

The Choice & Consequences of Power – Handout One

	No Choice	Choice
Negative Consequences	<p>Ritualized Agency <i>Characteristics:</i> Minimal agency or collective capacity to act; quiescence; disaffection among local residents; unconnected social fields; oppression at the hands of the elite; abandonment of hope by locals for overcoming power obstacles.</p> <p><i>Outcomes:</i> Negative life environment with little concern for the masses. Fragmentation of powerless groups.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Private</p>	<p>Incomplete Agency <i>Characteristics:</i> presence of agency or collective capacity, yet failure to achieve goals. Interacting but not fully connected social fields. Development ‘in’ community where locals interact with elites to enhance segments of the locality but not the entire community.</p> <p><i>Outcomes:</i> Action seen as a one-off occurrence or as successful goal attainment. Action focused on select segments of the community. Failure signals end of local empowerment.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Primarily Private and limited public</p>
Positive Consequences	<p>Abandoned Agency <i>Characteristics:</i> Minimal agency or collective capacity to act. Quiescence; minimally connected social fields; hidden oppression at the hands of the elite; belief by populace that action is not needed, as the elites will take care of them.</p> <p><i>Outcomes:</i> Good/tolerable life based on the arbitrary positive treatment by elites.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Private and public</p>	<p>Authentic Agency <i>Characteristics:</i> Agency, empowerment, and collective capacity. Strongly connected social fields. Development ‘of’ community. Communities achieve goals, negotiating a place at the decision-making table, mobilizing to facilitate change, fail to achieve goals, yet mobilizing to continue their efforts.</p> <p><i>Outcomes:</i> Episodic action seen as one in the scope of many. Community and development seen in the actions of individuals, not goal attainment. Enhanced social well-being.</p> <p><i>Benefits:</i> Public</p>

Agency = the capacity for local action and resiliency.

Source: Brennan, M.A. & Israel, G.D. (2008). The Power of Community. *Journal of the Community Development Society*, 39(1): 91.

Moving from Community Development “for” to “by” – Handout Two

Figure 1.2 Timeline of Development Approaches						Progression of community involvement
1950s→	1960s→	1970s/80s→	1990s→	2000→	2005→	
Centralized De-Centralized						
	Sectoral Technology Led/ "Green Revolution" Irrigation development					Consultation ↓
		Special Area / Target Group Area Development Program & Integrated Rural Development Program NGOs and private sector	Community- Based Development Social Funds			Participation ↓
				Community- Driven Development (CDD)	Local & Community- Driven Development (LCDD)	Empowerment

From: Binswanger-Mkhize, H.P., Regt, J.P., & Spector, S. (2009) *Scaling Up Local & Community Driven Development (LCDD) A Real World Guide to its Theory and Practice* Online document accessed August 6, 2009 at http://sitresources.worldbank.org/EXT/SOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-1237644546330/5948216-1237644567860/Scaling_Up_LCDD_Book_rfileeze.pdf