each one of these phases is discussed in detail below.

**Phase 1: Philosophy of Development**

Project documents revealed that Phase 1, depicted in Figure 5.1, involved formulating a team philosophy of development best described as ‘valuing, sharing and participation’. The reality and preferences of the Honduran people were respected. All costs had to be shared by the host institutions. Project identification, development and execution had to be handled as a team between LSU and the host institution. The academic team approached potential counterparts with an open mind, focusing on needs identified by them. The posture of the team was, “I am here to learn. How can I help?” The team did not approach stakeholder groups with predetermined partners, projects or answers. The team specifically sought true partnerships where participation was mutual in terms of in-kind and financial contributions. The phrase often spoken by the team leader in initial and follow-up discussions was “we didn’t come with a suitcase of money.” As a result, many potential counterparts who were looking for financial handouts or for the LSUAC social sector team to do all of the work became disinterested in our partnership offer (see Chronology, Narrowing Counterpart Focus).

The first phase can be conceptualized as the ecosystem under which the team operated throughout the project. This pervading ethic of operation influenced the other phases of partnership formation—particularly our main partner and the project chosen-- and is superimposed on Phases 2 & 3 to make-up the Partnering for Participatory Development Model.
Phase 2: Precursors to Partnership Formation

**Introduction.** The activities the team engaged in as a precursor to partnership formation in Phase 2 are illustrated in Figure 5.2 and Table 5.1. These activities were fostered by the project leader and the LSUAC and USAID program administration as necessary antecedents to later forming partnerships with Honduran counterparts. They were further buttressed by the knowledge and aid of the Honduran-national LSUAC employee stationed in Honduras. Phase 2
is divided into three parts that operate in concert with one another, not necessarily in this order: Generalized Learning, Generalized Teaching, and Specific Sharing.

**Phase 2, Part 1: Generalized Learning.** The first part of Phase 2, depicted in Figure 5.2 and reflected in Table 5.1 involved Generalized Learning or team education on the country, culture, challenges and potential partnerships available in Honduras. The educational process began when the team leader was appointed and traveled to Honduras in December of 2000 with the Director of International Programs. On this trip he met with USAID personnel and potential counterparts (see Timeline; see Chronology, Preparatory Site Visit). An initial survey was conducted of possible counterparts on industry needs, which was administered by the LSUAC Honduran office employee (see Chronology, Preparatory Site Visit). Education continued to be a focus after the team was appointed and traveled to Honduras in February of 2001 where they met with USAID administrators and potential counterparts (see Timeline; see Chronology, Team Fact Finding Site Visit). Prior to and subsequent to that trip, the team leader sent materials to the team via email on the country, resource base, economics and culture (see Chronology, Team Fact Finding Site Visit).

Only after the team approached a threshold of understanding did they formulate thoughts on who they might work with, and what projects they might work on. It is interesting to note that the initial USAID discussions (see Timeline December 2000 and February 2001) and industry survey results (see Chronology, Preparatory Site Visit) mentioned the stakeholder group we eventually partnered with, and the project we ultimately decided upon. The approach we used was almost identical to the stated philosophy of PRONADERS, one of the potential counterparts that we met though did not partner with. Meetings with potential counterparts contributed greatly
to the generalized learning phase, whether or not that particular stakeholder became our project partner (see Chronology, Team Fact Finding Site Visit).

**Phase 2, Part 2: Generalized Teaching.** The second part of Phase 2 involved Generalized Teaching (see Figure 5.2; see Table 5.1). Once the team had a basic understanding of the agencies and country, they conducted seminars as a way of introducing potential counterparts to their areas of expertise and how they might assist them. The LSUAC employee stationed in Honduras invited potential counterparts to meetings and seminars. The social sector gave seminars in May on their respective areas of expertise: Workforce assessment and development activities, and on an alternative model of social participatory development. The agencies that we eventually partnered with were at that seminar (see Chronology, Social Sector Presentation Site Visit; see Timeline, May, 2001).

**Phase 2, Part 3: Specific Sharing.** The third part of the Phase 2 is Specific Sharing. Only after the first two steps took place could the counterparts respond with some knowledge about what team members could contribute and how they might help. Counterparts approached us individually to tell us about themselves, programs, projects and needs. This required that we be available in-country for face-to-face contact, or that our office in Honduras arrange interviews with potential counterparts and then relay the information to us (see Timeline, May to August, 2001). Often the most fruitful meetings were arranged after we arrived in Honduras. Between October of 2000 and February of 2002—approximately 14 months—LSU employees visited Honduras a total of 7 times, with selected counterparts visiting the United States for training at LSUAC once (see Timeline column labels in red for trip dates). Even so, most of the direct contacts with our main counterpart were made by the LSUAC employee in the Honduras office or the LSUAC Honduran consultant hired to write the reproductive health section of the module.
The importance of direct contacts made by the LSUAC Honduran employees can be seen in the Timeline rows labeled Arturo (blue) and Melly (light blue) and their corresponding contacts with our counterparts, in particular with CADERH (brown). Contrast these contacts with those made by the LSUAC Social Sector found in the rows labeled Pam and Denese (light green and lighter green), many of which were made through the intervention of Arturo. Once Specific Sharing began between the LSUAC social sector team and CADERH, we agreed on a project in a relatively short period of time, 2 months (see Chronology Social Sector Presentation Site Visit & Chronology, Narrowing Counterpart Focus Site Visit; also see Table 5.1).

**Figure 5.2:** Phase 2: Precursors to Forming Successful Partnerships
Table 5.1: Examples of Contacts Representing Generalized Learning, Generalized Teaching and Specific Sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Precursor</th>
<th>Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/00</td>
<td>Generalized Learning</td>
<td>USAID Ray Waldron et al., ideas to Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/00</td>
<td>Generalized Learning</td>
<td>Survey of FP counterpart project ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01</td>
<td>Generalized Learning</td>
<td>USAID/Ray Waldron et al., ideas to Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01</td>
<td>Generalized Learning</td>
<td>Pam and Rich SS counterpart meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/00 - throughout</td>
<td>Generalized Learning</td>
<td>Project leader emails on culture, resources &amp; economics of Honduras to team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/01</td>
<td>Generalized Teaching</td>
<td>Meetings and discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01</td>
<td>Generalized Teaching</td>
<td>SS seminars at the Clarion (enter CADERH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01</td>
<td>Specific Sharing</td>
<td>E-mails with CADERH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/01</td>
<td>Specific Sharing</td>
<td>CADERH interview with Arturo on project ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07/01</td>
<td>Specific Sharing</td>
<td>Meetings &amp; site visits with CADERH in Honduras. Hit upon project idea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Phase 3: The Formula for Forming Successful Partnerships**

**Introduction.** Phase 3, depicted in Figure 5.4 is our formula for forming a successful partnership and is segmented into 4 parts. The first two phases served as an introduction to the country, and our initial decisions on partnering and project work. Phase 3 came into play only after phases 1 and 2 had been completed. The four requirements of formulating and sustaining a potential partnership were: A) finding the right partnership “fit”, B) a mutual effort at partnering, C) successful relationship development, and D) mutual participation. If one of these components was omitted, a successful partnership was not formed (see analysis below Figure 5.4)
Phase 3, Part 1: Needs and Expertise “Fit”. Finding a good match between our expertise and the needs of the counterpart agency was the first step in the partnering process. We ultimately partnered with two stakeholder groups—primarily with CADERH, and to a lesser degree on a smaller project with ESNACIFOR. A comparison of stakeholders shown in Table 5.2 illustrates the fit of our social sector team with that of eight potential counterpart agencies. There were three stakeholder groups where our area expertise fit project ideas suggested by third party experts and the partner agency itself. Six out of eight potential counterparts had mission statements that fit our expertise. We knew people or had contacts within three of the agencies. During the life of this project, six stakeholder groups were identified as potential counterparts for the social sector team by our team leader. Five agencies were noted by us as potential partners. We wrote three project proposals for three potential counterparts. Theoretically our project partners could have been any one of these agencies where their needs and our expertise matched. Only two agencies partnered with us, CADERH and ESNACIFOR (also see Timeline and Chronology).

Phase 3, Part 2: Mutual Effort at Partnering. An analysis of project documents revealed that the second step was a mutual effort at partnering. Our team initiated the first contacts through invitations to scheduled meetings or seminars. A comparison of stakeholders depicted in Table 5.2 suggests that a good indicator of relationship formation was how readily the potential counterpart responded to or initiated contact with us. For example, our team contacted all eight of stakeholder groups multiple times in an attempt to discuss a possible collaboration. However, stakeholder reciprocation was limited. The two groups we partnered with initiated contact with us more so than other groups, particularly CADERH. One group
Table 5.2: Comparison Chart of Stakeholder Contacts up to Partnership & Project Solidification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>Fit project ideas suggested by other stakeholders</th>
<th>Our expertise fit projects suggested by agency</th>
<th>Agency purview fit our expertise</th>
<th>Inside contact</th>
<th>Our team contacted them</th>
<th>They contacted us</th>
<th>Noted by us as possible</th>
<th>Indicators that relationship would form</th>
<th>Indicators that relationship would not form</th>
<th>Identified by LSUAC as possible SS counterpart</th>
<th>Project solidified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COHDEFOR</td>
<td>12/00 Consultant knew prior director</td>
<td>12/00 PM/DAV SS Seminar</td>
<td>06/01 for miniconference (cancelled)</td>
<td>07/01 PM/DAV</td>
<td>5/01 SS Seminar</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV</td>
<td>PM/DAV SS Seminar</td>
<td>02/01 RPV</td>
<td>Post 02/01 trip RPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDE</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>02/01 whole team (+ PM)</td>
<td>05/01 RPV</td>
<td>02/01 trip RPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESNACIFOR</td>
<td>12/00 survey 02/01 USAID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>02/01 PM</td>
<td>07/01 all</td>
<td>05/01 PM/DAV SS seminar</td>
<td>Post 02/01 trip RPV</td>
<td>PM/DAV SS seminar</td>
<td>02/01 “too many seminars” “actors come and leave”</td>
<td>Post 02/01 trip RPV</td>
<td>LSU training 11/02 approved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONADERS</td>
<td>2/01 USAID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>7/01 participatory focus</td>
<td>02/01 PM &amp; RPV</td>
<td>7/01 PM/DAV office presentation</td>
<td>PM 02/01 trip report</td>
<td>PM 02/01 trip report</td>
<td>02/01 “too many meetings” 07/02 disinterest</td>
<td>Post 02/01 trip RPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONADES</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>5/22 Arturo tried</td>
<td>5/23 RPV</td>
<td>6/01 for miniconference (cancelled)</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV SS seminar</td>
<td>5/23 responded to Arturo</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV trip report</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV trip report</td>
<td>Post 02/01 trip RPV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADERH</td>
<td>12/00 survey 2/01 USAID</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5/14/02 PM eml</td>
<td>5/31/01 DAV eml Arturo</td>
<td>7/01 PM/DAV site visits</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV SS Seminar</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV SS seminar</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV trip report</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV trip report</td>
<td>6/9 RPV eml to Arturo 7/2 RPV eml</td>
<td>At 7/01 visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD VISION</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>5/22 Art eml</td>
<td>5/23 RPV eml</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV SS seminar</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV SS seminar</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV trip report</td>
<td>5/01 PM/DAV trip report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDACION MARIA</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>First lady graduate</td>
<td>05/01 PM/DAV/RPV with staff</td>
<td>07/01 PM/DAV/RPV with First Lady</td>
<td>Change of government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

initiated contact at the beginning of the process but never reciprocated our repeated future attempts at partnering. The CADERH employee responsible for our partnering relationship expressed enthusiasm and interest from the outset, made a sustained effort at the beginning of our relationship, and contacted us as much or more than we did her. The counterpart agency that appeared to be a good fit based on agency purview, expert advice and suggested projects never did return phone calls or attend seminars. As the diamond shaped figure on the bottom left of Figure 6 shows, the partnership with CADERH was solidified when an agreement was made on a
mutual project, indicating that mutual purpose and plan determination are important to propel partnerships forward (also see Table 5.1).

Figure 5.3: Flowchart CADERH Counterpart Relationship & Project Choice
Phase 3, Part 3: Relationship Development. The timeline matrix analysis of the data suggests that the third step of successful partnering requires continued efforts at relationship development by and between secondary (LSU) and primary stakeholders (CADERH). An analysis of LSUAC contacts with CADERH revealed that relationship development occurred mainly during face-to-face encounters at the time the partnership was being solidified and into the project design and implementation phases. Most contacts between partners occurred during LSUAC visits to Honduras, through the LSUAC Honduran employee and consultant, and during primary stakeholder training in the United States (see Timeline headings in red for trip contacts and rows corresponding to Arturo, Melly, Denese, Pam and CADERH; see also Table 5.1). Some communications were made with the counterpart agency through written correspondence (see Timeline for emails on May 14, 24 and 30 between CADERH, Arturo, Pam and Denese). However, face-to-face contacts were more consistent and numerous, and resulted in more effort put forward on the module by our CADERH counterpart, particularly after her trip to the United States (see Timeline for comparison of CADERH activities before and after November, 2001 training). The US trip involved a good deal of socializing between all module contributors, which may have cemented our team relationships further (see Chronology, Counterpart Training at LSU). It is conceivable that if relationships were not nurtured, the project relationship would have dissolved or been characterized as unsatisfactory even after partnerships had been formed.

Relationship development may be fruitful for future collaborations even with individual primary stakeholders who do not play a significant present role in present partnership activities. For example, the partnership that we initiated with ESNACIFOR only involved the US training effort, which occurred late in the USAID project process (see Timeline November, 2001). However, the employee selected for that training worked on the CADERH module during her
visit to the US, and developed a relationship with us and the CADERH employee that could result in more significant partnership projects in the future (see Chronology, Counterpart Training at LSU).

**Phase 3, Part 4: Mutual Participation.** The fourth and final step for developing successful partnerships was mutual participation. For the purposes of this analysis, participation is defined as effort put forward by individual stakeholders that contributed to the project or project process. It is clear from the Timeline analysis located in Appendix 1 that all contributors to the module participated overtime from initiation of the partnership to project evaluation. Pam, Rich, Arturo and I on the LSUAC team, contributed to the module from beginning to end (December, 2001 to February, 2002). The only individual on the LSUAC team that did not contribute in the beginning of the project was Melly the LSUAC Honduran consultant due to the later date at which she joined our team. However, after she became involved she participated until the final stage of the project (see Timeline for Melly after December 11, 2001). The CADERH administrator, our primary stakeholder contact, participated throughout (see CADERH activities from May of 2001). Vocational school teachers and students, other primary stakeholders, did not contribute to the module during the initial stages because they were brought into validate the module in the last phase of the project (see Timeline February 2002; and Chronology, Project Testing and Finalization Site Visit). However, the timeline shows that stakeholder groups, taken as a whole, participated consistently throughout the life of the project; individuals participated from the time that they joined the team. A further analysis of the duration and level of individual participation on the Human Ecology Module project is conducted in the next section of this dissertation.
**Application of Phase 3: Formula for Successful Partnerships.** An analysis of all stakeholder contacts revealed that if any one of the four steps in Phase 3 was omitted, a successful partnership would not be formed (see analysis at bottom of Figure 5.4). For example, if the partnership failed to be formulated because of disinterest, if the project was rife with conflict or dissatisfaction, or if one stakeholder group put forth most of the participation and effort, the relationship would not be successful. This “formula” was applied differently to different partnerships and projects. For the rather simple project we engaged in with ESNACIFOR, all factors were there but at a minimal level. For the more substantial CADERH project, more effort was made in all of the four steps. The four phases of the Formula for Success Partnerships were: A) finding the right partnership “fit”, B) a mutual effort at partnering, C) successful relationship development, and D) mutual participation. An analysis of the four requirements relative to each potential counterpart follows:

**CADERH:**

**A)** Our expertise fit their needs (initially we discussed doing a needs-assessment of a community surrounding one or more vocational schools, later we decided on writing a human ecology curriculum for at-risk vocational school children).

**B)** We also made an equal and sustained effort at partnering. From the moment we met, our Honduran counterpart was enthusiastic, positive and proactive. She made just as many contacts with us as we did with her.

**C)** Our relationship developed through our Honduran visits, the Louisiana training, and through the efforts of our LSUAC Honduras team members.

**D)** Later we both participated consistently in the effort to develop and evaluate the modules.
PRONADERS:

A) Our expertise fit their general mission. However, we did not reach an agreement on how our expertise would have benefited their International Development Bank (IDB) Watershed Project. Monies had been allocated to PRONADERS and the project had been established. We would have been entering it without a role defined at the project’s inception, which might have made it difficult for them to find a “need” for us. Therefore, a “fit” was less probable.

B) Their philosophy was facilitation and participatory development rather than management, which was congruent with our approach. However, the philosophy underlying this approach often includes a view that “outsiders” do not necessarily fit the participatory development ideal, which is what may have predisposed them not to partner with us. Our only contact with them was in their offices and at our request. Pam met with them on the first trip. They were invited to our seminars and did not come. We brought a seminar to them at their offices on the next scheduled trip. They never approached us. Although their director was fluent in English and Ivy League educated, more than once she articulated her disappointment that we were not fluent in Spanish and could not conduct our meetings in the local language. For those reasons and probably more, they never contacted us again.

C) We were not able to develop a relationship with their director. This particular contact, in contrast to our experience with the CADERH director, indicates that a personality match on both sides is crucial to a good partnering process.
D) We never arrived at the “participation phase”, even though our team wrote a PRONADERS project description based on the possibility that we would partner with them.

CONADES:

A) Our expertise fit their interests (initially their director was interested in my seminar topic on the alternative model of participatory development). However, we did not communicate with them sufficiently to determine whether our expertise fit their needs.

B) We made attempts to meet. Their director initially indicated an interest in having the participatory development seminar presented to World Vision, where he was a board member. However, we did most of the contacting and follow-up. I finally gave the seminar at World Vision. However they were less interested in the model because I did not have data supporting the impact of the process. Subsequent to this presentation, they did not contact us. We did not hear from the director again about a future meeting with CONADES.

COHDEFOR:

A) Our expertise fit their organization but we did not discuss what joint projects we might develop.

B) We were not approached. Our team repeatedly initiated contact with and met with them at their offices.

C) We did not connect with anyone there.
ESNACIFOR:

A) Our expertise fit their general social sector project ideas. However, two staff members appeared more interested in social sector issues than the director. We jointly determined that we would offer training at LSUAC for some of their staff, even though the ESNACIFOR director initially said they went to too many seminars. Our offer of training and their acceptance cemented our partnership.

B) There was a sufficient “mutual” effort at partnering for this project to go forward (meeting with us, giving staff time to discuss their needs with us, allowing staff to go on this training).

C) After multiple visits at the ESNACIFOR office, we developed a sufficient relationship with the director so that he agreed to allow his employees to travel to the US and engage in training at LSU. Our relationship deepened with one of the instructors trained at LSU, however, only during the US training not before. Relationship development with that individual may prove fruitful for potential future work in Honduras.

D) They participated sufficiently to successfully complete the LSUAC training. If this group had partnered with us on a more substantial project, it is not clear whether they would have participated to a degree that would have been satisfactory.

Summary of 3 Phases in Partnering for Participatory Development

The matrix and timeline analyses revealed that there were 3 phases to our Model of Partnering for Participatory Development. Each phase was a pre-requisite for the next. Phase 1
was the team’s philosophy of development. We were prepared to share our expertise as true partners with counterparts (Figure 5.1). Phase 2 constituted the necessary precursors to finding appropriate Honduran partners and involved learning, teaching and sharing (Figure 5.2). Phase 3 consisted of our formula for developing and sustaining successful partnerships and involved finding a good fit, a mutual effort at partnering, relationship development and mutual participation (Figure 5.4). Together these 3 phases constituted the process we engaged in to partner for our participatory development project (Figure 5.5).

**Figure 5.4:** Formula for Successful Partnerships
Figure 5.5: Partnering for Participatory Development
Meaningful Participation

Introduction

If participation is an expectation, satisfactory participatory development can only occur if team members participate on a “meaningful level”. Meaningful participation was explored so that the following questions could be answered: How did individual stakeholders negotiate the participatory development process? Was the process successful?

According to the literature, meaningful participation requires a sustained and significant effort by primary as well as secondary stakeholder groups in all phases of the project process from ideation to evaluation (LaVoy, 1999; Long, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995; World Bank, 1996). In order to determine whether participation was meaningful in the Human Ecology Module project, a matrix analysis Comparison Chart of CADERH and LSUAC Participation was conducted using project emails, looking at the level of participation of each individual in each phase of the project cycle (see Table A2 in Appendix 2).

Participation Analysis Methodology

The matrix analysis in Table A2 (located in Appendix 2) was conducted as follows. Levels of participation were analyzed and divided into four groups categorized from least to most participation and located on the horizontal axis of the matrix. The project cycle was divided into three parts under each of the levels of participation: 1) ideation and planning; 2) implementation, and 3) evaluation. Individual stakeholders were categorized in primary, secondary and tertiary stakeholder groups. Administrators without project responsibilities were categorized as tertiary stakeholders; LSUAC team members and employees with project responsibilities were categorized as secondary stakeholders; and CADERH employees,
vocational school teachers and students were categorized as primary stakeholders. Individual stakeholders were placed in rows vertically in the matrix, which then intersected with each level of participation and phase of development on the horizontal axis.

Levels of participation ranged from least to most and were arranged from left to right. The first and least amount of participation was termed Information Sharing, which was defined as one stakeholder sharing information with another, without asking for or accepting input. The second level was to Provide Input into a decision that was primarily someone else’s decision or project. The third category was Shared Decision Making, which was defined as collaboration across stakeholder groups. For example, an action could be termed a shared decision when it was between primary and secondary stakeholder groups, such as between the LSUAC team and CADERH. It would not be a shared decision if there was joint decision making between two actors in the same stakeholder group. The intent behind this definition was to highlight participation between stakeholder groups. The final category came into play when there was Primary or Sole Decision Making either by an individual or by individuals within the same stakeholder group. Primary stakeholders engaging in shared decision making and sole decision making along all phases of the project cycle are said to be the goal of participatory development and can be a way to gauge whether the participatory process was successful for each stakeholder in the project.

Shared Decision Making

The results of this participation analysis revealed that our main CADERH contact-- a primary stakeholder-- engaged in shared decision making throughout all three phases of the project. Strategic co-decisions were made with the LSUAC USA social sector team members, and also with the LSUAC Honduras team members in areas such as project concept, project
content, project review and editing, determination of the validation methodology, and the development of the evaluation survey cycle (see Table A2 intersection of the Lourdes/CADERH row and Shared Decision Making column). The Participation Analysis in combination with a review of the Timeline and Chronology reveal the effort with which LSUAC team members solicited the input and participation of our primary stakeholder counterpart, CADERH. Many contacts were initiated by Arturo, Melly, Pam and me to insure that Lourdes participated equally in decisions (see Timeline, Table A1 in Appendix 1 between 7, 2001 to 2, 2002; in particular see the Chronology from Long Distance Project work through Project Testing and Finalization Site Visit). The only exception to our insistence on primary stakeholder participation occurred during the October to November, 2001 time period, which is when we worked furiously and individually as we believed that our project had to be completed by November, 2001. Note the relative lack of participation by Lourdes from October to November compared with the participation by Denese and Melly during that same time period, and compared with the participation by Lourdes after that time period (see Table A2, Appendix 2). Clearly, it would have been easier for the LSUAC team to develop the modules with little input from primary stakeholders, regardless of whether or not the extension to March, 2002 was granted.

The email data did not reveal that any shared decision-making took place between other primary stakeholders, teachers and students and the LSUAC team secondary stakeholder group in any phase of the project cycle. For a visual representation of their lack of participation, refer to the Participation Analysis in Table A2, the intersection of rows for teachers and students with the Shared Decision Making column and also refer to the Timeline rows for teachers and students in Table A1.
It should be noted, however, that the participation analysis -- which was conducted of email correspondence-- may have underrepresented the extent and duration of the student and teacher input into the modules. Teachers and school administrators were consulted on pressing issues pertinent to the students during our site visit to 3 CADERH supervised vocational schools early in July (see Chronology, Narrowing the Counterpart Focus). Students were brought into those conversations during these site visits. Our primary CADERH contact, Lourdes, received input on the modules from teachers and administrators before the testing exercise. In addition, teachers and students conducted a written evaluation of the modules before our evaluation workshop in Honduras in January of 2002 (see Chronology, Project Testing and Finalization Site Visit). Moreover, the participation analysis, which was limited to an analysis of input into the modules, does not reflect the number of stakeholders consulted during the initial generalized learning process (see Table 5.1 and Chronology, Site Visit and Team Fact Finding Site Visit). Input from these potential stakeholders overtime and at various venues and meetings indirectly contributed to the module’s conception and content.

**Sole or Primary Decision Making**

Sole or primary decision making occurred for all primary stakeholders-- including the CADERH administrator, vocational school teachers and vocational school students only in the last phase of the project cycle during the module validation exercise. The determination to validate the module and the methodology to do so were co-determined by the CADERH administrator and the LSUAC Honduran consultant. However, the CADERH administrator made the decision on the venue for the validation, the coordination of the validation exercise, and the administration of the evaluation surveys (see Table A2, rows for Melly and Lourdes under Sole Decision Making, Evaluation section). The two LSUAC USA social sector actors-- this writer
and her major professor—chose not to provide input into the validation design portion of the exercise (see Table A2, rows for Pam and Denese under Shared Decision Making, Evaluation section). Vocational school teachers had primary responsibility for organizing the validation written pre-review of the modules and leading the validation exercise (see Table A2 row for Teachers under Sole Decision Making, Evaluation section; and see Chronology, Project Testing and Finalization Site Visit). Vocational school students had primary responsibility for input into the pre-written critiques of the module and their comments during the validation exercise (see Table A2 row for Students under Sole Decision Making, Evaluation section; also see Chronology, Project Testing and Finalization Site Visit).

**Decision Making Progression**

The analysis revealed that our main CADERH contact transitioned from a shared decision making role in the first two phases of the project cycle to a sole decision making role during the last evaluation phase of the project cycle. Refer to Table A2 to compare Lourdes’ participation in all three phases of the Shared Decision Making column to her Sole Decision Making only in the evaluation phase of the module. This evolution to more decision making power may indicate the development of the capacity of our primary stakeholder contact. If this were the case, it would indicate that our participatory process was a success in providing a forum for participation, and also an opportunity for education and empowerment. It might also indicate further development in the LSUAC and CADERH team relationship. By the end of the project we knew each other well and were comfortable with independent rather than shared decision making roles.
Late Phase Participation of Primary Beneficiaries

Introduction. Although our primary CADERH contact participated in all project phases, other primary stakeholders did not. According to experts in the participatory development arena, the beneficiaries of the project should be involved in all stages of project development (See, Arja, 2000; Botes & van Rensburg, 2000; Chambers, 1995; Haidari & Wright, 2001; Jackson & Kassam, 1998; Long, 2001; Lyons & Stephens, 2001; Nelson & Wright, 1995; Shortall & Shucksmith, 2001). The participation analysis in Table A2 revealed that teachers and students participated only in the last phase of module development, because that is when they were asked to review and critique final drafts of the curriculum. As already mentioned, this analysis may have under represented the extent of teacher and student input. Nevertheless, further investigation was needed to determine whether late participation of project beneficiaries indicated a failure in our participatory development process.

Timeline Analysis of Primary Stakeholder Participation. Analyses of the data were performed to determine whether students and teachers could or should have participated earlier in the project cycle (see Timeline, Table A1 in Appendix 1; see Table A2 in Appendix 2; Figure 5.3; Table 5.1). Approximately 17 months elapsed from the time that the project leader was appointed in October of 2000 to when the project was completed, in February 2002. The original timeline of 15 months would have required that the project be completed by December of 2001, which would have required that all materials be submitted by November of 2001; however, an extension to March of 2002 was granted by the funding agency in late November (see Chronology, Long Distance Project Work). The process of selecting a partner and project figured prominently in our model of participatory development. That process of mutual partnership selection and very preliminary project determination, represented in the Figures 5.1 and 5.2, took...
Another 3 months elapsed until our LSUAC USA team had the preliminary module materials ready to present to the CADERH administrator in Honduras in October of 2001 (see Timeline Table A1 in Appendix 1 for Pam, Denese, Melly and Arturo). At that point, our Honduran partner asked for additions and corrections to that draft, which propelled us to add another team member, Melly, to write additional chapters. Thus, the second draft required another month and a half to complete (see Timeline Table A1 in Appendix 1, from October to November for Denese and Melly). We presented the revised draft to our counterpart, Lourdes, in November in Louisiana during her training at LSU. Post-LSU-training, collaborative work by all parties escalated so that the module could be finished in a participatory manner for testing in February (see Timeline Table A1 in Appendix 1 from November; see Chronology, Long Distance Project Refinement).

Only in October of 2001, with materials in-hand could our Honduran counterpart definitively agree that the project we had determined in July was satisfactory. The process of partnering and definitive project agreement had taken a year. At that point-- before the extension was granted-- we thought that we only had one more month to complete the project, which resulted in all parties working simultaneously without collaboration on individual areas of expertise (note participation levels in Timeline, Table A1 in Appendix 1 for Melly and Denese from October to November, 2001).

**Alternatives to Engage Primary Beneficiaries Earlier.** The engagement of end use primary beneficiaries-- vocational school teachers and students-- could have occurred after July or October of 2001. Before that general time period, we did not have sufficient contact with
CADERH to make a partnering and tentative project decision. As stated earlier, a partnering decision appears to be associated with a project decision. Without a mutually agreed upon project, even a provisional one, partners do not have enough information to determine whether their needs and expertise are a good fit. This suggests that where partnering is a part of the development process, end-use beneficiaries would not be the stakeholders to make the initial project decisions, although they could alter the project direction and content. A process to identify and include multiple primary stakeholders in decision-making in all project phases would have taken months longer. The knowledge that we had a longer timeline would have been necessary in order to plan such a process.

The other alternative under our particular timeline would have been to begin our contacts with students and teachers in the first months of the project. However, this would have entailed pre-identifying a particular stakeholder group to which we would have been assigned contact, which would have eliminated the element of choice that was the strength of our process. The analysis in Table 5.2 indicated that assigned partners, even based on valid criteria, might not be a good match, which may not lead to true partnerships or participation. In situations where counterparts have not previously worked together, participation in the earliest stages of the project cycle may indicate the lack of a participatory process rather than the presence of one.

**Facilitating the Process of Participatory Development**

**Introduction**

In order to determine what factors facilitated or hindered the participatory development process, grounded theory and relevant matrix analyses were conducted of all individuals in all stakeholder groups. These analyses were conducted at the individual level to determine how they became involved, and what types of decisions were made by whom and when. It also sought to
determine how these actors, and their actions and interactions furthered the Three Phase Partnering for Participatory Development process presented earlier. These analyses illuminate the procedures that individual actors in future projects can engage in to facilitate successful participatory processes. The factors that facilitated our participatory development process were:

1. Administrative decentralization that gave us the flexibility to make counterpart, project and personnel choices;
2. Two key LSUAC Honduran employees, and;
3. The supportive team dynamic within which we operated.

1. Administrative Decentralization

Methodology. In order to determine which actors facilitated our participatory development process, I examined each actor, when they became involved and what types of primary decisions they made. By comparing the results of these analyses with our Partnering for Participatory Development framework, I determined which stakeholders provided critical support in furthering our process. Timing of the involvement of development actors corresponded to what types of decisions each stakeholder group made. The Timeline (in Table A1, Appendix 1) and Participation Matrix Analysis (in Table A2, Appendix 2), revealed that the more administrative-oriented the stakeholder, the earlier was his/her involvement, and the more indirect was his/her effect on our project. Conversely, stakeholders closer to the beneficiaries, with the later involvement, had more applied and content-oriented decision making roles relative to our project.

Decision Type. Stakeholder decision types were clearly segmented into four general areas depicted by Figure 5.6. USAID made independent decisions on broad project parameters and objectives. LSUAC International Programs personnel made primary decisions on global project related administrative issues (see initial months of Timeline, Appendix 1 and
Participation Analysis Appendix 2 for both). The LSUAC team made sole decisions to supplement subject matter expertise as needed for the module. Finally, primary stakeholders made decisions as to the application of our expertise to and for the project recipients, and as to the validation methodology used in developing their curricula.

**Figure 5.6**: Stakeholder Decision Type

**Choice.** An important aspect of our participatory development model was counterpart and project choice. Decision-making or “choice” at our level of the development hierarchy was possible only if individuals with authority allowed it to be exercised by subordinates. The analysis showed that USAID and LSUAC administration facilitated the participatory development process by allowing primary and secondary stakeholder groups the freedom to make personnel, partnership and project decisions. The actions by administrators both at USAID
and at LSUAC determined the discipline and general guidelines within which we operated. They facilitated our initial introduction to Honduras and potential counterparts. However, as a whole, administrators did not mandate which employees or individuals we should involve in our projects. If the administrator did not require direct input from an individual or stakeholder, the administrator did not determine the involvement of that stakeholder in the project (see Table A1). This procedure allowed team leaders to choose their team members, and team members, in turn, were allowed to take the lead in partnering with stakeholder groups.

2. Key Honduran Employees

A more detailed review of the Timeline (Table A1, Appendix 1) and Matrix Analysis (Table A2, Appendix 2) revealed factors that were critical in facilitating the relationship component of our model of participatory development depicted in Figure 5.2. Success in counterpart relationship development was dependent on the personality and character of the individuals representing our stakeholder group. All team members who had contact with potential and actual counterparts were important to the process. However, these analyses showed that two individuals on our LSUAC team were pivotal in facilitating this process of partnering, relationship development and participation with our Honduran counterparts: The LSUAC Honduran employee, Arturo and the LSUAC Honduran consultant, Melly. Arturo was hired by LSUAC International Programs administration and Melly was invited on the project by the social sector team and our primary stakeholder contact, Lourdes.

**LSUAC Honduran Employee.** Arturo participated consistently in organizational and administrative duties related to our visits and seminars. He was also involved in actual project work on the module. While accomplishing these responsibilities he functioned as a “bridge” to our primary stakeholders. He fostered communications between US and Honduran counterparts,
acting as the language and cultural translator between our world and theirs. In many cases, information was first conveyed to Arturo who then relayed the information to the intended counterpart. When he received the counterpart’s response he relayed the message back to us (see Table A1). In his role as intermediary, he developed relationships with counterparts, and the goodwill he engendered in representing our group assisted us in relationship development with counterparts a continent away.

What was not revealed by an analysis of project materials was how much Arturo taught us over time about Honduran culture, geography and language when he drove us to visit stakeholders in various parts of the country. The education we received helped us establish a better understanding and connection with the people of Honduras. Establishing this position and hiring this employee might well have been the most important actions that the LSUAC administration took to support the success of our work.

**LSUAC Honduran Consultant.** Likewise, Melly, the LSUAC Honduran physician and consultant, served as an important nexus between our team and Lourdes, our primary counterpart contact at CADERH. Melly was consistently involved in the module development: she wrote content, edited, culturally and linguistically translated the series, and helped determine the final changes. To accomplish these tasks she often met with Lourdes when we were not in-country. She also had to keep in close contact with Pam and me to solicit feedback or to foster joint decision making. Her fluency in English was a plus because Lourdes’s English and my Spanish speaking abilities were limited. Melly developed close personal relationships with all of us, cementing our professional partnership. Pam and I were able to develop a relationship with Melly, possibly because we understood each other as educated women working between cultures. Being a Honduran female and a LSUAC representative may have fostered her
relationship with Lourdes, as they were both women working in a male dominated society. They literally planned the final steps of the module validation with little help from us (Tables A1 & A2). In fact, the increase in unilateral decision making by Lourdes in the final phases of the project may have been due to her relationship with and the mentoring provided by Melly. We knew Melly before she became involved in our project because she was the spouse of Arturo, the LSUAC Honduran employee discussed above. Her ability to work closely with the only male Honduran member of our LSUAC team was valuable in a culture where the opinions of women in the workplace are generally not well regarded by men.

3. Supportive Team Dynamic

   **Introduction and Methodology.** To explore our team process as a whole, a grounded theory analysis was conducted of email correspondence using line-by-line open-coding. This more detailed analytic technique reduces the chance of researcher selection and categorization bias. Categories and properties were developed with an eye toward conditions, interactions among actors, strategies, tactics, and consequences (Strauss, 1987). This resulted in an analysis that included all team member correspondence that I received from the LSUAC USA and Honduran team, not just interactions among participants involved in our social sector projects. This analysis revealed a supportive group dynamic, which can be segmented into the following three areas:

   a) Valuing every team member;

   b) Personally connecting with each team member; and

   c) Making space for socialization and play.

   These behaviors certainly led to a positive team experience, which conceivably facilitated the project outcome. It is also possible that they furthered our project process by engendering
trust, which may have encouraged participation of counterparts, which may have then resulted in capacity building.

a) Valuing Every Team Member. The overriding impression that emerged from the emails between LSUAC and Honduran partners was that they valued each other. This was expressed through several types of communications. Praise was expressed liberally and publicly. Statements of concern for team members and their personal struggles were common. Finally, LSUAC team members based in the US respected Honduran team members and Honduran counterparts under mundane or stressful circumstances (everyday deadlines, time and budget constraints).

Praise. Praise was expressed throughout the project for each individual team member and counterpart. Praise was public in the sense that it was contained in emails which were often sent or copied to various other recipients. It was expressed for small and large contributions, and also simply for the presence or character of the person receiving the correspondence. It is exemplified by the following email excerpts:

“They were astounded at what they heard and begged her to repeat the presentation.”

“All in all, kudos.”
“You are a good person with excellent credentials.”

“It was a pleasure having you along.”

“You were a valuable asset in Honduras.”

“I sat at the back of the room during your presentation and watched the response of the crowd. They really responded to your talk and I believe you will have much in the way of knowledge and experiences to impart to the Honduran people. Welcome aboard.”

“Thank you dear friend. That is exactly what I would have said.”

“Thanks for your visit, when you guys are here I don’t feel like I’m working, but vacationing.”
“Hi…. how are you. We all received your letter and post cards. It’s very nice you wrote me…. Mary Tica and Jose also thank you for the post card. Please stay in touch.”

Caring Communications. Caring communications were defined as thinking or being concerned about another teammate. These were exemplified through expressions of concern, most often about personal issues unrelated to work:

“Melly asked how Denese’s toe is doing? She hopes that she doesn’t get a cast.”

“I am very glad that you and Denese made it safely home.”

“I keep reading about the flood warnings on LA and Texas, I hope you are okay. Melly keeps asking me to inquire about your safety. We will be praying that everything is okay.”

“glad you had a good trip - …. are your parents still here? are they well?”

Requests. To further investigate relationship development an analysis was conducted of work communications, specifically where one party needed something from another. These were divided into four categories under the general heading of Requests, as follows: i) Imperative Requests (crises, deadlines/important dates, requirements); ii) Polite/Soft Assistance Seeking (asking for needed assistance in a polite way); iii) Conditional Requests (if you can, if it is convenient, if you wish) and; iv) Seeking Ideas or Advice (seeking input).

Imperative Requests and Polite Assistance Seeking were among LSUAC team members. The former category encompassed communications from our team leader to the rest of our LSUAC team. The later category was composed of emails among all LSUAC team members. Even the most urgent requests were often phrased in polite terms, with the implicit understanding that the requested item or report was being demanded by someone else higher up in the chain of command:
“I have a big favor to ask you. After we return on June 14 from the next visit, could you PLEASE have your trip reports to me on Monday the 18th?”

“Actually, you should submit your trip authorization for June NOW.”

“Pam did not hear from these folks. She is now on vacation for a week. Would you PLEASE contact these folks and set up a meeting for Pam and Denese? THANKS.”

“….INFOP we must meet with them…. You really need to get a hold of Miguel Hererra at ESNACIFOR to find out if they want our 4,000!!!!”

Polite Assistance Seeking, on the other hand, was softer in tone, and generally indicated that an item or arrangement was important to the writer’s work. These communications often thanked the recipient in advance and were phrased in an undemanding way:

“Just a reminder that we need to make sure that there will be an LCD projector, cables and screen at each of these presentations……..Any idea where this can take place? Take care.”

“Please advise if this is still a consideration.”

“Please go ahead and contact him. Thanks!”

“Please make the hotel reservations….. Thanks!”

“My seminars are tentatively scheduled for the 11th—all day. Therefore, I would appreciate it very much if our meetings with the CADERH people could be on other days.”

Conditional Requests were mainly to and from LSUAC team members and Lourdes, our Honduran primary stakeholder. Requests asking for Input and Advice were mainly between Lourdes, our Honduran counterpart and Arturo, our LSUAC Honduran team member. These two request-types were phrased as potentially two-way communication statements or questions and
asked for a response. They implied that as much weight would be given to what was heard as to what was said, and they encouraged a reply given in terms of content and feelings. They show that LSUAC USA participants did not place themselves in a position of authority relative to Honduran participants or primary stakeholder counterparts. This communication style may have fostered a relationship where power was shared or horizontal in structure, rather than a situation where there was a vertical line of authority. The following are representative of Conditional Requests:

“Since that meeting, members of the team have talked about the possibility of working with you at CADERH, at the sites for your schools, and in the surrounding communities. If you are interested in working together on a project, and if you think we might be of some service to your colleagues and students, let us begin a dialogue through email. We can discuss the kinds of activities that might be useful to you and possibly a plan of work will begin to take shape. Please also send the map or list of locations where the schools in your organization can be found (emphasis added).”

“Ms. Vlosky and I, along with other team members, plan to be back in Honduras June 9-14. If there is work we can do together, that trip would present an excellent opportunity for us to plan activities. We might even be able to carry out some work at that time, if we can plan some things via email (emphasis added).”

Some Advice or Input Requests were phrased in terms of proposals or ideas and they were stated in a way that communicated that the idea was not a foregone conclusion. Others were phrased as open ended requests for input from the recipient. Both styles show a desire to make joint decisions in the spirit of participation with counterparts:

“What do you think about Pam and Dene se having a separate meeting with Norman to discuss social sector implications of the activities of the cluster forestal?”

“According to Lourdes and Melly, it will very important to validate the module prior to final printing. I know that this activity gravitate around the extension, but their suggestion is to finishing validation, final review and other activities (activity book, et) and then prepare final print. My recommendation, if possible, is that we sit with International Program on Thursday morning and get the real odds for the extension. If we are not 100% sure of it, then we proceed on what we have, If we are 100 % sure that we
got the extension, we plan the module and connected activities while we are on the road. What do you think?”

“It is very nice to hear about you. We are very interested in working together on a project. We would like to know what are the scope of your work, and think about a plan we can do together… We will be waiting for you on June 9-14. Please write an email before you come. I hope to hear from you soon.”

“As long as we’re thinking about safety issues, I have something to propose. I propose that we purchase two cell phones that operate in Honduras, for us to keep with us while we travel there. One phone would probably go with the women and the other with the men…. As we will be splitting up in the future, it might be a good idea to have such a direct line of communication, not only to Arturo but to each other.”

b) Personally Connecting with Every Team Member. The second impression that emerged from the content of these email conversations among LSU and Honduran partners was the amount of effort and time they expended to personally connect with each other. Team members made repeated attempts to make personal connections through the use of self-disclosure, humor, nick names and insider terminology.

Self Disclosure. Self disclosure was an important component of making a connection and appeared integral to relationship building. Self Disclosure was accomplished through sharing feelings-- including venting and complaining-- and recounting personal stories. Sharing was done in increments, and increased in frequency if the speaker was accepted by the receiver. In these communications the speaker asked the receiver to “hear me,” and “know me.” Examples of self-disclosure of feelings or personal information follow:

“I fretted about this trip for a month, not about the presentation but about you two and how I would affect your group dynamic. I wanted to thank you for making me feel welcome.”

“I have always been a fairly irreverent person. Some people can stomach that and some people can’t. I poke fun at my roots because I think there’s humor in where I came from; but also I am very proud of where I came from. I try not to poke fun at things that can’t endure it. I think we-rednecks and the redneck society in general easily endures good natured poking, and indeed revels in it.”
“No, I'm not mad or resentful. I offer my apologies, because you and Rich were right. I've been assigning it a lower priority, because it did not depend entirely on me. But I know that you love me, and I love you very much as well. This is something we talked in *La Cumbre* with the meateaters and it is called friendship and ale bonding.”

[In response to an email where the o in Hello was missing:] “This member of Hell Team thinks that it would great to have such a meeting. I generally do not respond to emails that I receive via a cc but this was too good to pass up. I love the Hell Team.”

“….We LOVED having you here. You're not only great to work with, you're great friends.”

Frequently self-disclosure involved complaining and venting feelings about a situation or a third party and served to inform the receiver about a situation that impacted the sender’s work. Complaining and venting rarely occurred directly with the offending person.

“FYI: Actually she WONT take it from there, i've tried twice this week to give them the info and hinted not too subtly that they might prepare/type the form for us since there isn't a secretary at our disposal, and they have politely declined each time. So, I will be typing them today along with the gazillion other things i have to do (that sounds grumpier than i mean for it to). don't make a case of it…. NOW that i got that off my chest....”

“anything else? my computer is acting squirrelly today. my inbox full of emails disappeared right out from under my nose this morning. i can't find it, tho i know it must be floating around in the hard drive somewhere.”

”….good grief. i'm just going to stop coming in here with any hopes of getting anything done!”

Self disclosure also involved recounting stories past and present. Family-related stories, in particular showed what and who were important to the speaker. Stories might illustrate a point or a perspective, without mandating some particular outcome. They could be means of illustrating a work-related point or explaining a situation that impacted work responsibilities:

“Our kids were glad to see us. The cat was freaked out to be alone for 3 days and lost a lot of hair. I think Denese will see the doctor today but I am not sure that she will do it.”

“I want to let you know, however, that i'm not entirely on message: jim is very sick and i'm not leaving him alone, or alone with the kids, for long over the last couple of
days. so, just know that i'm here and watching your emails, but may not be too quick on the response today.”

“we had a nice turkey trot and Carson took second place in his age group. he was so proud. BTW - there is the jingle bell jog/reindeer run this friday night, with lots of outside activities downtown around the old state capitol, so keep that in mind as we think thru our social/down time events for the week. it's lots of fun to be down there and good food galore.”

“There is no policy as such. They stay in your room (I worked with Betty to check with the hotel, and they allowed Sarah to stay for no additional cost); I got her a medex (paid by me to Cathy), the Medex is not an LSU medex, but available to anyone. As far as traveling with me in country, my personal policy (from a safety/security standpoint) is that my children are never out of my sight 24 hours! I took Phillip to Honduras and Nicaragua when he was in the 4th grade, and I followed the above method. Main thing to remember is that all costs associated with their travel comes from the parents private funds—this includes airline tickets and all meals etc. One needs to remember, of course that if you are ‘working’ they can be with you at all times, if you need to spend time with them sightseeing etc., for a whole day for example, then you need to take annual leave (only for week days) to do this. Given the fact that you are already going to take annual leave to get paid, this may complicate things.”

**Humor.** Humor reinforced personal connections among participants. It was used to soften unwelcome messages, disclose personal information, reveal fears and address personal foibles. The fourth paragraph used humor to tell us that our visitors did not want to engage in the activities we had painstakingly planned for them. The third excerpt was in reference to the writer’s extreme sweating reaction to the Honduras heat; the last was an attempt to tell us how afraid he or she was about traveling during stormy weather. Most illustrate that the speaker did not take him or herself too seriously. Self deprecating humor, in particular reinforced the vertical hierarchy or egalitarian working relationship among participants.

“I would not want to put up barriers to Rich or your possible membership (as a redneck). If you are interested in joining the club, you will need a sponsor and mentor. I suggest myself.”

“well of course there is no report. i didn't attach it. just wanted to see if you were awake. :( “
“Any idea where this would take place? (An air conditioned space, I pray).
“Now some people are requesting some time off, so they can go shopping on Saturday and/or Sunday, What should I tell them? PS: They want to contribute to the economical recovery of the US. ;-)”

“ok team leader, i don't have to tell you that even the not-nervous among us are nervous about flying in the weather that is predicted for tomorrow. the nervous among us are wettin' down their legs. i think some flights were cancelled out of and into BR yesterday. BTW: is it raining cats and dogs in teguc right now? Keep us posted, ok?”

Personal connections were also reinforced through the use of insider terminology and informal address. Insider terminology made participants feel that they were a part of the club or team. Informal address such as “brother and buddy” suggested a family or familiar relationship. In the first snippet below, the recipient is being called mi hermano or “my brother”; he is also being referred to teasingly as don, which is a term of respect reserved for the very powerful or very old, and jefe or “boss” in Spanish. In the last excerpt, the writer refers to a meeting that was a “cluster” and by cluster he meant “debacle.” However, the term took on a double or inside meaning for team members as cluster was the proper term for governmental working groups in Honduras.

“Hola Don Ricardo”… Como estes mi hermano? I will see you in a week buddy.”

“Hello Team.”

“Hang in there, buddy.”

“We had a meeting today and it was a real “cluster”. “If possible, we’re hoping to fit in RSA on Saturday, Sunday or whenever else you feel it is appropriate in your role as Honduran team jefe.”

c) Making Space for Socialization and Play. The prior two categories that characterized our close relationships were facilitated by socialization and play. These clearly appeared to be important to team building and were conducted outside of work or as a supplement to work-
related activities. From May 7, 2001 through February 15, 2002 there were 50 emails arranging or referring to social activities. There were two main venues for socialization. First, field visits to Honduras, and second, the week of counterpart training at LSU.

Despite spending limitations (see later discussion on impediments to participatory development), team members chose to arrange and many times pay for social interactions with each other and with counterparts and consultants in a work or non-work-related context. The following emails illustrate the energy and commitment that were invested in trying to arrange venues for social interaction:

“Hopefully we’ll get to see Melly. Maybe we could all do dinner?”

“Rich offered to spring for beers at the Princess some evening and he accepted.”

“Students were invited to contribute art that could be used as illustrations for this module and they responded with an incredible amount of effort and art of admirable quality. Please drop in anytime during the art show to take a look at this work…. A light lunch will be available.”

“In addition, please join us for a luncheon reception immediately following the conference. The luncheon will be in the Chancellor's dining room at the Faculty Club. We will host 10 Honduran visitors that are with us for training over the next week.”

“Thursday evening, when the boys are out of town, we could do something fun….we could do a girl something …. kate and i saw the play at swine palace this past week and it was good, very different! so, anywho, let's not just abandon them - i don't want to wear them out either. i could cook over here or help with a potluck thing at your house or whatever you think is good.”

“As of right now, as I understand it, they will have their entrance fee waived to the Rural Life Museum on Sunday afternoon, and their entrance fees to the Aquarium will be paid on Saturday by me.”

“Mike also is going to the hotel at 10 AM to take a group to the Mall. Anyone who wants to go can go with Mike. He will drop them off and pick them back up at 2 PM and bring them back to the hotel. Once again, footballers will go to Mikes.”
**Supportive Team Dynamic Summary.** Valuing, connecting and playing contributed to the supportive and egalitarian team environment in which we worked. Solid teambuilding conceivably facilitated completing the product. However, more important in a participatory development project, our supportive team probably facilitated a successful process both for us and for our counterparts. Because we created a supportive dynamic with our LSUAC team, we naturally wanted to include our counterparts in the creative process. Trust is created through such a process and is likely a prerequisite to participation. People will not risk independent participation if they think that you do not value or will criticize them. They will also not go out on a limb creatively unless they know they are allowed to fail. Once trust is established, then participation and capacity building can occur.
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Impediments to Participatory Development

The three factors that facilitated our participatory development process were administrative decentralization that gave us the flexibility to make choices, key Honduran employees, and a supportive team created through a successful teambuilding process. The same open coding grounded theory analysis of project materials revealed that there were challenges to our process of successful participatory development. They can be grouped into the following main categories:

1. Insufficient time for participatory processes;
2. Restrictions on spending; and
3. A lack of relationship strength and regular communication with tertiary stakeholders at our university.

The following analysis reviews these impediments, their potential consequences, and the factors that mitigated or could have mitigated their impact.

1. Insufficient Time

Our project entailed 17 months of concentrated effort from initiation to completion. A year was required to identify counterparts and definitively determine a viable project. Therefore, time to complete the project was short, particularly with team members and counterparts physically located on another continent. The following correspondence was among the LSUAC US team and our LSUAC Honduran team member and occurred primarily after October of 2001. They illustrate that full participation by our primary stakeholders, our relationships with team members and partners, and the quality of the project could have been compromised due to a project duration that was too short for a project based on participatory processes.
Limited Participation. When deadlines loomed in the project implementation phase, the inclination was to eliminate the participation of counterparts who were a continent away. Missed deadlines nearly created a situation where counterpart contributions were limited or excluded.

“Because time is getting very tight for getting the CADERH module translated and printed in English and Spanish, I have decided that we will take what is in Denese's hands on Monday and submit it for publication. Any additional information that we wanted in the module, but is not here, will have to be excluded.”

“.... If there aren't many changes, this would be easiest. Either way, at this point, her comments should be general ones that I can address, not a gazillion tiny ones, or major overhauls. I need Melly's nutrition work, comments on my amendments to her reproductive health section, and I need the scanned pictures. We are between a rock and a hard place regarding deadlines.”

“We came home to a message from Arturo saying that Lourdes had "lots of ideas" about the module. This is after I basically told Arturo that it was too late for her to suggest major revisions. Anyway, I had a small cow….”

“It's going to be "some" validation study-- considering we only have until Nov 28 to spend money. It'll have to be validated in a very coordinated manner-- different teachers.”

Dispute Escalation. The short project duration and consequent emergency deadlines created an element of stress which resulted in the US team phrasing communications with each other and the Honduran employee in the imperative. Disputes may have been compounded by cultural differences relating to the meaning of time. These incidents could have placed our relationship with each other and the Honduran employee or counterparts at risk.

“WAIT BIG DOG! I wanted to give Melly a chance to contribute a piece on adolescent reproductive health; also to update our nutrition info. And the module needed a little re-ordering/editing. And Arturo and Lourdes were going to meet to talk about it and get her input. I'm aware of the spending deadlines, but please let's don't just haul off and print this thing, OK?”

“We can't go anywhere until Lourdes reviews this. If Wednesday is the earliest you can do this, then so be it. Walk her through the whole document. Let her see Melly's also-- ask her about the issue of birth control. DO NOT leave the module with her to review it later. Leave the meeting with her comments!!...”
“I wanted to say that Denese (and I) are disappointed that you did not respond to our request (sent many times) for the CADERH materials that she needs BEFORE we come down. I know you were VERY responsive to Pam yesterday regarding the hospital survey and research methods seminar but, although I think this is a good thing, it is NOT a part of the project and is NOT a priority in the big picture. Once again, to refresh your memory this is the request. Today is Tuesday. I sincerely hope it will be in our hands on Friday so at least she has Saturday to review it before and module testing takes place.”

**Lack of Access to Professional Services.** Lay-up, printing and translation had to be done by team members rather than by outside professionals because of project spending deadlines related to the short project duration. Therefore, the quality of the project could have been compromised. This also created additional work for team members, which again created more stress:

“I just met with Betty Creamer today at AgCommunications. It is too late for me to ask her to help us develop a cover for the module. It is too late for me to ask Graphic Services to do the lay-up for me. That means that unfortunately, the booklet will be copied not printed. It is too late for me to ask Graphic Services to help me scan in the pictures that the lab school students have drawn. At this late date I have to do everything myself. PAW PRINTS do not pre-bill and only bill after the job is done. At this time of year, a simple printing job will take probably two weeks. Consider that the document still has to be translated. We are sending in a copy of the module to have a translator translate **TOMORROW**. If the AgCenter translators can't do it, we'll have to try to find someone else who can, in short order. **THUS, I need your input by the end of the day Arturo.** We have decided to make the booklet the same size as the one CADERH now uses, in one color, and stapled in the middle (just like the ones they have now). I will be spending the rest of the day cleaning things up-- changing margins, type, headers, scanning in logos, trying to get lab school illustrations. Any help you can give me will be much appreciated.”

“This is Rich's suggestion (see forward). It seems reasonable since it is really their doing that this is so backed up, and it seems like they should be the ones scrambling with the additions or whatever….”

“Because the module has already gone out for translating, **I will have to ask you to help me make the changes to the Spanish version. HOPEFULLY, it will be back when you're here and we can run through it and make the changes together.** If not, I'll have to email it to you and you'll have to make them *rapidamente* as it needs to go to the printer ASAP after we get it back. It's in Publisher-- did you install Publisher on your machine at work?….”
2. Spending Limitations

Socialization was an important factor in our team and relationship building process. The challenge was to determine a way to pay for social encounters, particularly with potential counterparts. Social interactions among LSUAC team members in Honduras were not a problem as they were covered by a meal per diem. However, social activities that included counterparts could rarely be budgeted according to LSUAC and USAID rules, with the exception of several events for counterparts who attended LSU training. Therefore, the team made a great effort to secure permission for payment, or in the alternative they paid for the activity themselves. These strategies created considerable additional work and tension, which could have harmed our working relationships and thwarted our teambuilding process.

Effort to Find Payment Alternatives. Following are examples of the time and effort expended in an attempt to find payment alternatives for social activities for our counterparts and guests:

“...he needs an invoice that says "room rental for art show reception for Honduran CADERH Human Ecology project". No food on the bill. Still. How much will this run?”

“The visitors will be staying at the Homewood Suites on Corporate (next to CitiPlace). LSU has an agreement with them and the Sheraton is too pricy.) Given budgetary restrictions, it is impossible to pay for the evening catered reception we talked about. No food can be purchased. I was told that the only way to do this is if we pay for it ourselves.”

“Good news. I received permission from Russell Greer, Legal Counsel for LSU Foundation to use my foundation account funds for cultural activity entrance fees and a reception dinner on Tuesday PM for our Honduran Forest Sector Development Visitors.”

“If we do it on campus, we have to use certain rates and I do not believe that it will cost $1000 for 30 people. Any way I will authorize if I know the estimated rate, and it is under $1000. Brandon/Melissa could you advise on the rate or check with Mark revenue and rate?”
“As of right now, as I understand it, they will have their entrance fee waived to the Rural Life Museum on Sunday afternoon, and their entrance fees to the Aquarium will be paid on Saturday by me.”

“We discussed our visitors, and our constrictions on expenditures (which they seemed to understand well) and she suggested that we write a letter on LSU stationary explaining these limitations and requesting a waiver of costs for our visitors.”

Payment Disputes: Many times funding could not be secured for social activities or events. These roadblocks created tension and disputes among frustrated team members and could have harmed our relationships with each other. That frustration could well have carried over to relationships with our counterparts and guests:

“Given budgetary restrictions, it is impossible to pay for the evening catered reception we talked about. No food can be purchased. I was told that the only way to do this is if we pay for it ourselves.”

“I think what Rich is saying is that we’ll have to pony up the money ourselves and we will not be reimbursed for it, if we do this meal thing. Is that correct, Rich? If so, I don’t really have a “big bucket of money”…. to donate to this sort of thing, especially around Christmas. I’m sure I’ll already be a couple thousand in the hole from money owed me by international programs. Spending money on food in the State of Louisiana is, for some reason, nearly impossible. Very ironic, for a state that prides itself on its “food culture.” I thought it was blindingly naïve or just outright ignorant …. to say that we would spend to the 75th percentile, when we are faced at every turn with obstacles to spending. I’ll go along with whatever the majority wants to do.”

“There is a need to be more responsive and flexible in the ability to shift budget funds as the project progresses. It is difficult, if not impossible to plan specific tasks for a 15-month development project before it starts.”

“What the hell. If y’all will help, Rich and I can probably do it at our house, unless Pam wants to do it at hers! I think we really need to do this somewhere.”

3. Tertiary Stakeholder Relationships

Time and money disputes often involved our LSUAC tertiary stakeholders peripherally. However, one monetary dispute toward the end of the project occurred directly with them, which threatened the completion of our module project. We almost did not get the completed modules...
copied and sent to our CADERH counterpart. Two factors contributed to this dispute. First, there was a lack of regular communication between our team leader and the tertiary stakeholder office on budgetary and other administrative issues. Second, there were weak personal relationships between the project manager in that administrative office and individuals on our team. These factors could have been mitigated by treating the project manager as a member of our team. With stronger relationships we may have overcome this crisis earlier and with less damage; while more communication between groups may have avoided this situation altogether.

**Lack of Relationship and Communication.** Below are examples of the communications that were sent during this period that illustrate the dispute. The first email was sent directly between the disputing entities, our team leader and our LSUAC administrative office personnel (the tertiary stakeholders). It was business-like and offered very little information. The second email was from our team leader to the rest of our team and recounted the information vacuum perceived by our LSUAC Honduran team member. The later two emails were sent from our project manager to the LSUAC tertiary stakeholder office; they are more heated but still contained in tone. All revealed the lack of relationship strength and communication between the sender and receiver.

“It has come to our attention that both accounts for the Honduras Projects are overdrawn. As of today, all expenditures must cease. If you are in travel status and/or have recently returned from a trip you will receive reimbursement. Because of the overdraft in the accounts, no more travel, extra compensation, shipping or supply purchases from either account as of this day will be possible.”

“IP has instructed folks to use email...no fax or phone calls due to the financial crisis. Arturo is stressed to the max. No one has told him anything. He was not copied on any of the emails from IP about the situation. Missy and LV won't respond to him and he has to shut down this office in the next 2 weeks before he comes to Louisiana. He is struggling to get a number of loose ends tied up today....”
“Before our team writes an in-depth email responding to the email from you regarding lack of funds, I have three key questions that need to be answered immediately. 1) In December, we budgeted $10,000 for CADERH module booklets to be printed and distributed at vocational educational centers in Honduras. Hundreds of person hours have been put into this and we MUST print and disseminate these documents. This is one of the 2 most important projects we have done. 2) The team needs to receive extra compensation for the trip we are currently on. 3) Denese must be paid for February and March. Please respond to these issues. There is MUCH more dialogue that will take place but these are the absolutely most pressing issues.”

“No, we have not spent anything on the CADERH module. We HAVE had countless meetings and hundreds of hours of work put into it. I am to have the module booklets made in Baton Rouge and shipped to CADERH. I hope compensation will also be in your thinking. I have personally incurred $2,000 in expenses in anticipation of using this compensation to pay it back. It’s just not fair to change the rules while we are in-country. Keep me posted.”

**Emotional Fallout: Filling the Void with Speculation.** Lack of communication and relationship strength, and the severity of the financial crisis created a situation where speculation and fault-finding ran rampant. These types of communications consumed time and energy that could have been devoted to other project details, and they postponed constructive actions that could have led to a resolution. Clearly, they escalated the chasm between divisions. Below are some examples of communications among team members as to the cause and effect of the debacle, and the emotional fall-out that resulted.

“I suspect that IP will not authorize the funds for printing and sending the CADERH module. …The onus will be on us to print it...somehow. …My stomach blew up again….”

“As is the case in the Contra congressional hearings, I think this is a case of "follow the money.”

“I sincerely someone of authority can come up with a solution to the mess.”

“I spent $2K of my own money on stuff fully anticipating getting this extra compensation to pay the bills. I'm screwed.”

“i do not have the list infront of me. But i guarantee you we have not spent $91,000 in 2 months. Plus we had $240,000 in November so WTF???”
Mitigating Conflict

Introduction: Supportive Team Dynamic

The disputes we encountered in the project process involved time and money. Key factors that facilitated resolution of disputes among LSUAC team members were our consistent communications and relationship strength. To cope with conflict, we relied on the same approaches that helped us to develop a supportive team dynamic: a) We valued every team member, and b) we connected with other team members.

a) Valuing Every Team Member. We resolved disputes or supported each other in dispute resolution by promoting the value of every team member. Expressions of value took several forms. First, we advocated on behalf of each other to third parties. Second, we placed individuals over project goals.

Advocacy. Advocacy took several forms. We expressed our team member’s situation and limitations to those they worked with, as in the first email. We also interceded for them with third-party disputants as in the second and third emails. Finally, in general discussions we argued our teammate’s side as in the last two emails:

“Arturo is stressed to the max. No one has told him anything. He was not copied on any of the emails from IP about the situation. Missy and LV won't respond to him and
he has to shut down this office in the next 2 weeks before he comes to Louisiana. He is struggling to get a number of loose ends tied up today so can this questionnaire wait until later today when you have a final draft? What is it you want him to do with it?”

“…I came in, made jokes ("I come in peace") and generally stumped for you ("Rich has one of the kindest hearts of anyone I know-- he may initially get angry but he reverses himself quickly. He cares a lot") as Lakshman was taken aback by your first email to him. So, in the process of this ambassadorial visit I made, they told me…”

“Pam is quite upset that you maybe upset that Rich was irritated with you.”

“But I can’t imagine how it could be Rich’s fault when he has no control over the budget or expenditures.”

“Rich is not the PI, they’ve made that very clear. So it is THEIR responsibility, not his, for expenditures made. They approve EVERY one of them. So, the buck stops with them, not Rich.”

**People over Projects.** If differences escalated to disputes, we ultimately valued the team member over the disputed topic. This resulted in relationships where we were not defensive, and we did not make it a priority to “be right”:

“This is NO BIG DEAL…no issue at all. I care about YOU more than any stupid issue on who is going to meet with Norman Garcia about what. I do think that we should all meet, not exclude anyone, and feel him out on the employment/training work-readiness element of the cluster. Then, we can chat about our project sans women. They do not want to hear the boring details anyway. Agreed? I tried to call you. Are you home? Want me to come by and chat?”

“Thanks Arturo. When something like this happens, just keep conversing with us. Then we can work things out. This was quite simple to work out, really…”

“You know Rich loves you, and I love you. You work "with us" not "for us"-- we know that. Are you okay?”

**b) Connect with Other Team Members.** We supported each other in dispute resolution through various self-disclosure techniques. We vented and complained to each other about disputes with outside parties, and requested, gave and listened to advice. In direct disputes we
communicated until there was closure on the issue, by apologizing, and explaining our feelings and reasoning.

**Complaining, Asking for and Listening to Advice.** When issues became too emotional to handle alone, we also asked for advice and input. Many times rather than engaging in direct confrontation we vented and complained to others on the team, which allowed for a cooling off period which preceded analytical problem solving. The first two emails illustrate requests for advice, and the latter emails the advice given:

”Well, it looks like the shit is going to hit the fan sooner than later. Any thoughts on what I should say? Maybe you and Denese could type up a few points that need to be in the email. Should we respond as a team or should it be from just me? I am so pissed off I can not see straight.”

”Below is my hasty and angry reply…. Should I send it? I planned to cc everyone …”

“No, don't send it. The tone is way too angry. Just sit back for today and let the issue breath for awhile. Then craft a more professional email. You can say everything you said here but say it in a more professional tone, like presenting a refereed paper...just the facts. The angry tones should be reserved for a face to face meeting with as many administrators as possible attending. Hold the public anger in check until you can get back here and we'll hash this out. Hang in there, buddy.”

…”Too late meant you did not ASK questions of LV like I hoped you would but rather DEMANDED with a touch of anger. Believe me, they KNOW you're angry. It's ok, no big deal. Just see my last email I just sent. I'll see what I can do later today. I've got to finish what I'm doing now and get ready to go to the more.”

“I'm not sure what to say, except that this is what i see: there are two competing demands, both legit, coming at each other like a freight train. you know what our demands are - time and money.....some things just can't be rushed, even when everything in our brains say to rush and push like mad. my advice at this point is to let the thing unfold and see what happens. push but don't close off options.”

**Closure through Apology and Explanation.** Finally, we resolved conflict among team members by apologizing, when appropriate. In addition, we explained our
feelings and reasoning. The examples below illustrate our post-conflict conversations and resolution:

“I'm sorry I haven't sent you the complete package. But I don't have it.”

“First, I want to apologize to you, Lourdes, Melly, Helen, Betty and Denese for not considering your feelings before agreeing with the group on our trip not to go to New Orleans. They indicated a desire to run around Baton Rouge and shop for specialty items (toys, saxophone, clarinet reeds, electronics) and go to movies. I was a little overwhelmed. I will apologize to the others later. This is the current plan….”

“Why the Forestry Team that is so warm and so human, are always thinking that some team member is mad at other team member. No, I'm not mad or resentful I offer my apologies, because you and Rich were right. I've been assigning a lower priority, because it did not depend entirely of me. Buy I know that you love me, and I love you very much as well. This is something we talked in La Cumbre with the meateaters and it is called friendship and ale bonding. So please don't be hard on Rich. I appreciate very much your concern, and I can't wait to see you Sunday.”

Summary: Mitigating Conflict

Our LSUAC team had the relationship strength to mitigate and resolve conflict with each other: we expressed the value of each person, and made a dedicated effort to connect and communicate with each other. Our overdraft crisis was different than other disputes because it was directly with a tertiary stakeholder group, not with an individual on our team. Email documentation reveals that most of the tools we utilized to resolve and diffuse direct disputes with team members were absent from this dispute with LSUAC tertiary stakeholders. In short, there was a communication lapse and lack of relationship strength between our groups. The communication collapse occurred on both sides and consisted of an absence of explanations, shared feelings and perspectives. There were no requests for input or advice. Valuing each other, and the clear personal connections that characterized the relationships among team members were lacking in our communications with these tertiary stakeholders. It is likely that if
individuals in that office had been involved in our team building process the dispute could have been avoided or resolved more quickly and with less angst.
CHAPTER 6. DISCUSSION

Introduction

In 2000 and 2001 our US-based academic team had the opportunity to work on a project funded by USAID in Honduras in post-Hurricane Mitch reconstruction efforts. The purpose of this research was to understand whether the “participatory” process we used to develop a Human Ecology Curriculum for vocational schools in Honduras was successful. To determine the success of our process, I examined the participatory development literature, applied these concepts to Human Ecological Theory, and examined the process and actors themselves through Grounded Theory and Matrix Analyses. With these background materials and analytical techniques I asked the following questions to determine process success:

1. How did stakeholder groups negotiate the participatory development process?
2. What factors promoted the participatory process of development in this project?
3. What factors impeded the participatory process of development?

The answers to these questions throughout a range of contexts will help future project participants structure their process effectively so that program benefits reach those who truly need it.

Stakeholder Negotiation of the Participatory Process

Our Process

How did stakeholder groups negotiate the participatory development process? An analysis of the project in Chapter 5 revealed that stakeholder organizations moved through 3-phases from project inception to completion. An analysis of individuals within groups illustrated that participation was sustained along the project process for secondary stakeholders and the primary stakeholder administrator. Participation was significant for all primary stakeholder
beneficiaries at the end of the project process. Administrative decentralization, having key Honduran team members and a supportive team dynamic facilitated the project philosophy, process and participation level. Lack of adequate project duration was the main impediment to the participatory nature of the process. Limitations on spending and a lack of relationship strength with tertiary stakeholders further frustrated the process.

In the first phase our US-based team established a development philosophy that was egalitarian and participatory, and which impacted the rest of the process. Host country nationals’ perspectives and culture were valued. However, there was a threshold requirement expressly communicated to all prospective groups that only true partnerships would be formed with agencies and individuals that wanted to share in the process and project. In the second phase the team learned about the country, culture and challenges. They gave seminars to potential stakeholder groups on their general areas of expertise. Finally, the team met with individual stakeholder organizations to learn about their specific programs, projects and needs. The third phase involved a partnering process that explored the “fit” of our expertise and their needs. There was a subsequent mutual effort at partnering and successful relationship development among parties. Finally, overall project participation was mutual. Specifically, participation was sustained from the inception to the completion of the project by actors in our secondary stakeholder group, and by the administrator of the primary stakeholder agency. Participation measured by decision-making was significant for all individuals involved. However, primary stakeholder teachers and students participated only during the final evaluation phase of the module project.
The Literature

Development literature, written about or by actors in the field focuses on the involvement of poor, mainly rural peasants and their participation in defining their own challenges and addressing their own solutions. It calls on development workers, preferably indigenous, to make a paradigm shift from managing to facilitating behaviors and from ethnocentric to egalitarian attitudes. Large development organizations attempted to institutionalize this shift by producing manuals and requiring or encouraging the involvement of local NGOs instead of government agencies. The obvious difference in approach between field workers and development organizations is that field workers want to involve intermediaries (read local elites) as little as possible, whereas, donor organizations have focused on the local intermediary agencies as representatives of the poor. Participation of primary stakeholder groups in internationally funded projects has been predominately in the implementation stage. Despite recommendations for participation all along the project cycle, it has not been practiced in the initial stages of identification or design or in the final stage of evaluation. Much of this lack of participation has been due to the planning and accounting requirements of donor bureaucracies.

Project Successes and Facilitating Factors

In light of the history of development and recommendations in the literature, our 3-phase process was successful in the following respects:

1) Our team valued, respected and facilitated the needs and desires of local agencies working in the field;

2) Our process was informed, iterative and voluntary;

3) Overall participation by the primary stakeholder agency was consistent and significant.
Team Philosophy

The combination of the individuals on our team, their past experiences and close relationships led to a team philosophy of development that was egalitarian, respectful and participatory in all respects. If viewed from an ecological perspective, our collective attitude composed the environment in which we worked and determined our process, and impacted our partner and project choices.

In many respects, the composition of the team that created this collective philosophy was a serendipitous accident: The right people were available and interested in the project at the right time. Only one member of our US team had ever been involved in an international development project of this magnitude; just that person and another had had extensive international travel experience. Most of the US team did not speak even rudimentary Spanish. I could speculate that individuals interested in this type of work would be more likely to possess this respectful and egalitarian philosophy. However, the top down, ethnocentric approach of most large development organizations vigorously contradicts this assumption.

The team dynamic that facilitated the cohesive nature of our group and the collective nature of our participatory philosophy was not an accident. Close relationships were created through a teambuilding process supported through our close proximity on site and our consequent efforts at socialization and play. Having created this supportive dynamic with our LSUAC team, we naturally wanted to include our counterparts in the same dynamic process. We valued, respected and connected with our Honduran counterparts because we valued, respected and connected with each other. Respect and close relationships encouraged participation, which promoted risk taking and thus capacity building. The impact of the attitude and environment
created by the implementing development actors representing the international donor probably
can not be understated.

Process Promoting Choice

The process we used to find partners and determine projects highlighted the element of
mutual choice—between the indigenous agency and the outside partner. Our process revealed
that more goes into the partnership decision than a match determined by objective variables such
as agency mission or current project need. Our process suggests that where partnerships are
determined by third-party perceptions, forced partnership relationships could be strained and
predetermined projects could be implemented without agency need. If there is no perceived need
for a particular project, participation would not be likely and it certainly would not be
meaningful. The analysis also revealed that project determination may be the final factor that
cements a partnership relationship. Thus, superfluous projects or those perceived as not pressing
would not likely hold the relationship together.

The process we used was possible because the international donor and our local
administrative agencies did not dictate partnerships or projects. The development literature
indicated that this decentralized decision-making, in itself was an unusual and unique
opportunity. In addition, team members in Honduras were indispensable in facilitating
communication and relationships, and bridging cultural and language gaps. This corresponds
with the literature, which recommends that indigenous actors facilitate development efforts.
Again, our team supported this participatory approach despite the frustrations and uncertainty
involved in a process co-facilitated across continents and cultures. In a less supportive team
environment, the difficulties inherent in this process would have encouraged less participation by
primary stakeholders not more, as secondary stakeholder facilitators would find that making
decisions alone would be much less time consuming and angst producing. Our team relationships 
helped us go forward with the process and resolve differences and disputes as they arose.

**Meaningful Participation**

Meaningful participation by the agency primary stakeholder measured by level of 
decision making was consistent and significant throughout all phases of the project cycle. In fact, 
our primary stakeholder contact engaged in progressively more significant decision-making in 
the later stages of the process. Participation was facilitated by our numerous visits to Honduras 
and counterpart offices. It was also nurtured by our team members located in the Honduran 
office through their dogged persistence in engaging input and in their efforts at nurturing the 
relationships we had established. In addition, our social sector team clearly was not satisfied with 
a lack of participation on the part of the primary stakeholder. On many occasions, despite it 
being easier to do so, we persevered in requiring stakeholder involvement. The close team and 
counterpart relationship promoted the sense that all parties were important and that all should 
have input. If you do not know someone well it is easier to disregard and devalue their 
participation.

Participation by project beneficiaries--administrators, teachers and students--was 
significant in the evaluation phase of the project. Their involvement was orchestrated and 
encouraged by our primary stakeholder contact, which was supported by our LSUAC Honduran 
consultant. By that phase in the project cycle our primary stakeholder contact was given nearly 
free reign in determining the level and extent of their involvement; and her predisposition was to 
encourage their input without reservation. The significant decision making displayed by students 
and teachers was also facilitated through our hands-off approach in determining the evaluation
procedure, and through the financial support we extended to our counterpart in the testing process.

**Project Limitations and Impediments**

In light of the literature and a study of individuals and how they negotiated our development process, our participatory process was less than a success because of the late stage involvement of primary beneficiaries. The main impediment to their participation was the inadequate timeline available for a process based on participation.

The participatory process we utilized involved primary stakeholder beneficiaries—that is the teachers and students of the vocational schools. Their participation was significant and, meaningful, although potentially underrepresented in the analyses utilized. Nevertheless, the bulk of their involvement in the process did not occur until the evaluation phase. The literature promotes involvement of primary stakeholders from the beginning of the project process. However, to engage the teachers and students in the first phase of our process would have required a longer timeline, particularly if we continued to reach beneficiaries through agency partnerships. In such scenarios, the donor agency would have to be prepared for an ultimate partnering decision to be made very late in the project timeline. Work and project determinations would have to be made in the field and with the participation of beneficiaries and agency administrators. Another alternative would be to let the host-national NGO make the preliminary project decisions with a longer timeline so that end-use beneficiaries would have additional time to make more substantial contributions to the module content.

A final option would be to organize beneficiaries at the village level, bypassing existing non-profit and governmental entities as development field workers have advocated. This option highlights the weakness in the organization-to-organization nature of our model. Our
participatory development process was based on partnering and project decisions made by employees of stakeholder agencies--individuals the literature would call local elites. These stakeholder agencies were identified to us by the international donor agency (USAID) and through a multitude of meetings and contacts set up by our Honduras-based team member. All Honduran counterpart contacts were educated and most were bilingual. All individuals on our team had advanced degrees. Most of our meetings were in the capital of Tegucigalpa at Western-based hotels or agency and governmental offices. Our process was not one envisioned by Paulo Freire, which would have involved putting aside the trappings of station and education level, and working directly with the poor and disenfranchised in the field. Such an alternative could have potentially required different participants and another participatory model entirely.
IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this dissertation were obtained through qualitative methodologies used to analyze one group process and they therefore can not be generalized to other situations or groups. Nevertheless, these findings are useful “lessons learned” that future development organizations can utilize to structure participatory processes, which are intended to promote capacity building of country nationals and sustainability of project results. They can also inform future researchers as to relevant variables to include in the design of a quantitative analysis of program processes. A future study of our project outcomes and the impact of the module itself could be conducted in order to confirm that capacity building and sustainability resulted from our approach. Specifically, the findings in this dissertation suggest that individual development workers, the group dynamic and philosophy, and the process of development are equally important in facilitating a participatory project.

Project administrators and team leaders should choose individuals carefully who will participate on such a project. Project team members should believe in the value of all people, their ability to determine their own problems and solutions, and the requirement that they participate in doing so, despite the difficulties in acting between cultures and continents. Host country team members should hold the same belief system; additionally, they should be able to move between groups acting as a bridge between cultures.

Project administrators should ease budgetary restrictions so that team building activities among all counterparts are possible. Socialization appeared to be important to team building, as did face-to-face contacts in the host country and at the implementing institution, all of which require money. Administrators that directly influence project activities by way of budgetary authorizations and the like should be included in the team building process as well so that fewer
project difficulties result. A cohesive team appears to facilitate communication, relationship
strength, maneuvering through project disputes, a participatory philosophy and participation
levels.

Project administrators seeking to implement a participatory process of development may
want to look at our 3-phase model, which promotes informed, self-determined partnerships and
projects, and participation for primary beneficiary groups. Participation levels and duration
would be greatly improved with a longer timeline, which would be more adequate for a
participatory development project.
REFERENCES


DFID (Department for International Development) (date unknown). Inter-agency experiences and lessons: from the forum on operationalizing sustainable


PRIA (Society for participatory research in Asia). Available: http://www.pria.org/


Strasser, S. Phenomenology and the human sciences. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.


World Bank b (date unknown). The effects of Hurricane Mitch on Honduras. Available:


### APPENDIX 1. TABLE A1 TIMELINE STAKEHOLDER CONTACTS

- Stakeholders are listed in rows, dates are in columns
- Entries with asterisks are from author's email files
- Entries without asterisks are from other documents
- Dates in red indicate trips or intended trips
- Entries in color indicate action taken by entity or person in corresponding row
- Entries without color are actions taken that affect entity or person in corresponding row but in which that entity or person did not participate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USAID Honduras</td>
<td>Set broad program goals</td>
<td>Selected managing agency</td>
<td>Approved universities &amp; project guidelines</td>
<td>*Met with LSU AgCenter in Honduras</td>
<td>*Met with advance team to suggest projects &amp; counterparts</td>
<td>*Met with LSU SS team to suggest projects and counterparts</td>
<td>Mentioned CADERH by name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MetroVision</td>
<td>Selected universities Solicited projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC International Programs Lakshman &amp; Brett</td>
<td>Sol project desc Sel team leaders Advance work in-country</td>
<td>Refine Guidelines for Disciplines &amp; Projects</td>
<td>*Trip to hire, establish LSU office in Honduras Met with USAID</td>
<td>Help coordinate advance team visit</td>
<td>*Advance trip to Honduras to meet with counterparts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of RNR Rich</td>
<td>*Develop guidelines for FP Select team Select consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event/Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/24/2001</td>
<td>Rich emails CONADES re future SS with Arturo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/1 &amp; 2/2001</td>
<td><em>Rich emils Norman Garcia/FIDE bouth meeting with SS</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/8/2001</td>
<td>6/2001 TRIP CANCELLED STORM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/7/2001</td>
<td>7/1/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/11-16/2001</td>
<td>7/11-16/2001 Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/30/2001</td>
<td>8/22/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/2001</td>
<td><em>Rich eml to Art re contacting CADERH, World Vision, COHDEFOR, CONADES Fundacion Maria</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/30/2001</td>
<td><em>Rich attended all SS seminars &amp; visits</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/2001 Honduras</td>
<td>9/18/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/22-29/2001</td>
<td>Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/10-14/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Honduras Trip FP group ESNACIFOR visit (Todd bamboo project)

*We have too much money; RV, PM & DAV invite LM to visit LSU for training

*Rich with us at CADERH, ESNACIFOR & World Vision
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/15/2001</td>
<td>*Flurry of emails arranging for Lab School Art Reception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-11/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/19/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/25-26/2001</td>
<td>RPV sends module out for translation w/o MP pics, w/o LM review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/27/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/28/2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/2001 Training visit to LSU</td>
<td>*Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/3/2002</td>
<td>*Art &amp; MP translate, correct, add vocab module initiates idea of printing module in Honduras Discusses w/ LM &amp; Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/2002 Honduras</td>
<td>*Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on LM/MP ideas for validation techniques in February. Ideas from PM?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2002</td>
<td>*Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational instructors &amp; 10 students (see Chronology). RPV there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of RNR</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of RNR</td>
<td>Todd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of RNR</td>
<td>Elvin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of Human Ecology</td>
<td>Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of Human Ecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arturo emails me &amp; Rich re future date for World Vision SS sem</td>
<td>*Arturo talks to LM about site visit Emails us *I email Arturo about possible site visit *Arturo contacts CONADES and sets up seminar SS emails me &amp; Rich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Arturo meeting with LM about site visit &amp; phone with CONADES</td>
<td>*Arturo sends PM &amp; DAV notes of CADERH meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Rich eml to Art re contacting CADERH, World Vision, COHDEFOR, CONADES, Fundacion Maria</td>
<td>*Arturo attended most all SS seminars &amp; visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Lourdes Maradiaga (LM) emails Pam</td>
<td>*Arturo emails Pam &amp; me about CADERH site visit *Arturo email us about future seminar with CONADES *Arturo sends us notes of meeting with LM CADERH *Presentd at PRONADERS site visit CADERH, ESNACIFOR visit SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Pam and I wrote PRONADERS project description watershed mgmt IDB for team leader</td>
<td>*Pam and I wrote CADERH Module &amp; ESNACIFOR visitor project proposals for Team Leader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Honduras Trip FP group ESNACIFOR visit (Todd bamboo project)**

- *Eml to Art: I finish CADERH module draft, Pam reviews, has comments for LM, suggests Melly nutrition review*

- *Emls from me to Art pushing for LM to review module, Melly to complete her sections.*

- *We have too much money; RV, PM & DAV invite LM to visit LSU for training*

- *Arturo with us at CADERH & ESNACIFOR

- *Pam talks to Diane Saser in Extension about reviewing 4-H materials for CADERH module*

- *Pam reviews CADERH draft, has comments for LM, suggests Melly nutrition review*

- *We have too much money; RV, PM & DAV invite LM to visit LSU for training*

- *Reviewed module draft with LM @ CADERH, changed, discussed sexuality & nutrition issues PM suggested Melly write puberty & sexuality sect. LM agreed! Discussed role of visitors in training @ ESNACIFOR World Vision present*

- *PM reviews Melly Perez sections & suggests amendmts PM & MP emls through me & Arturo re amendments & possible additions MP oks amendmts MP wants to validate*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAV made edits per PM suggestions, add to module, send to MP (thru Art) with suggestions re adding birth control per LM comments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LM reviews module w/ Art, makes suggestions (correct, split, validate, make culturally relevant).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*MP sends DAV module pics through Art.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAV makes changes per LM &amp; MP.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP reviews nutrition, sends comments to DAV through Art.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*eml to MP through Art. Bring pics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Art sends DAV module. Art talks to LM--yes copy module for testing in Feb. Art talks to MP she will get pics for DAV.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PM eml invites HUEC faculty to participate with Honduran visitors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PM invites HUEC to lab school art show.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAV sends finished module booklet to Art to reproduce for validation in Feb</td>
<td><em>Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on LM/MP ideas for validation techniques in February Ideas from PM?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam eml leaves module testing to MP &amp; LM (sends through DAV &amp; Art)</td>
<td><em>Art emls to DAV (cc RPV &amp; PM) on module testing procedure that MP &amp; LM propose for 2/2002 (groups &amp; protocol) Also CADERH form</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on LM/MP ideas for validation techniques in February Ideas from PM?</td>
<td><em>Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational instructors &amp; 10 students (see Chronology)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam eml leaves module testing to MP &amp; LM (sends through DAV &amp; Art)</td>
<td><em>Art emls to DAV (cc RPV &amp; PM) on module testing procedure that MP &amp; LM propose for 2/2002 (groups &amp; protocol) Also CADERH form</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed module per comments</td>
<td><em>Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational instructors &amp; 10 students (see Chronology)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of Human Ecology</td>
<td>In consultation with Pam and Rich I joined the team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denese</td>
<td>*Trip to Honduras to give SS seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC Honduran Consultant Melly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Lab School School Albert, Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arturo emails me re date of future SS World Vision sem</strong></td>
<td><em>Arturo emails Pam &amp; me about CADERH site visit</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Em! to Art: I finish CADERH module draft, Pam reviews, has comments for LM, suggests Melly nutrition review</td>
<td>*Em!s from me to Art pushing for LM to review module, Melly to complete her section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*We have too much money; RV, PM &amp; DAV invite LM to visit LSU for training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewed module draft with LM @ CADERH, changed, discussed sexuality &amp; nutrition issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM suggested Melly write puberty &amp; sexuality sect. LM agrees!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussed role of visitors in training @ ESNACIFOR World Vision presn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melly finishes draft of CADERH sexuality section, Arturo translates, sends to DAV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PM reviews Melly Perez sections &amp; suggests amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM &amp; MP em!s through me &amp; Arturo re amendments &amp; possible additions MP oks amendments MP wants to validate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*P.M. reviews Melly Perez sections &amp; suggests amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melly finishes draft of CADERH sexuality section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*PM reviews Melly Perez sections &amp; suggests amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM &amp; MP em!s through me &amp; Arturo re amendments &amp; possible additions MP oks amendments MP wants to validate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Albert brings in Lab School Art Program &amp; Service Learning for CADERH module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lab School Art</strong></td>
<td>eml to DAV Illustrations finished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Flurry of emails arranging for Lab School Art Reception</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DAV made edits per PM suggestions, add to module, send to MP (thru Art) with suggestions re adding birth control per LM comments | LM reviews module w/ Art, makes suggestions(correct, split, validate, make culturally relevant), |
| DAV needs pics from MP & LM module review | Art translates suggestions, sends to DAV |
| *MP sends DAV module pics through Art* | DAV makes changes per LM & MP |
| MP reviews nutrition, sends comments to DAV through Art | |
| *e ml to MP through Art* *Bring pics* | |

| *MP sends DAV module pics through Art* | |
| MP reviews nutrition, sends comments to DAV through Art | |
| *e ml to MP through Art* *Bring pics* | |

| *DAV made edits per PM suggestions, add to module, send to MP (thru Art) with suggestions re adding birth control per LM comments | |
| DAV needs pics from MP & LM module review | |

| *DAV made edits per PM suggestions, add to module, send to MP (thru Art) with suggestions re adding birth control per LM comments | |
| DAV needs pics from MP & LM module review | |

| *MP sends DAV module pics through Art* | |
| MP reviews nutrition, sends comments to DAV through Art | |
| * e ml to MP through Art* *Bring pics* | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Art &amp; MP translate, correct, add vocab module initiates idea of printing module in Honduras</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Art talks to MP she will get pics</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Art sends DAV module</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art talks to LM--yes copy module for testing in Feb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art talks to MP she will get pics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Art sends DAV module</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art talks to LM--yes copy module for testing in Feb.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art talks to MP she will get pics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*DAV sends finished module booklet to Artto reproduce for validation in Feb</td>
<td>*Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on LM &amp; MP ideas for validation techniques in February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Pam leaves module testing to MP &amp; LM (sends through DAV &amp; Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Art emls to DAV (cc RPV &amp; PM) on module testing procedure that MP &amp; LM propose for 2/2002 (groups &amp; protocol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational instructors &amp; 10 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational instructors &amp; 10 students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP &amp; LM meet to talk about new sexual health section validation techniques</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on LM/MP ideas for validation techniques in February</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Pam leaves module testing to MP &amp; LM (sends through DAV &amp; Art)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Art emls to DAV (cc RPV &amp; PM) on module testing procedure that MP &amp; LM propose for 2/2002 (groups &amp; protocol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational instructors &amp; 10 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed module per comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab School Service Learning Eleanor</td>
<td>Lab School Art Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern University Anthropology Professor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC Extension &amp; 4-H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUEC Faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COHDEFOR</td>
<td>* Met with LSU team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIDE</td>
<td>* Met with LSU team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rich emails Norman Garcia/FIDE about meeting with SS

*Rich eml Art contact COHDEFOR future SS meeting
Eleanor Canon brings in Lab School Art Program & Service Learning for CADERH module

Art Program developed curricula around project

*Eleanor suggests anthrop prof @ SEastern to tell kids about Honduras

Pam talks to Diane Saser in Extension about reviewing 4-H materials for CADERH module
*Lab School Art eml to DAV Illustrations finished

*Flurry of emails arranging for Lab School Art Reception for CADERH illustrations

*I eml Diane Saser (extension & 4-H) for apt. for her review of module & how to credit authors

*PM eml invites HUEC faculty to participate with Honduran visitors

*PM invites HUEC to lab school art show
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESNACIFOR</td>
<td>*Met with LSU team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Attended SS seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRONADERS</td>
<td>*Met with Pam &amp; Rich on SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONADES</td>
<td>*Met with F Products team at CONADES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*Attended SS seminar at Princess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADERH Lourdes</td>
<td>*USAID (Ray Waldron) mentions CADERH by name to work with SS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Vision</td>
<td>*Pam emails CADERH Raudales &amp; Maradiaga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rich emails CONADES about future SS seminar

*Arturo email me about future seminar with CONADES

*Arturo phoned CONADES about future SS seminar

*Rich eml Art contact CONADES re SS presentation next visit

*PM & DAV met with ESNACIFOR SS faculty at ESNACIFOR

*Pam & I met @ PRONADERS offices, gave SS presentn/listened to presentn on watershed mgmt IDB

*Pam and I wrote PRONADERS project description for team leader

*PM & DAV site visits CADERH

*Arturo talks to LM about site visit

*Arturo meeting with LM

*Rich eml Art contact CADERH re next visit

*PM & DAV site visits CADERH

PM & LM Project Concept Determined

*Lourdes Maradiaga (LM) emails Pam

*Arturo talks to LM about site visit

*Arturo meeting with LM

*Rich eml Art contact CADERH re next visit

*Rich eml Art contact World Vision for SS seminar date

*PM & DAV site visits CADERH

PM & LM Project Concept Determined

*I write Albert about lab school and his involvement in CADERH module

*Pam and I wrote CADERH Module project proposal for team leader

*Pam and I wrote ESNACIFOR visitor project proposal for team leader

Pam and I wrote ESNACIFOR visitor project proposal for team leader

RICH EMAILS CONADES ABOUT FUTURE SS SEMINAR
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Honduras Trip FP group ESNACIFOR visit (Todd bamboo project)</th>
<th>Discussed role of visitors in training @ ESNACIFOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam talks to Diane Saser in Extension about reviewing 4-H materials for CADERH module</td>
<td>Albert brings in Lab School Art Program &amp; Service Learning for CADERH module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Eml to Art: I finish CADERH module draft, Pam reviews, has comments for LM, suggests Melly nutrition review</td>
<td>*Emls from me to Art pushing for LM to review module, Melly to complete her section.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*We have too much money; RV, PM &amp; DAV invite LM to visit LSU for training</td>
<td>Reviewed module draft with LM @ CADERH, changed, discussed sexuality &amp; nutrition issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM suggested Melly write puberty &amp; sexuality sect. LM agreed!</td>
<td>*Eleanor suggests anthrop prof @ SEastern to tell kids about Honduras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melly finishes draft of CADERH sexuality section, Arturo translates, sends to DAV</td>
<td>*PM reviews Melly Perez sections &amp; suggests amendmts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM &amp; MP emis through me &amp; Arturo re amendments &amp; possible additions</td>
<td>MP oks amendmts MP wants to validate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*DAV (w/ PM & RV) seminar World Vision at their offices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM invites HUEC faculty to interact with visitors</th>
<th>Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR &amp; CADERH, et al.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lab School Art eml to DAV**

*Flurry of emails arranging for Lab School Art Reception for CADERH module illustrations*

I eml Diane Saser (extension & 4-H) for apt. for her review of module & how to credit authors

*DAV made edits per PM suggestions, add to module send to MP (thru Art) with suggestions re adding birth control per LM comments*

DAV needs pics from MP & LM module review

*MP sends DAV module pics through Art*

RPV sends module out for translation w/o MP pics & LM review

LM reviews module w/ Art, makes suggestions (correct, split, validate, make culturally relevant),

Art translates suggestions, sends to DAV

DAV makes changes per LM & MP

MP reviews nutrition, sends comments to DAV through Art

* eml to MP through Art bring pics

*MP sends DAV module thru Art*

**Art**

Initiates idea of printing module in Honduras

Art & MP translate, correct, add vocab module

Discusses w/ LM & Rich

*Art sends DAV module*

Art talks to LM--yes copy module for testing in Feb.

Art talks to MP she will get pics

*Involved in LSU Training for ESNACIFOR & CADERH, et al.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>MP &amp; LM meet to talk about new sexual health section validation techniques</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on LM/MP ideas for validation techniques in February</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pam leaves module testing to MP &amp; LM (sends through DAV &amp; Art)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Art emils to DAV (cc RPV &amp; PM) on module testing procedure that MP &amp; LM propose for 2/2002 (groups &amp; protocol)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational ed instructors &amp; 10 students LM there &amp; CADERH director (see Chronology)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Art contacts Rich (cc DAV &amp; PM) on ideas from PM?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pam leaves module testing to MP &amp; LM (sends through DAV &amp; Art)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Art emils to DAV (cc RPV &amp; PM) on module testing procedure that MP &amp; LM propose for 2/2002 (groups &amp; protocol)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational ed instructors &amp; 10 students LM there &amp; CADERH director (see Chronology)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundacion Maria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Module validated at Clarion with 10 vocational ed instructors & 10 students
(see Chronology)
**STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

Tertiary Stakeholder: Administrative stakeholders without project responsibilities  
Secondary Stakeholder: LSUAC team members with project responsibilities  
Primary Stakeholder: Beneficiaries of development

**LEVEL of PARTICIPATION**

*Information sharing:* One stakeholder group shares information with another; e.g., FYI, this will help, these are the guidelines, rules.  
*Provide Input:* Where input is provided into a decision that is primarily another person or stakeholder's decision/project.  
*Shared Decision Making:* Collaboration across stakeholder groups; e.g., secondary to primary stakeholders. If primarily completed by one stakeholder group but was essentially a joint decision among or between groups the activity will be listed in the shared decision making column but only in the row of the individual who did the majority of the work. There is difference between who initiates or decides an idea and who does the work. One counterpart may do a lot of work but it may be a joint decision. Very fluid process. Duties varied according to expertise and time available. For example, on module authoring, Melly and I wrote, Pam reviewed, provided input, made decisions, suggestions, and we nearly demanded that LM do so too and she did, multiple times, therefore this was listed as a joint decision. On the module validation exercise, Lourdes and Melly executed this alone virtually without Pam's or my input; however, since this was across stakeholder groups (secondary = Melly to primary = Lourdes) it was listed as a joint decision.  
*Primary/Sole Decision Making:* All items that one person does alone, or does jointly within a single stakeholder group. Therefore, when Pam and Rich asked me to join the team it is listed as a primary/sole decision as they did so within our stakeholder group, other stakeholder groups were not jointly deciding. Although an item might have been a joint decision within a stakeholder group (Pam and me) the item is only listed in the person's row who did most of the work.

**PROJECT PHASE**

*Ideation & Planning:* The Initial Stage, which includes all administrative decisions, meetings, seminars & training in Honduras before projects jelled. This phase ends after project description has been determined.  
*Implementation:* All project execution, after project concept and proposal have been determined.  
*Evaluation:* All project review during all phases.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>INFORMATION SHARING</th>
<th>PROVIDE INPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USAID Honduras</td>
<td>Ideation &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Gave teams suggestions re counterparts &amp; projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARED DECISIONMAKING</td>
<td>PRIMARY/SOLE DECISIONMAKING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideation &amp; Planning</td>
<td>Ideation &amp; Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementn Evaluation</td>
<td>Implementn Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Set broad program goals @ outset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected managing agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved Universities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approved project guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote forest products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating guidelines &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC IP</td>
<td></td>
<td>LSUAC School of Human Ecology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakshman, Brett</td>
<td>Introduced team to potential counterparts</td>
<td>Pam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refined project guidelines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSUAC School of RNR Richard</td>
<td>Choosing SS counterparts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Choosing seminar topics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suggesting possible projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team members' project descriptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrote forest products operating guidelines &amp; objectives</td>
<td>Selected team leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved project guidelines for FP team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved consultants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything to do with expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established Honduran office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired Honduran personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set up framework for IP management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Shipping method and time |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wrote forest products operating guidelines &amp; objectives</th>
<th>Selected initial team members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected initial consultants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited me on team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of all agendas, visits, venues, expenditures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies for carrying out projects (time, materials, setting)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information distributed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting to LSU &amp; USAID for FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense justification LSU &amp; USAID for FP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS counterparts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time &amp; agenda of CADERH visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project concept CADERH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| CADERH module editing, reviewing, amending |
| CADERH module format, look, lay-up |
| LSU Training content |

| Own seminar content, delivery |
| Invited me on team |
| Brought in new SS team member (Melly) |
| Brought in Diane Sasser from LSU for extension & 4-H materials |
| Lourdes to come to LSU Training |

<p>| Changes to module per written critiques |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LSUAC School of Human Ecology Denese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Honduran seminars topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Validation technique for CADERH module</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Validation exercise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| LSU lab School Group               |

| LSUAC Honduras Arturo              |

<p>| LSUAC Honduras Melly               |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SS counterparts</th>
<th>Time &amp; agenda of CADERH visits</th>
<th>Own Honduran seminars content, delivery</th>
<th>Changes to module per written critiques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Book 1, Activities 1,2,6</td>
<td>- Brought in Lab School Art Department for Students to do illustrations</td>
<td>- Decision to administer &quot;process&quot; survey to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Book 3, Book 4 CADERH module</td>
<td>- Lourdes to come to LSU Training</td>
<td>- Survey analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nutrition (Activities 3,4,5</td>
<td>- Art reception</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Book I) CADERH module</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CADERH module editing &amp; reviewing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- CADERH module format, look, lay-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- LSU Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Own Honduran seminars content, delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- own Honduran seminars content, delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Brought in Lab School Art Department for Students to do illustrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lourdes to come to LSU Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Art reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Changes to module per written critiques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Decision to administer &quot;process&quot; survey to students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Survey analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination of all visits, venues for LSU/CADERH meetings</th>
<th>Lesson plan, art instruction, solicitation of illustrations</th>
<th>Changes to module per written critiques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- CADERH module editing &amp; reviewing</td>
<td>- Re-translation of CADERH module</td>
<td>- Changes to module per written critiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- CADERH module format, look, lay-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adolescence, human reproduction (Book II) &amp; Nutrition (Activities 3,4,5 Book I) CADERH module</th>
<th>Decision to Validate</th>
<th>Changes to module per written critiques</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Editing, reviewing all CADERH module sections</td>
<td>- Validation technique for module</td>
<td>- Changes to module per written critiques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Who participates in validation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADERH Lourdes</td>
<td>Vocational School Instructors</td>
<td>Vocational School Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS counterparts</td>
<td>Project concept</td>
<td>CADERH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADERH project content</td>
<td>Editing, reviewing all CADERH module sections</td>
<td>LSU Training content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validation form</td>
<td>Who participates in validation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venue for module validation</td>
<td>Organization, coordination &amp; expense of bringing participants to validation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organized pre-validation review</td>
<td>Review of module materials &amp; critique (written)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of module in validation exercise &amp; decision on what to include in group comments</td>
<td>Ran validation exercise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of module materials &amp; critique (written)</td>
<td>Review of module in validation exercise &amp; decision on what to include in group comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VITA

Denese Lorraine Ashbaugh Vlosky was born on December 17, 1957, in Portland, Oregon. She is the daughter of Lowell Clair Ashbaugh and Darlene Lorraine Olson and the sister of Myron M. Monson. She has been married for over 20 years to Dr. Richard P. Vlosky and has two children, Daniel Jung Il Lee Vlosky and James Lowell Vlosky.

In 1981 she graduated from Southern Oregon State University with Bachelor of Arts degrees in economics and Spanish. In 1984 she graduated from the Seattle Pacific Law School with a Juris Doctor degree. After moving to Louisiana in 1992, she began a graduate program in family studies at the School of Human Ecology at the Louisiana State University and graduated with a Master of Science Degree in 1999. She continued her studies and will graduate with a Doctor of Philosophy Degree in human ecology in December of 2003.

Denese is a member of the Gamma Sigma Delta Honor Society, the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR) and the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). She received the AAFCS Naomi R. and Freeman A. Koehler Fellowship for her studies, and participated in a Kellogg Foundation grant to study community, sustainability and spirituality in India and Sri Lanka in 1999-2000. She is honored that she will be nominated by the School of Human Ecology for the Distinguished Dissertation Award for this work. She is a long-time advocate for the elderly and a 22 year supporter of the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement in Sri Lanka. She loves to travel and has done so in Latin America, Asia and Europe.

Denese worked as a lobbyist and attorney for credit unions, and as a real estate and elder law attorney during her previous life as a lawyer. Since beginning her life as an academic, she has worked doing research and writing for various professors, in curriculum development as an advisor to a continuing care retirement community, and on a USAID technical transfer project in
Honduras. She taught family dynamics for the Family and Consumer Sciences Division of the School of Human Ecology at LSU. She hopes that she can continue in academia in family science and aging, and international development work.