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1. Introduction: What Are The Basic Issues?

The NGO phenomenon is an emerging reality of great significance to Latin American development processes. Donor agencies, governments and NGOs themselves are expressing the need to better understand this social phenomenon, which bears promise in its potential capacity to respond to critical development issues at a time when the world is characterized by "the persistence of poverty and the declining availability of financial resources" (Brown & Korten, 1988).

The huge number of NGOs, their overwhelming heterogeneity and the diverse contexts in which they operate within Latin America make it extremely difficult to draw generalizations about their reality that would be universally true. Nonetheless, this exploratory discussion paper will attempt to provide a general picture of specific characteristics that depict the nature of NGOs in Latin America and will offer some initial responses to key questions posed by the International Development Research Center of Canada (IDRC). This paper does not pretend to provide definitive answers to these questions, but rather it will share the author's observations and reflections based on personal experience in working with various NGOs in Central and South America, a review of the sparse literature that exists on Latin American NGOs, and interviews with directors of NGOs in Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala and Peru.

The questions posed by IDRC are the following:

1. Operational definition of NGO's:
   - What are they?
   - What characteristics do they have?

2. What role have NGO's played in the region, in the area of research and development? Provide a few outstanding examples of the role played by NGOs in the area.

3. Can we distinguish different types of NGOs? What are the most relevant ones for "Development Research?"

4. What comparative advantages do NGOs have in the area of research and development that distinguish them from government institutions and universities? Do they have capacity to carry out research? Do they have experience in the area of technology dissemination and utilization (link between research and development)?

5. What are the main weaknesses of NGOs? What are their funding sources? What degree of persistence or stability do they have?

6. Is it possible to identify "minimal requirements" (or characteristics) we should look for in an NGO to make it eligible for IDRC funding?

7. Are there presently available studies, inventories or data bases that provide information on NGOs in the region? If not, how can this information be collected and periodically updated? Who could be the users of this information?

These questions are excellent, but like all excellent questions they are quite difficult to answer. These questions are particularly difficult due to the lack of the systematization of facts and experiences regarding the NGO phenomenon. This kind of information is essential for the generation of knowledge and the elaboration of a plausible theoretical framework. Hopefully, as an initial approximation in response to these questions, the observations and reflections presented in this exploratory discussion paper will assist in creating some clarity of thought regarding this complex subject and will contribute to future deliberations.

2. What are NGOs?

2.1 General Considerations

For the sake of discussion it is important that we first define the subject of our study. This task will require that we establish certain distinctions that will allow us to divide the NGO universe into subgroups and thus enable us to identify and delimit the specific subgroup that will be the focus of our observations and reflections.

A major dichotomy that is commonly referred to in development literature is that of "State" and "Civil Society." The term "nongovernmental organization" obviously refers to organizations that are not identified with the state. Although many NGOs may have collaborative relationships with public agencies they remain as independent and autonomous legal entities within the private sector. Many NGOs prefer not to be identified by the term "private sector" because this term is com-
Within civil society there exists a vast diversity of organizations that are non-profit and that could be classified as NGOs, but are not involved in what would be defined as development activities related to the needs of urban and rural poor populations. Thus, a useful division can be made between NGOs that are involved in development processes and those that are not. In this paper we will focus on the intermediate-size institutions of the first group and will refer to them as "Nongovernmental Development Organizations" (NGDOs).

For purposes of clarity, we delineate even more our subject by drawing distinctions between three types of organizations that are involved in development activities: grassroots organizations (GROs), intermediate-size nongovernmental development organizations (NGDOs) and international development cooperation institutions (IDCs). The effectiveness of an NGDO ultimately depends on how well they relate to the other two types of organizations (Padron, 1987). Aspects of this topic will be elaborated upon later in this paper.

Some development theorists and practitioners claim that the NGDO phenomenon represents an emerging "third sector" of society. They divide society into three sectors: public sector, private commercial sector, and the social interest sector (NGOs and NGDOs). The proponents of this viewpoint argue that:

- Neither the government nor the private sector are by themselves capable of responding to the needs of the millions of poor Latin Americans who are being left at the margin of a brutal process of modernization. The state is bureaucratic and totally inefficient even when the political will exists and the right people are occupying the most important leadership positions. The private sector is motivated by profit and its interests do not always correspond to the interests of the poor majority of the inhabitants in any of the Latin American countries. The non-government development organizations are, on the other hand, created by ordinary citizens whose basic motivation is the well-being of their people. In a sense, they are public entities but free from bureaucratic and political constraints of the government. Being private and relatively small, they can show the efficiency of the private sector without representing the interests of the more powerful economic sectors. The third sector then, brings together the strengths of the two other sectors and avoids at the same time their weaknesses" (Arbab, 1988).

Although these reflections could be accused of idealizing the strengths of the third sector, obviously this is done for the purpose of drawing significant distinctions.

An essential characteristic of NGDOs is that they tend to be value driven rather than market driven (Brown & Korten, 1988). Although some organizations are legally established as non-profit and like to refer to themselves as NGDOs, in reality their institutional behavior reflects the patterns of market driven enterprises. Their project track records correspond more to the changing fads and fashions of donor funding trends rather than to institutional values and visions. These agencies lack a coherent development strategy formulated through a process of accompanying the populations that they serve. Market driven NGOs often lose their institutional autonomy and become extended instruments of donor agencies that seek to fulfill their own priorities. NGDOs that opt to play this role end up sacrificing their potential role as articulators of the needs and aspirations of the poor and as catalyst of alternative development paths. Market driven organizations are highly vulnerable to external manipulation and tend to dissolve quickly when funding is cut off. Value driven NGDOs, however, operate more on the basis of commitment to mission rather than to money.

This characteristic of being value driven is believed to be an essential strength of NGDOs which empowers them with the capacity to survive funding shortages and adverse political climates. This is not to say that NGDOs do not need adequate funding to carry out their institutional missions, but rather that the projects which they choose to design and seek funding for tend to be consistent with core values and principles. This kind of institutional integrity and coherence provides quality to the development process and is vital to strengthening civil society. Again, we are speaking of the "archetype" NGDO. In the real
world, where all NGDO projects of first choice are not financed, trade-offs are made, and even the best NGDOs are required to have a mix-bag of projects, some of which are closer to their vision, and others that reflect a realistic institutional survival strategy.

There exists two other types of organizations that by definition will not be classified as NGDOs in this paper. They are government-organized nongovernmental organizations (GONGOs) and donor-organized nongovernmental organizations (DONGOs). GONGOs are "organizations that are created and registered by governmental agencies as NGOs to achieve objectives defined by government. They are created as instruments of government policy and their missions are defined by government" (Brown & Korten, 1988). DONGOs are organizations either created or co-opted by donor agencies to achieve donor priorities. "The mission of DONGOs will normally be defined by its sponsoring donor. Such organizations may serve useful functions for the donor, while offering a degree of flexibility in administration and funds disbursement that the donor's own procedures might not allow" (Brown & Korten, 1988). Both of these types of organizations may fulfill valid and useful purposes, but they should not be confused with NGDOs or be allowed to displace them.

NGDO consortium, federations and coordinating bodies will not be considered as intermediate NGDOs. These type of institutions represent a relatively new level of organizational experience for Latin American NGDOs. The three federations that exist in Central America are still in the process of defining their role in their respective NGDO communities. At this time they basically provide supportive services to their NGDO members in areas of technical assistance, training and information sharing. They do very little work, if any, with GROs.

NGDOs are legally established autonomous entities that possess non-profit status and are organized by ordinary citizens (professionals, technicians and field workers) whose primary motivation is to improve the well-being of their people. They are service oriented and mission-driven rather than market-driven. They accompany the people they serve in diverse and complex activities that relate to development processes, such as the generation of knowledge, the delivery of services that respond to fundamental human needs, and the search and application of alternative development strategies that promote social transformation. They reflect a plurality of ideological perspectives and cherish their institutional autonomy and independence. Their primary modes of action are projects and programs that are funded by international donor agencies. They tend to view development in terms of a participatory learning process that facilitates capacity building and empowerment. They tend to be intermediate-size organizations endowed with a high degree of flexibility to respond to changing socio-economic environments. Although they function at national, regional and local levels of society, the vast majority function at regional levels and at local levels in conjunction with grassroots organizations (GROs). Although their work may have political implications, they are not political parties and tend to maintain an organizational position of political independence.

In order to understand more fully the nature of NGDOs and to appreciate the unique potential they represent for innovative development action and research, it is essential to discuss their diverse origins and characteristics.

3. Origins

During 1988 a group of 10 Latin American NGDOs participated in a Learning Project sponsored by Private Agencies Collaborating Together (PACT) and directed by CLEATER. The project was designed to assist the participating NGDOs, along with 40 other NGDOs in their respective countries, to come to grips with their own institutional reality and to strengthen their effectiveness in their respective fields of action. In reference to their efforts to make sense of their own origins the following comment was made:
Each institution tells a distinct story about the background and the events that led to its establishment. To the casual observer, each case seems to be nothing but a chain of coincidences or the evolution of the thoughts and practices of a single individual or a small group of people. But when chance repeats itself so often and in a short period of time hundred of development organizations emerge in the continent, one has to look for causes rooted more deeply in human and social condition (Arbab, 1988).

A brief historical overview of the evolution of NGDOs in Latin America may provide a useful perspective. Some authors concur that the first NGOs in Latin America were established during the 1950s and were relatively few compared to the number that exists today. The primary role played by these early versions of NGDOs was one of supporting "the developmentalist ideology being promoted by the modernizing elites of Latin America" (Landim, 1987). During this period many NGOs were also characterized by a "welfare approach" expressed in charitable activities, especially those linked to the Catholic Church. In the mid-1960s, many NGDOs shifted their role and began to criticize the negative effects of developmentalism that produced a situation in which "growth and industrialization generated and coexisted with poverty, social marginality and economic dependence" (Landim, 1987). The decade of the 1970s was one of political and economic crisis, a period during which authoritarian regimes dominated the Latin American political scene. In this context there emerged a great increase of new NGDOs whose founders and members came primarily from three sources: the Catholic Church, universities and opposition political parties (Fernandes, 1985). Many of the NGOs that were born during periods of political authoritarianism and in limited political space assumed a militant role of "resistance and denunciation" and turned away from the state and began to identify themselves with "civil society", a basic characteristic that they maintain to the present (Landim, 1987). The current "re-democratization" process in Latin America has great implications to NGDOs in defining their changing role in society.

It is a difficult task to identify, let alone to understand, all the complex and inter-related forces which have brought the NGDO phenomenon into existence. These forces are in a constant state of flux and create the societal environment in which NGDOs emerge and adapt. The decade of the 1980s has witnessed a vast proliferation in the numerical strength and growing influence of NGDOs. Some of the forces that have stimulated this phenomenon are the following:

- the urgency of responding to the needs of millions of poor Latin Americans who are being left at the margin of the process of modernization
- a growing recognition of the failure of the dominant (economic-production) development paradigm in addressing the needs of the poor and the exigency to explore alternative strategies in search of a new paradigm
- the failure of the public sector in providing basic services to the urban and rural poor that is due to various reasons, including bureaucratic inefficiency, declining public resources for development and inappropriate development policies
- the emergence of popular social movements that have stimulated the organization of thousands of grassroots organizations (GROs)
- the re-democratization process that has provided greater political space for the creation of NGDOs dedicated to social action and research
- a growing recognition by donor agencies of the capacity of NGDOs to work more effectively with rural and urban poor than government agencies
- growing awareness of the capacity of NGDOs to generate innovations that could potentially influence public institutions in their macro policy formulation.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to analyze these complex forces. In this document we simply point them out and recognize that each one of these forces has exerted varying degrees of influence on the evolution of the NGDO community in every Latin American country. Each one has left its mark on the character and nature of NGDOs. These forces have influenced the number of NGDOs that exist, their institutional forms, the type of projects and programs that they are involved in and the specific populations that they
serve, all of which impacts upon institutional effectiveness. In view of the persistent nature of most of these forces, it is safe to predict that they will continue to influence and sustain the NGDO phenomenon well into the future.

4. Characteristics of NGDOs: Strengths and Weaknesses

Despite the diversity of their origins, of their ideological perspectives, of the types of services they deliver, of their projects/programs, of their funding sources and the contexts in which they function, there are characteristics that many NGDOs have in common. It is important to note that the characteristics we will focus upon are by no means possessed by all NGDOs in their totality.

4.1 Relationships with Grassroots Organization

An outstanding feature of NGDOs is their ability to work intimately with community structures and to accompany the people they serve in development processes. Their abiding commitment to nurture and strengthen GROs is evident when we survey their activities throughout Latin America. Their work reflects a basic belief in a bottom-up approach to development and the value they place on grassroots participation. Yet, it cannot be said that all NGDOs work in the same way with GROs or establish the same kind of relationships with them. Many factors come to play in this aspect of NGDO work, such as the nature of the projects and programs being implemented, how the NGDO perceives its own role and the role of GROs in the process, how the NGDO defines participation, how the community and its leaders perceive the NGDO and its activities, the degree of maturity and strength of existing GROS, and the political space available for these types of relationships.

The degree of maturity, experience and skill of NGDO field workers in accompanying community leaders in capacity building processes are probably the most important elements for success in establishing abiding collaborative partnerships of mutual trust and respect with GROs.

It appears that the NGDOs that are most effective in establishing grassroots linkages are those that perceive their role as accompanying the people they serve in a learning process that enables the participants to discover the most appropriate path of development within their specific micro context. Unfortunately, project design constraints frequently preclude this type of process, which may take years. Nonetheless, the commitment of an NGDO to a specific group of people will often transcend the duration of a specific project. They tend to maintain a consultative relationship with GROs until another project can be generated. This type of commitment to accompany a specific group of people in a long term development effort enables NGDOs to enhance their perception and understanding of social reality, to the point that some actually begin to see development through the eyes of the people they serve (Arbab). When this unique capacity is developed, it enables an NGDO to formulate alternative development strategies that respond to the real needs and aspirations of their people. Not all NGDOs are able to function at this level; some do and many are moving in this direction.

Even NGDOs that work primarily in the delivery of services are confronted with the need to assist rural communities in strengthening existing local structures or in organizing new ones for purposes of mobilizing effective local participation in decision making. These processes impel NGDOs to deepen their understanding of the complex issues related to social transformation.

On the one hand, the greatest strength of NGDOs lies in their demonstrated ability to work at the micro level. On the other hand, there is the risk that the processes they are involved in can be undermined, especially if they ignore the political implications of their work in relation to the government and its macro policy functions. In many cases, the intense focus of NGDOs on specific micro regions needs to be complemented with a broader vision that embraces macro level considerations. This aspect of NGDO functioning will be explored later.

4.2 Alternative Development Strategies

As mentioned above, the patent failure of the prevailing and entrenched development paradigm to respond to the development needs of the poor inhabitants of the Latin American societies is one of the underlying causes for the emergence of the NGDO phenomenon. The extreme ecological damage and social disparity generated by the
economic-production model of development has magnified the urgency to search for alternative development strategies based on human and ecological values. NGDOs are playing a significant role in this creative search for a "new utopia." Despite the depressing severity of the global crisis facing humanity, it seems that NGDOs have not lost the capacity to 'dream'. It is precisely this visionary capacity, coupled with the ability to design and implement practical projects, that enable NGDOs to formulate and experiment with alternative development strategies and paradigms. This is a vital function for the process of social transformation, a function which traditional institutions, whether of the public or private sectors, seem unable to perform.

The wealth of experiences that NGDOs are accumulating through processes of action and reflection, once systematized into a body of knowledge, may make a significant contribution in the conceptualizing of a new development paradigm. Of course much more work and resources are needed before this can occur. (For a deeper examination of these issues, see in this series "NGO's in Indonesia" by Mansour Fakih, ed.).

4.3 Administrative Flexibility

Their intermediate-size and their lack of bureaucratic procedures endows NGDOs with the flexibility to adapt to the unstable socio-economic environments that characterize Latin American societies. This high degree of flexibility allows them to work effectively with GROs and to respond directly and promptly to the people they serve. These are virtues that definitely do not characterize governmental bureaucracies. This flexibility also enables NGDOs to adapt to the varied requirements of donor agencies.

This flexibility is often perceived by donor agencies as a lack of institutional consolidation. The informality that often characterizes NGDO dealings is unsettling to representatives of donor agencies who are accustomed to working with highly structured institutions. This perception tends to impel donors to impose certain management procedures that NGDOs must comply with in order to receive funding.

There exists a general acknowledgment, even among NGDOs themselves, that the majority of NGDOs need to strengthen their institutional capacity in the administration of projects and programs in order to enhance their effectiveness and the scope of their impact. As the prestige of an NGDO grows and the number of projects that it implements increases, it is confronted with the need to establish appropriate administrative structures and systems to manage the complexity of its endeavors. This situation is frequently referred to as a "management crisis" in the development field. Unfortunately, there is a trend to transfer the administrative models used by northern NGOs to southern NGDOs. This is marked by a proliferation of management training courses that are often sponsored by donor agencies and delivered in a fragmented fashion. The northern NGO management models consist primarily of technocratic procedures designed for control purposes that have proven to be effective in the commercial sector, but are perceived by many southern NGDOs as not being appropriate for administering the type of work that they are involved in. Some NGDOs have expressed the concern that the introduction of these technocratic management practices have created profound contradictions and inconsistencies within their organizations, undermining their institutional effectiveness for the sake of so called "efficiency". If effectiveness is sacrificed for the sake of efficiency, the question arises: whom does efficiency serve? (CELATER, 1989).

This situation has impelled certain NGDOs to search for more appropriate administrative models based on the experiences of successful southern NGDOs. The work of CELATER and the Universidad Javeriana in Cali, Colombia to establish a post graduate course on NGDO management is an example of these efforts.

4.4 Networks in a Pluralistic Universe

Although references to the heterogeneity of NGDOs has been made before, this characteristic is worthy of further elucidation. We perceive the rich diversity of the NGDO community as an essential strength that reduces its vulnerability to changing environments and ultimately guarantees its stability (Max-Neef & Elizalde, 1989). A completely unstructured diversity, however, can also be a cause of weakness. As the NGDO community has evolved, basic structures have emerged in the form of networks. These networks consist of linkages formed by NGDOs that share common focuses of action and specialization, such
as those related to appropriate technology, participatory research, primary health care delivery and small farm production. These networks provide opportunities for sharing experiences, information and forums for discourse on issues related to their areas of specialization. They operate on regional, national and international levels.

However, useful as they may be, these networks do not represent the existence of an integrated community of NGDOs that share a common language and understanding of the complex forces, social structures and political and economic interactions that cause the conditions of poverty. They tend to focus on specific aspects of the whole, and when they are confronted by the complexities of social reality at the community level, they begin to appreciate the fact that their focus is not integrated enough to respond simultaneously to all the problems of a population. This is not to imply that all NGDOs should implement integrated projects and programs. Although some NGDOs choose this path, in most cases it is not the best alternative. Few NGDOs have the capacity to carry out such a complex endeavor.

A development thinker makes some pertinent comments regarding the issue of NGDO specialization:

There are indeed many advantages to specialization, and an organization that performs well along one or two lines of action is an asset to the entire community of organizations for development. The problem lies precisely in the fact that specialization makes sense if one is part of an organic whole, part of a community of people and organizations that do examine the entire spectrum of social problems, try to understand the nature of forces that are rapidly changing our societies, discuss different theoretical and practical alternatives, learn from everyone’s mistakes and successes, and somehow advance in a path that could be called social and economic development. To be specialized in a given methodology for administration of credit, or any other kind of special services, in isolation from such a community is to be an instrument of a methodology and not a development organization (Pardon, 1988).

The problem is that such an organic community does not yet exist. We feel that this type of community will gradually emerge based on the principle of "unity in diversity". The potency of NGDO impact will continue to be limited, relative to the magnitude of the problems, until their diverse and multiple efforts converge into a synergistic effect.

4.5 Modes of Action

The basic mode of action of NGDOs are projects and programs. Projects are the means by which NGDOs receive funding from donor agencies to work with the populations they serve.

Donor agencies evaluate the effectiveness of an NGDO by the success or failure of its projects. Projects themselves are ultimately judged from different perspectives and expectations, depending on whether they be those of the donor agency, the population being served or the NGDO itself. Thus, the evaluation of a project or program is a difficult task that is relative to the criterion that is applied. Most donor agencies are interested in evaluating what they refer to as "quantifiable indicators" of impact. They are generally not very interested in evaluating qualitative results and invisible processes that promote community empowerment and capacity building, processes which are impossible to measure by traditional evaluation indicators.

Grassroots organizations and peoples tend to want immediate responses to their critical needs, which if solely complied with tend to create dependency patterns that short-circuit long term processes that lead to self-sustained development. The design and implementation of projects that can meet these multiple exigencies is indeed a difficult task.

The short duration of projects also places a serious constraint on effectiveness. Most projects are funded for three years, with a possibility of re-funding by the same donor for another two or three years maximum. This is due to funding policy constraints that many donors place upon themselves on the principle or pretext that they do not want to create a dependency relationship with a specific project. This situation keeps NGDOs in a constant search for funding to sustain grassroots processes that have been set in motion, and which may require further assistance and more time to consolidate and to become self-sustaining. It often happens that just as a project is reaching a critical point of consolidation and maturity, funding is cut off because the donor’s time frame has reached its limit.
The serious constraints inherent in a project approach to development have motivated many NGDOs to establish permanent on-going programs, which consist of a set of strategically integrated projects that operate in the same micro-region. The program mode of action allows an NGDO to maintain a presence within a specific micro-region on a continuous basis, even in difficult circumstances such as those in which funding for a key project is scheduled to end. This type of situation requires that in the midst of all their diverse activities, staff members of an NGDO must embark on the arduous and uncertain task of mobilizing funding from a new donor. 

This may all seem like the "facts of life" and normal procedure to a donor that is simply following policies that do not permit the funding of projects beyond a fixed period of time. In most cases, donors expect projects to become self-sustaining within the 3 to 5 years of project life that they establish in their policy framework. In reality, the vast majority of projects are unable to fulfill this goal within the time-frame imposed by donor agencies. We feel that not only this particular aspect of funding policy requires serious reconsideration, but rather that the entire system used by major donors for project proposal preparation, funding approval and disbursement procedures need in-depth evaluation with a view towards significant restructuring.

Donors have to face the urgent and persistent reality that appropriate policy guidelines must be established and that the procedures, which are supposed to facilitate these processes, must be streamlined if effective resource transference, commensurate to the development needs of the Third World, is to occur during this critical juncture in history. In that both donors and NGDOs are willing partners in these mutual endeavors, it seems that it should be possible for them, through mature consultation or negotiation, to agree upon and establish mechanisms for supporting projects and programs that are less time consuming and less painful for all concerned.

4.6 The Need for a Development Language

As an NGDO becomes competent in the use of the technical language used in project design, implementation and evaluation, its possibilities for receiving funding tends to increase. Proposals cast in the appropriate language become more acceptable to donor agencies. In a sense this, "project language" is like a two edge sword. On one side it is a useful tool for mobilizing resources, and on the other, its indiscriminate use by NGDOs turn it into a sort of jargon. This would be harmless in itself if jargon did not have the capacity to distort the perception and understanding of social reality. A classic example of this is the terminology used in the project design methodology promoted and used by USAID and CIDA ("the Logical Framework"). This methodology is basically a top-down, linear approach that attempts to reduce complex development processes into measurable indicators consisting of project inputs and outputs, linkages and assumptions. These terms in themselves are innocuous as long as they do not preclude the evolution of the new "development language" that NGDOs are beginning to formulate. And, as long as NGDOs recognize the limits of "project language" and utilize it only as a tool for casting their own project designs into formats that are acceptable to donors, its possible negative effects can be avoided.

It has been suggested that one of the greatest weaknesses of the emerging NGDO community is that it has not yet established a common development language that is powerful enough to articulate a new paradigm. Most NGDOs use the same terms, such as "participation", "empowerment", "appropriate technology" and "social transformation", but often these terms are applied in reference to diverse conceptual frameworks. Obviously this diversity is enriching, but at the same time NGDOs need a language that will facilitate their communication with each other and allow them to sustain a meaningful discourse on relevant issues.

The critical role of language for the advancement of any field is undeniable. It can be said that one of the key factors that enabled economists to play such a dominant role during the last decades in the field of development was precisely their use of the "language of economics", with its sophisticated terminology and formulas that give the semblance of exact knowledge based on a sort of scientific method.

NGDOs must recognize the state of their language and begin conscious efforts to formulate a development lexicon that is capable of articulating their visions and their alternative development strategies. It is possible that a common language
may not emerge until the theoretical basis of
NGDO development work has been more
rigorously conceptualized and some degree of
consensus reached as to its validity.

4.7 Financial Dependence

The basic financial problem facing most NGDOs
is that they do not have a guaranteed income that
would enable them to pay the salaries of even core
staff on a regular basis and, in general, must
finance their institutional operations from donations
received for specific projects. The percentage
allocated for administrative overhead in a project
budget often barely covers the cost of providing
administrative support of the project. As an
organization grows in expertise and increases the
number of projects it is involved in, one would
think that its financial stability would then be
secured, but ironically the cost of full-time staff
and of maintaining infrastructure becomes a load
that is increasingly more difficult to bear.

Donor agencies prefer to pay the cost of research
or field action rather than the operating cost of an
institution. Even though the giving of grants for
institution building is currently not in fashion,
many NGDOs argue "that they can best
demonstrate the feasibility of people-based
development as an alternative or complement to
government-led development, if they are given
more core funding for sustained capacity building
instead of funding on a project basis" (Drabek,
1987). As mentioned above, project funding as
practiced by most donors encourages a fragmented
approach to development activities, which
precludes long-term institutional strategic planning
and the establishment of on-going development
programs.

NGDOs recognize their need to continue receiving
funding from donors for some time into the future.
Awareness of this reality motivates a general
concern amongst NGDOs to improve the quality of
their relationship with donors. Many southern
NGDO leaders feel that "they have paid too high
a price in terms of loss of autonomy, compromise
of their priorities and lack of their own institutional
identity in the way they have had to approach
donors for funds" (Drabek, 1987). NGDOs must
develop the capacity to negotiate effectively with
donors the terms of funding, and donors have to
stop insisting that because they "pay the piper"
they have the right to "call the tune". The times
have changed and the stakes are too high to
continue with that old game.

The growing maturity of southern NGDOs in
providing leadership to the development process
has impacted greatly on their relationship with
their northern NGO counterparts. The relationship
seems to be shifting towards one of equal
partnership and shared leadership. Hopefully these
fundamental changes will lead to a more equitable
sharing of resources between northern NGOs and
their southern counterparts.

Although NGDOs recognize the need to raise
funds in their own countries in order to increase
their institutional autonomy and to enhance their
self-reliance and independence, the extreme
scarcity of resources available for development
purposes in their societies poses serious constraints
to the viability of this strategy as an ultimate
solution to their financial problems. The
experiences of some NGDOs have demonstrated
that this strategy requires a great expenditure of
effort with very little return on investment in
financial terms, relative to the possibilities that
exist in fund-raising in the international field. Of
course, local resource mobilization is a part of the
solution, but obviously international resource
transfer will remain a major part of the solution
for quite some time.

NGDOs that have acquired expertise in a
specialized area are sometimes able to generate
income for their institutions through the sale of the
materials that they have developed, the delivery of
training courses and the provision of technical
assistance through consultant work. An NGDO
that enters this arena of income generation has to
be fairly outstanding to survive. Such NGDOs will
be competing with private sector consultant firms
and international NGOs in marketing their services
to limited clientele that consists of governmental
agencies and other NGDOs. An NGDO that
enters this market driven world has to be
careful not to allow these types of income generating
activities to distract it from its primary mission.

One of the most significant examples of an
imaginative effort to increase the financial stabili-
ty of NGDOs is the opportunity offered by
Fundacion para la Educacion Superior (FES)
which establishes endowment funds for NGDOs
working in most regions of Colombia.
FES, itself a non-profit development organization, has managed to enter the financial market in Colombia successfully and can pay relatively high interest rates to the funds established jointly with NGDOs, including a contribution of 50% to 100% as a matching grant to the initial capital. But alas, very few donors are willing to contribute capital to these endowment funds, and NGDOs in Colombia can only build them gradually using their own meager savings and uncommitted income. The unwillingness of donor agencies to transfer large sums to new institutions is, of course, understandable. It may even be argued that most organizations should be kept on their toes, and that loss of creativity results from financial comfort and abundance. Be it as it may, it seems reasonable to assume that, once an NGDO has proved time and again to be an effective and responsible institution, its donors might consider participation in a more rational plan to finance its activities and help it achieve some degree of financial stability. A simple measure, using the mechanism of FES as an example, would be to transfer the totality of a three year grant to an account that can presently produce up to 100% additional funds (in Colombian pesos) over the three year period without affecting the required flow of funds for the actual project. Inflation does not allow the creation of these funds to constitute definite steps towards self-sufficiency, but through such a mechanism each project can leave behind a small sum that would contribute to increasing financial stability (Arbab 1988).

One promising suggestion for developing appropriate funding strategies and models is that case studies of different funding experiences, such as the one above, be shared amongst NGDOs. Another suggestion is that opportunities for dialogue between NGDOs and donors be created to explore alternative funding strategies (Drabek, 1987).

### 4.8 Difficulties in Scaling Up

Sometimes NGDOs are criticized for having limited ability to "scale up" successful projects to achieve regional or national impact. Difficulties in "scaling up" have been attributed to some of the characteristics mentioned above, such as limited administrative capacity, inadequate financial resources, scarcity of well trained and experienced human resources, and the tendency to make long-term commitments with specific populations at the micro-region level.

Although there is some truth in the observation that NGDOs have limited ability for scaling up, the same could hold true for any type of organization in both private and public sectors. The deeper issues have to do with the purpose of scaling up and whether or not it is valid and appropriate for the specific NGDO under consideration to scale up. Obviously, there are many complex factors that have to be taken into account to justify the decision to scale up. One key issue has to do with the question of institutional roles within society, and whether or not an NGDO is displacing government agencies by expanding the scope of its operations. Are the ultimate solutions to development problems to be found in NGDOs assuming the responsibilities of the State?

There are a few rare cases in which NGDOs have been granted authorization by government agencies to assume responsibilities of the State, especially in the delivery of services to marginal populations that the state has been unable to reach adequately with its programs. For example, in Bolivia the Ministry of Health has granted authorization to two NGDOs to run the rural health system in two highly inaccessible provinces in southern Potosi and Chuquisaca. In reality these arrangements are considered to be stopgap in nature. Until the State has the administrative capacity and resources to effectively expand its services to all sectors of society, it seems plausible that NGDOs could play this role. In the case of Bolivia, with its inaccessible and highly disperse rural population, NGDOs may play a relevant role in the delivery of rural health services for generations to come. It should be noted that the two Bolivian NGDOs have assumed responsibility at the province level of operations. The issue of whether or not they would be capable of scaling up to a regional or national level of operations, if the opportunity presented itself (which is a highly doubtful possibility), is still in question.

Nonetheless, it is reasonable to state that in the majority of cases the most strategic role that an NGDO could play would be to discover and pioneer new and effective paths of development that later the State could replicate in a sustained way through on-going programs. Thus, the role of the NGDO would not be to scale up in a way that would displace the State, but rather to generate knowledge based on experiential learning.
processes, to develop effective methodologies and technologies, and to propose alternative development strategies that the State could adopt as its own and implement on a national scale. Of course the feasibility and possible success of this approach ultimately depends on the receptivity of the State to appreciate and accept the pertinent innovations that NGDOs are generating and to perceive their relevance to policy formulation.

A distinction should be made between research activities and delivery of services. Scaling up to regional or national levels does not have the same implications for research as it has for service delivery. Many NGDOs implement research projects throughout a region or nation without major administrative difficulties. This is possible because the nature and scope of research projects are quite different than those of social service programs, which if designed for a regional or national scale require greater financial resources, adequate infrastructure, and appropriate administrative systems for managing information, logistical support, personnel and financial resources. Unfortunately, these are precisely the areas in which most State bureaucracies need strengthening.

5. Potential for Macro Policy Impact

Possibly one of the most important roles that NGDOs can play in the development process is their potential role as "micro-macro articulators" (Max-Neef & Elizalde, 1988). This refers to the strategic role that NGDOs could play in systematizing micro level development experiences and in articulating them to the State institutions that are responsible for the formulation of macro policies for development. It is proposed that such a process could secure the input of relevant information that would assist in the formulation of more appropriate macro policies, which hopefully would sustain micro development process, rather than undermine them.

Lamentably, the problem of inappropriate macro development policies is common to most Latin American countries. This problem is often referred to as a "micro-macro disarticulation". As NGDOs become more and more conscious of the impact of this problem on their work, they become aware of the importance of developing their potential capacity to play a role as "micro-macro articulators" (Max-Neef & Elizalde, 1988). It can be said that in every country there are at least a few NGDOs that have begun to play this role to some degree.

One of the major obstacles which prevents the NGDO community from having a greater impact on macro policy-making is the ambivalent attitude that it has towards government. This ambivalence is the result of the diversity of attitudes that exist amongst NGDOs regarding the type of relationship that they would like to have with the government. At one end of the spectrum, NGDOs that are involved in the delivery of services generally operate in a "space" that is approved by the government. These type of NGDOs are generally perceived by government agencies as resources that respond to the basic needs of populations that they are unable to reach, and thus a relationship tends to be established that allows the NGDO to enjoy the state of legitimacy necessary to work with public agencies in the field. At the other end of the spectrum there are NGDOs that maintain a position of severe criticism towards the government. Such NGDOs pursue a vision of social transformation that is defined in terms of structural change which refers primarily to those in power. These type of NGDOs do not desire close contact with the government due to ideological considerations, and generally attempt to maintain as much distance as possible from government agencies.

In the middle of the spectrum are NGDOs that have a broader concept of social transformation and do not limit it to the change of power structures, but see it in terms of the deeper need to change the underlying structures of thought and values that shape and sustain society. Even though these type of NGDOs may maintain a position of mild criticism towards government policies and development models, it is possible for them to approach government agencies and develop a meaningful collaborative relationship. Some NGDOs have established this type of relationship and have even become well-wishers of the government.

The question is what will motivate more NGDOs to go beyond their traditional detached position and their attitude of minimum involvement to ensure legitimacy of their projects? There are two basic concerns that move NGDOs to establish better relationships with governments. One has to do with the hope of influencing governments so as to increase their impact on larger populations. The
other has to do with their fear of government initiatives to control them by establishing laws and decrees to regulate their function. "This interest is seldom the result of a genuine desire of governments to incorporate NGDOs in their national development plans: it is usually an expression of a desire to be informed or to control, the fear of subversion, or a search for additional financial and human resources" (Arbab, 1988). These type of initiatives are perceived as threats and tend to unite NGDOs as a means of protection. Considerations of this nature motivate some NGDOs to take positive initiatives to prevent possible negative circumstances from arising in the future. The perturbing question often arises: how can an NGDO establish a meaningful collaborative relationship with the government without losing the kind of independence that is the most cherished characteristic of such an organization?

"How to influence the government, then, is a recurring theme of discussion among an increasing number of NGDOs and their donors, since everyone believes that at least some of their findings are indeed worthy of being propagated" (Arbab, 1988). Is it realistic to expect that a lone NGDO, with limited resources, to be able to influence the government, especially when the government is not asking to be influenced? Is this not a task that is more appropriate for a community of NGDOs to perform? What can be done when such a community of NGDOs does not yet exist? What role should donor agencies play in this process? Are not international donor agencies more suited than NGDOs to perform this kind of task? Should donors and NGDOs work together on this task? How can they do it? These are the kind of questions that arise when NGDOs discuss this issue. Answers must be found to these questions. But, what donor is willing to invest in a systematic research effort to explore these issues in depth?

Social transformation and the building of a new society are complex, long term processes that will require the collaborative efforts between the State and Civil Society. Many NGDOs that function at the margin of political conflict have the great opportunity to pioneer these collaborative efforts, "to build alliances on the basis of common points and experiences" and to gradually "introduce valuable methods and results of grass roots action into the operations of large and apparently change resistant official systems" (Arbab, 1988).

6. Examples of Roles Played by NGDOs

At this point it may be useful to describe some NGDOs that have been playing significant roles in the areas of research and development. The NGDOs that have been selected for description are ones that have consistently rendered outstanding work over a number of years and are playing a leadership role in their respective areas of endeavor. They should not be viewed as a random sample of NGDOs, but rather as NGDOs that are in the process actualizing their potential.

6.1 Fundación para la Aplicación y Enseñanza de la Ciencia (FUNDAEC)

FUNDAEC began in 1973 as a small group of university professors who sought to understand the role of science, technology and education in the lives of rural people. During the following seventeen years, it has evolved into an NGDO respected by the rural people it serves and by both national and international groups, institutions and agencies alike. It is considered to be an innovator and leader in the field of rural education.

FUNDAEC’s concept of education is based on the premise that training and learning are processes shared by teachers and students. While FUNDAEC’s main objective was to increase peasant access to education, that education had to be relevant to the rural environment. The learning, therefore, had to be achieved through both theoretical and practical means. The research itself needed to be participatory with the farmers benefiting from the process and with the results being used to modify the methodology on an ongoing basis. Education and technical assistance had to involve people both as teachers and as learners.

In 1974, FUNDAEC established its Rural University program and by 1982 graduated twenty-three students as ‘Rural Engineers’. After this first group of graduates, however, there was not a sufficient number of new students to continue. FUNDAEC decided to postpone further development of its post secondary program and began to elaborate more fully the high school level program model known as the Tutorial Learning System (SAT), which responds to the lack of high school level graduates to feed into the rural university program.
Building on its 7 year experience in training Rural Engineers, FUNDAEC began in 1981 to focus its efforts on the development of the Tutorial Learning System. The development of the texts for this program began during the years that the Engineers were being trained. By 1988, all course outlines were complete. A full set of texts involves 81 books, which were produced with assistance from CIDA. FUNDAEC has trained approximately 300 educators in the SAT program. These tutors carry out their teaching in the rural areas of Cauca, Narino, Calle, Antioquia, Huila, Santader and Cundinamarca.

The Colombian Ministry of Education piloted a SAT program in Narino. The conclusion was that SAT is an effective continuation of its "Escuela Nueva" primary school program. The Ministry of Education has secured World Bank funding which will allow it to increase its radius of SAT activity to 80 communities. A similar test is being done of another program which has been developed by the University of Caldas. Results from these two experiences will be used to shape future educational directions of the Ministry of Education.

In addition to the Ministry of Education, the FUNDAEC model has been employed by other semi-autonomous as well as by non-governmental institutions. These include:

- Fundación Educadora San Nicolás
- Fundación Cartón de Colombia
- Hogares Juveniles Campesinos
- Fundación Mariana
- Parroquia del Penol
- CADERH (Honduras)
- Concentración de Desarrollo Rural de Ginebra
- CONARE
- Juntas de Acción Comunal del Municipio de Apia
- Instituto Agrícola de Tunia
- Colegio Departamental del Tambo
- FUNDESIB (Bolivia)
- Instituto Ruhi

It appears that FUNDAEC has developed a model that could be shared by both government and non-governmental organizations alike. The demand for more and better qualified rural educators has increased over the years. Therefore, FUNDAEC has decided to reactivate its post-secondary program this year. A feasibility proposal was prepared which establishes the need for the development of a University Bachelor of Rural Education Degree Program. Accepted and approved by the Colombian Institute for Higher Education (ICFES), it will be the only such University program in an area with a population of 100,000.

Parallel with these activities in formal education, FUNDAEC has been extensively involved in non-formal education activities related to rural extension and community development, research related to agricultural sub-systems for small-farm production and the design and production of instructional materials. The scope of this paper does not permit further description of FUNDAECs many contributions in the generation of knowledge for the training of human resources for rural development. The above brief description of the Rural University and SAT should be sufficient to demonstrate the leadership role played by FUNDAEC as an NGDO.

6.2 Centro de Alternativas de Desarrollo (CEPAUR)

CEPAUR was founded in 1981 in Santiago, Chile and initiated formal activity in 1983. Its primary objective is to promote the re-orientation of development in terms of the conceptual framework that it has elaborated and which is articulated in the CEPAUR document entitled "Human Scale Development". Through its action oriented projects, CEPAUR stimulates experiences of local self-reliance and the fulfillment of fundamental human needs from an interdisciplinary perspective. These experiences are designed to contribute to the formulation of policies that facilitate social and personal development.

During its first years of operations, CEPAUR carried out an international project focused on issues related to "Economics for Human Scale Development", in which professionals from eight countries participated with funding from the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation. The final product of this effort, which is contained in a document published by the Dag Hammarskjold Foundation, articulates the conceptual framework and sets the foundation for a development process that not only addresses the fulfillment of needs but the stimulation and development of potentials as well. The document envisions a development oriented towards: a) the satisfaction of fundamental human
needs, b) the generation of self-reliance, and, c) the organic articulation between global and local processes, between planning and autonomy, and between State and Civil Society. This document has served as a platform for the emergence for other action, research and diffusion oriented projects currently being carried out, or to be carried out in the near future, not only by CEPAUR, but by a number of other Latin American groups as well.

The principal themes of reflection and study by CEPAUR have been the following: a) fundamental human needs and self-reliance as the basis for development at a human scale; b) the constituency dynamics of movements and social actors; c) the collective pathologies originated from the economic crisis and diverse forms of repression; d) a data base for measuring what is relevant for development at a human scale; e) the invisibility of social actors and social practices.

Despite its relatively small number of staff members, consisting of five permanent researchers, CEPAUR has been quite prolific in the publication of books, working documents and articles. The high quality and creativity of CEPAUR's intellectual output has served as a kind of leaven in the on-going discourse held within the international development community. The vision of development that is articulated in the CEPAUR documents has captured the attention of NGDOs and government agencies, not only in Chile but in many countries throughout Latin America.

An example of the pioneer work being done by CEPAUR is the workshop-seminar on Human Scale Development recently held in Santa Cruz, Bolivia. The event was coordinated by Manfred Max-Neef and Antonio Elizalde, Director and Adjunct Director of CEPAUR, with the participation of over forty representatives from NGDOs and government agencies. The purpose of the workshop-seminar was to provide an opportunity for the participants to apply the matrix for social needs analysis developed by CEPAUR to the Bolivian reality. This exercise clearly demonstrated the effectiveness of the CEPAUR conceptual framework in bringing about coherence of thought and understanding regarding social reality, even in such a heterogeneous group consisting of representatives from public and private development organizations. This unique approach appears to be an effective strategy for creating meaningful dialogue between the State and Civil Society, which is an essential requirement for addressing the problem of "micro-macro dis-articulation."

CEPAUR is currently in the process of publishing a new book on the role of NGDOs in promoting democratic culture, which is the result of a workshop-seminar for NGDOs that was sponsored by IDRC last year. This book addresses many of the issues related to the changing role of NGDOs in society. It is a very timely contribution in light of the current re-democratization process occurring in many Latin American countries.

6.3 Centro Mesoamericano de Estudios Sobre Tecnologia Apropiada (CEMAT)

CEMAT was founded in 1976 to provide emergency disaster relief in response to the earthquake catastrophe that occurred that year in Guatemala. Although the initial stimulus for the formation of CEMAT was the social solidarity that emerged around the need to provide emergency disaster relief, its institutional purpose and vision were the product of theoretical discourse, informed by a process of interdisciplinary reflection and a high sense of social commitment, held by the founders of CEMAT prior to its institutional birth. For this reason CEMAT's institutional purpose was defined in terms that transcended emergency relief services. Its institutional purpose was articulated in terms of the following four major objectives:

1. To promote and systematize the transference of appropriate technical knowledge from countries with more technical experience to Guatemala and the region.
2. To promote and systematize scientific research and appropriate techniques that have local origin and can have impact on national and regional settings.
3. To develop and implement appropriate technology and information systems projects for popular groups.
4. To promote means of communication and interchange of experiences in the field of appropriate technology at the national, regional and international levels.
CEMAT defines its concept of appropriate technology in terms of two basic criteria:

a. The technology must be adequate in regards to the social, financial and natural resource conditions of the popular sectors of developing countries.

b. The technology must be capable of being owned by rural and marginal urban communities due to its low cost and simplicity.

This organization has gone through four basic stages of organizational development. Its initial phase of existence was characterized by the recruitment of personnel, disaster relief and the development of appropriate technologies related to small farm production and rural family life. CEMAT’s second phase focused on the development of effective training methodologies such as “experiential workshops” and participative courses, and the organization of community groups. The third phase was one of institutional contraction caused by the shrinking of “political space” for social action in rural communities in Guatemala and repression from the national level. Due to the difficult circumstances during this period, CEMAT focused its activities primarily on scientific research and laboratory activities, and the development of numerous relationships with international agencies. Its fourth and current phase began with the return of civil government in Guatemala. In this phase, CEMAT has reactivated its strategy to strengthen local groups with an emphasis now on production projects, financial viability and work coordinated with other private and public institutions.

CEMAT’s approach to community work begins with attention placed on the family unit as the most strategic entry point for introducing appropriate technologies. After an adequate number of families are enthusiastic about the technologies that they have adopted, a process of forming community groups and micro-enterprises begins. CEMAT considers the participation of women as a determining factor in the success of this process.

The basic problems that CEMAT attempts to resolve through its various lines of action are related to the:

- increase productivity and economic income
- defense and preservation of the ecosystem
- rescue of autochthonous technologies
- injection of dynamism towards development via organized work
- improvement of the health and education status of the family

The most difficult obstacles confronted by CEMAT in its work to address these problems are the lack of motivation and financial resources of the small farmer, and especially the landless farm worker. Another major obstacle to the process of community organization has been the fear that exists in the rural communities due to the history of repression of community organizations.

The six specific lines of action pursued by CEMAT are the following:

1. Agricultural production
2. Health and Hygiene
3. Micro-business Management
4. Construction and Planning
5. Information and Training
6. Model of Sustainable Development

These lines of action are implemented through various programs and projects which would be beyond the scope of this paper to describe.

6.4 Centro Internacional de Educacion y Desarrollo Humano (CENDE)

CINDE was founded in 1978 by two educators who were motivated by the idea of applying the findings of educational research to improve the quality of preschool education for children of marginal communities in rural and urban sectors that had been most neglected by the formal educational system.

CINDE’s institutional objectives are:

1. The execution of research projects that are instrumental to the implementation of educational and human development models that represent alternatives to the traditional models, and which will serve as a basis for resolving existing problems.

2. The preparation of mature professionals with a great potential for the development of similar programs.
This institution began its activities focusing upon preschool and postgraduate levels of education because neither level was regulated by the government. This situation offered freedom of action to discover and study the vacuums that exist in the traditional system and to introduce alternatives to fill the void.

CINDE has conceptualized and developed a philosophy of education that is consistently reflected in the strategies and methodologies that are used to design and implement its programs and projects. This philosophy of education is grounded in three basic concepts:

1. The first concept refers to the development of an educational model that responds to the needs of the learner and enables the learner to become an agent of self-development. This concept uses the cultural frame of reference of the learner as a basis for learning. The strengthening of self-image and the capacity to solve problems are key elements of this concept.

   The methodologies used to make operational this concept are based on 5 principles derived from the work of Moore and Anderson (1969). These principles are:
   a) perspective
   b) relevance
   c) "autotelico" (refers to when a person learns because they want to know, and not because of grades or some other external reward)
   d) productivity
   e) reflection

2. The second concept affirms that the needs of the learner are physical and psychological in nature. Therefore, to stimulate learning that is conducive to healthy development, an environment is required that has certain physical, social and psychological characteristics.

   This concept is derived primarily from Maslow’s theory of the hierarchy of needs. CINE’s proposition is that an environment that stimulates the development of human potential must provide conditions that allow each person to:
   a) satisfy their basic physical and biological needs
   b) be free of fears
   c) have satisfactory relationships with other people
   d) experience feelings of love and solidarity with those who surround him/her
   e) self-actualize his/her potential

CINDE differs from Maslow’s idea that needs are satisfied in a specific hierarchical order.

3. The third concept has to do with defining the "human ecological base". This idea attempts to expand the educational context beyond the immediate learning environment. This concept recognizes that the learner is influenced by forces that come from the broader ecological, cultural and socio-political environments.

   This concept is derived from the "human ecology perspective" developed by Urie Bronfenbrenner, and has contributed greatly in clarifying the types of relationships that should be established between different environments and institutions represented in a project, and how they relate to methodological issues.

CINDE has seven basic programs which are strategically integrated and reflect the basic philosophy of education described above. These programs are the following:

a. Materials and appropriate technology development: consists of the development of educational materials and technologies the respond to the specific needs of the other programs.

b. Integrated School-Home Program for Childhood Education: the main objectives of this program are to enhance the direct participation of the family in the intellectual education of the children and to improve the productive use of time, physical facilities, educational agents and other resources for learning. This program seeks to integrate the learning process of the home and of the school.

c. The PROMESA Program: this is a project with four marginal communities of the Costa Pacifico del Chaco region. Its main focus is the preparation of mothers as educators of their preschool children. Over 700 families are direct beneficiaries of this program.

d. Early Childhood Stimulation Program: this program provides training to mothers with
children of the ages of 0-3 years. Through a series of 36 meetings over a period of three years, the mothers learn how to observe their infants and how to stimulate their healthy growth and development.

e. Child to Child Program: this program trains older children (9 to 12 years) to work with their younger siblings (3 to 6 years) in the process of stimulating physical and intellectual development.

f. Post Graduate Program: this is a sort of "university without walls" program designed for working professionals, which allows them to integrate their work setting with the learning process. CINDE has developed and offers this program in conjunction with the Universidad Pedagogica Nacional de Colombia and Nova University of Fort Lauderdale, Florida. CINDE has also given this course three times in Venezuela, and in Bogota and Medellin, Colombia with cooperation from OEA.

g. Technical Assistance for Institutions and Enterprises:

6.5 Instituto Mayor Campesino (IMCA)

During the early 60s a group of Jesuit priests working in the city of Buga, Colombia established an institution dedicated to the service of rural villagers. They founded the Instituto de Ciencias Sociales y Economicos, popularly known as the "Universidad Campesina" (the Peasant University), which has evolved into what is known today as the Instituto Mayor Campesino (IMCA).

IMCA’s institutional purpose as stated in its statutes is to become: "a social work, oriented by preference to the education of workers and peasants, to the integral improvement of the working classes and to the organization of other social, cultural and educational movements that are judged advantageous for its full development." In its pursuit of this purpose, IMCA’s activities have successively emphasized different approaches over time.

IMCA has passed through four distinct phases in its institutional development. Although each phase has been characterized by different programs, they have all consistently reflected the underlying strategy to empower rural populations with the capacity to pursue their own development path. IMCA’s constant search for an appropriate institutional role in accompanying villagers in rural development processes makes its organizational evolution an excellent case study of an institutional learning process based on action and reflection.

During its first phase (1963-69), IMCA focused its activities on the education of adult "campesinos" in primary education and training in cooperativism. The goal was to prepare the villagers to become conscious agents of change in transforming the dominant social structures. Community leaders participated in courses, workshops and public meetings that were designed to raise their critical awareness of their situation and to motivate unity of thought and action in a joint search for appropriate solutions to community development problems.

IMCA’s second phase (1970-77) focused on the training of rural youth as technicians of community organization and cooperativism. IMCA perceived the need of training rural youth to become promoters of the development and well being of their own communities. Thus IMCA set up a secondary education program for rural youth (male and female), that integrated academic studies with social service work in rural communities. This program reached an annual average of 120 students, and towards the final period of its existence had over 400 students enrolled.

The third phase began in 1978 when IMCA decided to suspend the secondary training program for rural youth. This decision was based on the results of an evaluation that indicated that the program was not achieving its main purpose, which was to provide organizational assistance to grassroots structures. The evaluation noted that the program was utilizing financial resources, that were supposed to be used for popular education purposes, to train technicians who in many cases would later become employed by the private business sector.

These circumstances motivated IMCA to change its "modus operandi" to one in which the institution would go to the village population rather than have the village population come to the institution. The conceptual frameworks found in nonformal education and participatory research became the primary sources for providing IMCA with the principles for designing its new methodology for
promoting integrated rural development. As a result of these activities the need for community participation was highlighted and IMCA began a program for training "animadores" in each of the 40 rural communities participating in an integrated rural development project administered by IMCA.

IMCA organized four regional teams and each team was responsible for a specific region. These teams would establish contact with the people of each community and would promote a participatory research approach to community needs assessment and searches for viable solutions. IMCA would then invite those interested in receiving training to participate in training events to learn how to design and implement projects that responded to the identified needs. As a result of these activities, specific community projects emerged that required specific technical assistance. In 1984, IMCA formed four departments within its organizational structure as a response to this approach. The four departments were: research, pastoral work, education and organization. Each department developed its own program within the framework provided by shared general objectives and methodology. These technical assistance programs tended to become integrated with each other at the grassroots level where they provided assistance to the same communities. A board for social promotion was formed to facilitate coordination and integration of the programs, consisting of representatives from each department.

At this stage the primary activities of IMCA were related to the intensification of campesino participation, the search for integration amongst emerging community organizations, the acquisition of a deeper understanding of participatory research, the increase of benefits through institutional contacts and the sharing of experiences through seminars, publications and advisory work.

A global evaluation of IMCA's work was done during mid-1985, which sought to identify necessary adjustments and to provide continuity to its integrated rural development projects. By the beginning of 1986, the results of the evaluation set the direction for the formulation of a "new model" of work, which IMCA called: "integral intensivo/extensivo". This model has been implemented in three zones located in the state of Valle de Cauca. An interdisciplinary team was formed to work in each zone. The on-going presence of these teams in each zone has had the twin purpose of generating the formulation of an alternative regional development strategy and at the same time providing support to the process of consolidating independent and critically conscious rural organizations.

The dynamics of rural production has been integrated as a new element to the work focus of the teams in order to discover, with the participation of the small farmers, an economic system appropriate for the zone. This new focus has required a systematic investigation of the values and logic that sustain the traditional rural economy. The work implemented by the teams is complemented by periodic technical assistance provided by the four departments mentioned above.

These four phases of institutional development have consolidated IMCA's activities into six strategic lines of action:

A. Production-comercialization: the support of organizing processes from the point of view of production-comercialization techniques, generation and recuperation of local technologies, maximization of the resources of the small farmers unit of production and the minimization of agri-chemical (agrotoxicos) inputs purchased outside of the small farm setting.

B. Organization: the support of organizational processes in the region that could contribute to its consolidation.

C. Training: provide training that can contribute to economic and organizational projects that are implemented by organizations that IMCA advises, both at grassroots and regional levels, on the bases of requests made by these organizations.

D. Community participation and the celebration of faith- Pastoral: the accompaniment of IMCA in the process of forming Christian rural communities, and the training of "animadores" who are committed to a socio-politico project of change as an exigency of faith, thus viewing as a motivating factor the religiosity of the population and its specific celebrations.

E. Elaboration of materials: the production and distribution of appropriate support materials in the areas of production, commercialization,
training, organization, health and pastoral work that will accompany community processes according to their needs.

F. Interinstitutional relations: the promotion and participation in interinstitutional activities for the purpose of sharing experiences and information.

7. A Functional Typology of NGDOs

The construction of typologies that categorize NGDOs can be useful for clarifying thought and for facilitating specific decision making purposes, if the limitations of the typology are kept in mind. Different kinds of typologies have been proposed that attempt to make sense of the diversity of the NGDO universe. David Korten's typology looks at NGDOs from an evolutionary perspective and identifies three generations of NGDO program strategy development: a) Generation 1: relief and welfare, b) Generation 2: small-scale self-reliant local development, c) Generation 3: sustainable systems development. The following Table summarizes this typology:

Table 1. Three generations of NGO development program strategies
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Defining features</strong></td>
<td>Relief &amp; welfare</td>
<td>Small-scale self-reliant local development</td>
<td>Sustainable systems development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Problem definition</strong></td>
<td>Shortage of goods and services</td>
<td>local inertia</td>
<td>Institutional and policy constraints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time frame</strong></td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Project life</td>
<td>Indefinite long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial scope</strong></td>
<td>Individual or family</td>
<td>Neighborhood or village</td>
<td>Region or nation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chief actors</strong></td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>NGO + beneficiary organizations</td>
<td>All public and private institutions that define relevant systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development education</strong></td>
<td>Starving children</td>
<td>Community self-help initiatives</td>
<td>Failures in interdependent systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Management orientation</strong></td>
<td>Logistics management</td>
<td>Project management</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Koren, 1986)
Although the above typology provides an interesting lens by which to view NGDOs, its main limitation is that it excludes the diversity of alternative development strategies that NGDOs have been creatively exploring. It seems that NGDOs that are promoting the "sustainable systems development strategy" are oriented more towards creating effective systems for implementing the prevailing and entrenched development paradigm, rather than searching for a new model of development that would promote processes of social transformation. Maybe NGDOs that generate alternative development strategies should be grouped under a fourth generation category.

Manfred Max-Neef and Antonio Elizalde have developed a typology from the point of view of NGDO origins within civil society (See Annex: Max-Neef/Elizalde). This typology is a helpful tool in attaining clarity of thought and understanding regarding the origins of the ideological diversity that exists amongst NGDOs.

For purposes of this exploratory paper we will propose an NGDO typology based on a functional point of view. This typology will categorize NGDOs in such a way that will help us to identify the types of NGDOs that would be the most appropriate for receiving IDRC funding.

This functional typology divides NGDO activities into three generic functions:

1) **Delivery of Services** in response to basic (fundamental) human needs
2) **Research** with a focus on the generation of knowledge for development
3) **Grassroots action** for social transformation.

There exists NGDOs that specialize in one of these three areas. Most NGDOs begin their existence focused on one of the functional areas and then gradually begin to feel the need to expand their activities into one or both of the other functional areas. Seven basic types of NGDOs can be identified through this kind of analysis. The easiest way to describe the mixes of functional areas is with a Venn diagram.
7.1 Description of NGDO Types

#1 Delivery of Services: this type of NGDO is involved in providing services to marginalized urban and rural poor populations that respond to basic human needs such as those related to health, housing, education, etc. These NGDOs are not disaster relief NGOs, although some may have begun their existence as such. They are not involved in research or local action that promotes social transformation. Good examples of NGDOs in this category are organizations dedicated to providing specific service such as small farm credit or child survival interventions.

#2 Research: this type of NGDO is involved in research activities that may not incorporate community participation nor the delivery of services. These NGDOs seek to generate relevant knowledge for development purposes, through research in areas related to social sciences, ecology, appropriate technology, biological sciences, agriculture, etc. If the providing of workshops, seminars and the teaching of courses is considered to be a service delivered by a research oriented NGDO, then it would in fact be very difficult to find a research type NGDO that is not providing this service as a means for the diffusion of their research findings. CEPAUR (described above) is the closest example of an NGDO that is primarily dedicated to research, but its participatory research approach and its manner of diffusing its findings through workshops-seminars places it more in type #6 category than in #2 type.

#3 Grassroots action: this type of NGDO is involved in activities that promote community actions that change or create local structures that sustain processes which facilitate social transformation. These NGDOs are not involved in research or delivery of services. Their main activities are related to processes that promote critical consciousness, community organizing, capacity building, empowerment, etc. The Instituto Mayor Campesino (IMCA), is an example of an NGDO that is rooted in this category, but has functioned in category #4 during different phases of its existence.

#4 Mix of #1 and #3: This type of NGDO emerges when an NGDO that is involved in delivering services sees the need to assist the community in strengthening existing local structures or in organizing new ones for grassroots participation in local management for the delivery of services. The complex process of community organizing has a great deal to do with capacity building and empowerment processes. These type of NGDO also emerges when a type #3 NGDO realizes that it must begin to respond to the felt needs of the community in order to maintain credibility. Type #3 NGDOs may also decide that they must complement their long-range social transformation activities with some immediate (tangible), result producing services that the community values. IMCA is an example of this type of NGDO.

#5 Mix of #1 and #2: This type of NGDO emerges when a type #1 NGDO realizes that it must generate new knowledge in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of its services. This type of concern often motivates NGDOs to embark on research activities. For example, some rural health projects have done extensive research into the methods of diagnosis and remedies used by traditional practitioners. On the other hand, an NGDO that is involved in research may enter into the delivery of services in the form of technical assistance or the provision of products such as seeds or technologies. This is often done as a means of disseminating their findings and of securing their practical application in the development process. CINDE is an example of this type of NGDO.

#6 Mix of #2 and #3: This type of NGDO emerges when a research oriented NGDO begins to apply action-research or participatory research methodologies for the generation of knowledge that is relevant to grassroots development processes. These approaches have been used in diverse types of research efforts, such as those related to small farm production, appropriate technology, social analysis, etc. Also, some grassroots action NGDOs (type #3) become type #6 NGDOs when they feel the need to understand more deeply the processes that they are involved in and realize the importance of systematically documenting the methodologies developed and the results achieved. This group of NGDOs combine the capacities for carrying out relevant research with development action. CEMAT is an example of this type of NGDO.

#7 Mix of #1,#2 and #3: This type of NGDO blends all three functions into its modes of action. Very few NGDOs have the capacity to effectively integrate the three functions in a strategic way. Most NGDOs basically complement a main
function, which is the thrust of their activity, with activities related to the other two functions. As an NGDO matures and grows in capacity, it learns how to integrate these functions in ways that are appropriate to the development strategy it is pursuing with a specific population. FUNDAEC (described above) is an example of this type of NGDO.

If this typology were applied to the community of NGDOs in various Latin American countries, one would probably find a different proportion of each type of NGDOs in every country. This diversity of proportional configurations of the various types of NGDOs is relative to the socio-economic condition of the country and the degree of political space available to NGDOs for social action. For example, in countries that have authoritarian regimes and limited availability of political space, it is likely that there will be very few (if any) NGDOs openly involved in grassroots action for social transformation.

8. Types of NGDOs Recommended for IDRC Funding

NGDOs that are involved primarily in research, such as those in group #2, are obviously a natural selection and it appears that this type of NGDO has traditionally received funding support from IDRC.

It is our recommendation that IDRC give priority rating to NGDO types #6 and #7 for funding consideration. We consider that these two types of NGDOs have the greatest capacity for carrying out relevant development research and for the dissemination of their research findings within the populations that they serve. Their penchant to utilize action-research and participatory research methodologies has great potential for the generation of knowledge in areas related to the social sciences, small farm production, appropriate technology, rural economy, and community organization; all of which are areas of great importance to the development processes that affect the millions of Latin Americans who live in conditions of extreme poverty. Also, these two types of NGDOs appear to be fertile sources for the generation of alternative development strategies, which greatly enhances their potential impact on the development processes in their countries.

9. NGDO Research vs. Government and University Research

Once again we emphasize that the vast diversity of the Latin American countries makes it quite difficult to make generalizations that would be true across the board, especially regarding governments and universities. The question of the relative advantages of funding NGDO research work as compared to the funding of government and university research is a complex issue that would require extensive research to adequately answer. The limited scope of this paper permits us to share only a few personal reflections regarding this question.

If IDRC is interested in funding development research that is relevant to the urban and rural poor, then NGDOs have the advantage of working on a daily basis with these populations. This is in contrast with the majority of Latin American universities, especially private universities, that tend to maintain a traditional "ivory tower", academic position in relation to society. Of course there are some universities that have research centers that are performing interesting studies on critical socio-economic issues. A question that often arises relates to the relevance of their publications to NGDOs that are concerned with acquiring knowledge that will be useful in guiding social action.

The basic challenge facing most academics who are involved in social research has to do with the problem of how to keep in touch with the real issues of development. Many have recognized that this is extremely difficult to do unless they themselves are involved in social action. It is interesting to note that during the last two decades in many Latin American countries, there has been a general exodus of social scientists from the universities to the NGDO world. A key factor that has stimulated this trend has been the political "extremism" at both ends of the spectrum that have purged the universities of discordant views. Although, in many cases this trend has seriously debilitated the capacity of universities to carry out social research, it at the same time has endowed the NGDO network with a wealth of human resources who are trained in the social sciences. Chile is a prime example of this phenomenon. Chile has a relatively large number of research type NGDOs that employ highly qualified social scientists. It is quite common to find researchers working for NGDOs who have received masters
and doctoral degrees from European universities. A recent study of 40 research oriented NGDOs in Chile registers that of the 543 researchers -not including those involved in work-study scholarships or assistants- who work for the 40 NGDOs, 73 have doctoral degrees, 32 are doctoral degree candidates, and 61 have masters degrees.

Obviously, in the area of basic research, such as in the biological and physical sciences, universities definitely have a considerable advantage over NGDOs. In fact, most NGDOs do not even consider basic research as part of their mission. They are focused more on applied research in areas related to agricultural production, appropriate technology, social organization, etc.

In most cases, government agencies do not have an impressive track record for innovative development research. However, it is possible for a government agency to carry out quality research, especially if the research is focused on the parameters defined by its national development plan, and if the knowledge generated is deemed to be useful for its implementation. An example of this would be research related to population studies at the national level, an area in which governments often have a marked advantage over NGDOs due to the scale and extended time duration of this type of research effort. The main problem of government implemented research, besides bureaucratic inefficiencies, has to do with ideological constraints that could be imposed by the political party in power.

An important criterion for judging which type of institution would be the most appropriate for carrying out a specific research project has to do with the nature of the "object of study" to be performed. As mentioned above, there are types of research that government agencies and universities are better suited to perform than NGDOs. Likewise, the same holds true for NGDOs, especially if what is required is imaginative research into the processes of life within rural populations.

To clarify this point further, there are several observations that may provide a backdrop to this question. When the impressive financial resources and intellectual structures that serve the traditional paradigms of rural development are compared to those meager resources that support the emerging complementary structure provided by NGDOs, the extreme contrast is overwhelming. When observing just the field of agriculture and animal sciences, it can noted that:

- a large number of government programs and centers supported by numerous universities as well as an impressive network of international centers are at work in creating new scientific knowledge, in developing technologies, in training human resources at all levels, and in propagating the results of their findings (Arbab, 1988).

The knowledge generated by these systems is obviously useful. Yet, when we assess the current situation of rural people after decades of this type of research, it becomes clear that "the present research and development system can only contribute partially to the development process and that a great deal of knowledge must be generated using different methodologies and concepts" (ibid). It is precisely into this particular knowledge gap that many NGDOs have strategically inserted their research projects. Thus, it seems reasonable that NGDOs that are involved in this type of research should receive support for their vital work from donors such as IDRC.

10. Minimal Requirements for Research Funding: Criteria for the Selection of NGDOs for Centre Support

The issue of what should be the minimal requirements that an NGDO must fulfill in order to receive funding for research is a complex and delicate matter. On the one hand, a donor needs to guarantee as much as possible that the funds it donates will be used properly and to the maximum benefit, thus the necessity of establish minimal requirements. On the other hand, the donor must be careful not to establish requirements that impose its own agenda on an NGDO and should avoid the tendency to delimit an NGDO’s institutional autonomy and creative independence. This is a complaint about donors that is frequently voiced by NGDOs.

A set of minimal requirements should provide an objective basis for judging the merits of the research proposal and the capability of the NGDO to carry out the project effectively. In establishing a set of minimal requirements it is recommended that the following three categories of factors be considered.
10.1 Quality of Proposal Design
- Subject of research and its relevance to development
- Appropriateness of research methodology
- Identification of the users of knowledge generated
- Identification of the beneficiaries of the knowledge generated
- Adequate plan for the dissemination of knowledge generated

10.2 Institutional Track-record
- Degree of institutional credibility and stability
- Previous projects: coherence, relevance, results
- Current projects: coherence, relevance, integration
- Publications: number, quality, distribution

10.3 Track-records of research personnel
- Academic background: degrees, specializations, honors, etc.
- Work experience
- Publications

By applying these three categories of indicators, it is possible for a donor to identify serious, experienced and well established NGDOs, and avoid the possibility of being hoodwinked by a "phantom NGDO", which is a legally established organization that basically consists of a researcher who prepares proposals and operates out of a post office box number. Most donors have had experiences with this type of operation one time or another. Donors that have had negative experiences with "phantom NGDOs" must be careful not to allow the experience to prejudice their attitude towards all NGDOs. The NGDO community, like any other community, has a few phonies, but by applying well conceived requirements for funding the risk factor can be reduced considerably, if not completely. Yet, this is not to imply that only NGDOs with extensive institutional track-records should be selected for funding. The quality of the proposal and the curriculum vitae of the research team members are also vital considerations. Often a new NGDO is founded by individuals who have impressive work experience and excellent research backgrounds and who are quite capable of implementing a quality research proposal. These factors must be given appropriate weight, so as not to reject an excellent proposal because the NGDO is new and has not yet developed an institutional track-record.

11. Availability of Information on NGDOs in Latin America

There is a relative scarcity of systematized information on NGDOs in Latin America. This situation is partially due to the relative newness of the NGDO phenomenon. Nonetheless, the rapidly increasing number of publications that have been produced during the last decade is notable. This trend appears to be a sign of the growing interest in the NGDO phenomenon.

11.1 Studies

The bibliography in the Annex of this document gives an idea of the type of studies that have been published regarding the Latin American NGDOs. The identification and acquisition of publications on NGDOs is not an easy task. It is not simply a case of going to a library or documentation center and asking for the section on NGDOs. The documentation center at the IDRC office in Bogota is a rare one in that it has a small, but growing, section on NGDOs with useful studies from both Latin American and global perspectives. One of the characteristic weaknesses of most studies is the marked absence of statistical data on NGDOs. Even studies of limited scope done from a national perspective do not provide adequate information regarding the number of NGDOs that exist in the country, or any information regarding the number and type of projects and programs that they manage. Also missing is any financial information regarding funding. This lack of hard data is a serious problem that needs a systematic and on-going solution.
11.2 Data Bases

A data base at the country level (or international level) that is fully developed and worthy of serving as a model for replication has not been identified at this time. Probably the best example of a data base on NGDOs at the country level is the one developed by DESCOr in Peru, which operates under its unit of Project Services. DESCOr's data base is considered to be better than the one developed by the Asociacion Nacional de Centros, which periodically publishes an updated directory on NGDOs in Peru.

In general, NGDO directories have not been impressive. Most of them simply provide addresses, phone numbers and a brief description of each institution that contains little of substance. The best example of a useful directory is the document "Centros Privados de Investigacion en Ciencias Sociales", prepared by Maria Teresa Lladser and published by FLACSO and AHC. This document provides excellent descriptions of 40 research oriented NGDOs in Chile. The format used in this document is worthy of emulation for those who are developing a data base or directory for NGDOs.

One way of setting up a data base on Latin American NGDOs would be to identify an NGDO in each country that is already involved in developing a data base for NGDOs. The next step would be to invite them to send key personnel, who are working on setting up the data base, to a series of regional seminar-workshops designed to strengthen their country level efforts in a way that would secure hardware and software compatibility, and the establishment of uniform information gathering and processing procedures for the efficient sharing of data with a central documentation center for Latin America. Parallel with the process of setting up country level data bases, IDRC's documentation center in Bogota could develop the capability to receive, process and store country level data on NGDOs. Analytic reports could be prepared and distributed periodically. This network of country level data base centers could gather all publications on NGDOs and send them to the IDRC documentation Center.

11.3 Users of Information

The primary users of information regarding NGDOs are donor agencies, governments and NGDOs themselves. As more information is made available to government agencies and the general public, the less possibility there will be of misconstruing or distorting the true nature and activities of NGDOs. In that NGDOs do not have anything to hide, information about their activities should be made available to the general public. In a sense, the effort to systematize information and to generate a body of knowledge about NGDOs is probably the most effective way of protecting their autonomy and freedom to participate in development processes and to pursue their visions.

12. Concluding Remarks

Do NGDOs fit into the greater scheme of things, or are they just a fleeting reality, like the foam on the waves of the sea?

During times of frustration, opposition, and failure, those who work for NGDOs may feel helpless before the magnitude of the negative forces being released by our disintegrating societies. The poverty, the injustices, the violence witnessed daily in their work sometimes overcomes them with profound feelings of despair and pessimism. At such moments they may doubt the ultimate meaning and consequence of their work, feel alone in the struggle and begin to question their purpose and vision . . . and ask themselves soul-searching questions: Are we no more than a little group of well intentioned individuals? Will our efforts only benefit the small population that we serve? And if so, what of the millions who suffer extreme poverty, injustice and violence? When this crisis of faith sets in, a lone NGDO may feel impotent before the magnitude of the problems afflicting this "age of transition."

There is another view, however, that inspires hope and optimism. It is the vision that the NGDO phenomenon represents an emerging social movement that is manifesting itself throughout the world. It perceives NGDOs as an expression of the popular will, in which the peoples of the world are expressing their decision to no longer wait for their governments to solve their problems. A sign of this reality is that the poor have been organizing themselves into thousands of grassroots organizations and NGDOs during the last decade.
and have been taking charge of their destiny. This is tangible evidence that something new is happening and that NGDOs are at the heart of it.

Within the NGDO "movement", there exists an emerging scientific community that is energetically involved in research activities and that generates knowledge that is highly relevant to development. This group of scientists is questioning the traditional academic concepts of science and research and is developing new concepts and methods that are oriented towards social action. This emerging scientific community represents a great potential force for Latin American development processes that is worthy of encouragement and support.

When an NGDO perceives itself in this light, as part of a greater social movement, this vision empowers it with an optimism, vitality and effectiveness that far exceeds its limited material resources. Maybe NGDOs are "the difference that will make a difference".
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1. The Ecuador Project: Discusses the basic goals, philosophy and methodology of a rural nonformal education project.
2. Conscientizacao and Simulation Games: Discusses Paulo Freire’s education philosophy and the use of simulation games for consciousness raising.
3. Hacienda: Describes a board game simulating economic and social realities of the Ecuadorean Sierra.
4. Mercado: Describes a card game which provides practice in basic market mathematics.
5. Ashton-Warner Literacy Method: Describes a modified version of Sylvia Ashton-Warner’s approach to literacy training used in Ecuadorean villages.
7. Bingo: Describes bingo-like fluency games for words and numerical operations.
8. Math Fluency Games: Describes a variety of simple games which provide practice in basic arithmetic operations.
9. Letter Fluency Games: Describes a variety of simple games which provide practice in basic literacy skills.
10. Tabacundo - Battery Powered Dialogue: Describes the use of tape recorder for feedback and programming in a rural radio school program.
11. The Facilitator Model: Describes the facilitator concept for community development in rural Ecuador.
12. Puppets and the Theatre: Describes the use of theatre, puppets and music as instruments of literacy and consciousness awareness in a rural community.
13. Fotonovella: Describes development and use of photo-literature as an instrument for literacy and consciousness raising.
14. The Education Game: Describes a board game that simulates inequities of many educational systems.
15. The Fun Bus: Describes an NFE project in Massachusetts that used music, puppetry and drama to involve local people in workshops on town issues.
16. Field Training Through Case Studies: Describes the production of actual village case studies as a training method for community development workers in Indonesia.
17. Participatory Communication in Nonformal Education: Discusses use of simple processing techniques for information sharing, formative evaluation and staff communication.
21. Q-Sort as Needs Assessment Technique: Describes how a research techniques can be adapted for needs assessment in nonformal education.
22. The Learning Fund - Income Generation Through NFE: Describes a program which combines education and income generation activities through learning groups.
23. Game of Childhood Diseases: Describes a board game which addresses health problems of young children in the Third World.
24. Road-to-Birth Game: Describes a board game which addresses health concerns of Third World women during the prenatal period.
25. Discussion Starters: Describes how dialogue and discussion can be facilitated in community groups by using simple audio-visual materials.
26. Record Keeping for Small Rural Businesses: Describes how facilitators can help farmers, market sellers and women’s groups keep track of income and expenses.
27. Community Newspaper: Describes how to create and publish a community-level newspaper in a participatory fashion.
28. Skills Drills: Describes how to make and use a simple board game for teaching basic math and literacy skills.