“WE HAVE DONE THIS OURSELVES”: EVALUATING PARTICIPATORY AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES IN RURAL SENEGAL

by

KAITLYN J. GRIGSBY

A THESIS

Presented to the Environmental Studies Program
and the Graduate School of the University of Oregon
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Master of Science

December 2013

THESIS APPROVAL PAGE

Student: Kaitlyn J. Grigsby

Title: “We Have Done This Ourselves”: Evaluating Participatory and Sustainable Development Practices in Rural Senegal

This thesis has been accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Science degree in the Environmental Studies Program by:

Stephen Wooten	Chairperson
Ana Schaller de la Cova	Member
Renee Irvin	Member

and

Kimberly Andrews Espy	Vice President for Research and Innovation; Dean of the Graduate School

Original approval signatures are on file with the University of Oregon Graduate School.

Degree awarded December 2013

© 2013 Kaitlyn J. Grigsby

THESIS ABSTRACT

Kaitlyn J. Grigsby

Master of Science

Environmental Studies Program

December 2013

Title: “We Have Done This Ourselves”: Evaluating Participatory and Sustainable Development Practices in Rural Senegal

The World Bank paradigm of large-scale neoliberal development projects has repeatedly failed to deliver durable and sustainable changes for the world’s poorest nations. Although the World Bank and other multilateral development organizations have committed themselves to forging new participatory intervention methods, the core objectives of development have not changed.

This thesis explores the work of CREATE!, an organization that funds and implements rural and community-based projects that address the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change in Senegal. This analysis is an illustrative case study of a small-scale and participant focused development intervention in West Africa. I use interviews and participant observation to describe (1) how CREATE! understands and responds to beneficiary needs through participatory development, (2) how participatory methods influence CREATE!’s programs, and (3) the organization’s sense of success or failure in promoting poverty alleviation and community sustainability in rural Senegal.

CURRICULUM VITAE

NAME OF AUTHOR: Kaitlyn J. Grigsby

GRADUATE AND UNDERGRADUATE SCHOOLS ATTENDED:

University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon
St. Mary's College of Maryland, St. Mary's City, Maryland

DEGREES AWARDED:

Master of Science, Environmental Studies, 2013, University of Oregon
Graduate Certificate in Nonprofit Management, 2013, University of Oregon
Bachelor of Arts, Student Designed Major in Environmental Studies, Biology, and Public Policy, 2011, St. Mary's College of Maryland

AREAS OF SPECIAL INTEREST:

African Studies
Nonprofit Management
Political Science

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Independent Contractor, CREATE!, October 2013 –

Independent Contractor, BEST, October 2013 -

GRANTS, AWARDS, AND HONORS:

St. Mary's Senior Scholar, St. Mary's College of Maryland, 2011

Hollings Scholar, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2009

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to Professors Wooten, Schaller de la Cova, and Irvin for their assistance in the preparation of this thesis. In addition, special thanks to the employees of CREATE!, without whom this project would not be possible. Finally, I would like to thank the employees of St. Mary's College of Maryland in Serrekunda, who introduced me to Wolof, baobab juice, and the beautiful countries and people of Senegal and The Gambia.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter | Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Thesis Overview 4

II. CONTEXTUALIZING THE CASE STUDY 7

Development History, Theory, and Practice 7

The Promise of Participatory Development 16

Research Questions 20

III. AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE 25

Material Evidence on CREATE! 25

Evaluating Development NGOs 26

IV. CREATE! AS ORGANIZATION 29

Organizational Structure 29

CREATE! in Senegal 31

V. "USING A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH AND APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES": CREATE! PROGRAMS IN SENEGAL 36

Mission 36

CREATE! Programs 40

Goals and Objectives 44

Chapter Page

Monitoring and Evaluation Techniques 47

VI. REFLECTING ON CREATE! 56

Responding to Felt Needs 56

Adapting for Participation 60

"The Grease in the Anti-Politics Machine": CREATE! and Participatory Development Theory 61

Assessing Success or Failure in CREATE! Development Interventions 65

VII. "WE HAVE DONE THIS OURSELVES" 68

Addressing the Deficiencies of Development 68

Policy Recommendations 74

APPENDIX: MAP OF CREATE! PROJECT LOCATIONS 77

REFERENCES CITED........ 78

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. CREATE! Evaluation Methods 52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A smiling child, school book in hand. Women drawing water from a new well, holding baskets of fresh produce. Health, confidence, empowerment, prosperity – these are the promises of development. But what exactly is development? The *Oxford English Dictionary* includes several definitions of development, including: (1) a gradual unfolding, (2) evolution or bringing out from a latent or elementary condition, (3) the bringing out of the latent capabilities (of anything) or the fuller expansion (of any principle or activity), (4) the act or process of developing a mine, site, estate, property, (5) the economic advancement of a region or people, especially one currently underdeveloped, and (6) gradual advancement through progressive stages. All of these various definitions are applicable in a discussion of development interventions in Senegal. Conventional definitions of development implicitly suggest that recipients of development aid are in an "elementary condition" and require outside influence to advance to their full economic and sociocultural potential – their perfect form. The Global North and multilateral development organizations deem development interventions necessary to ensure the progression of people living in "underdeveloped regions," including the Global South.

Development has become synonymous with organized economic growth, encouraged either by nations or multilateral development agencies. The development industry, or those agencies engaged in international development programs, includes institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), in addition to

independent consultants and professional experts on development. Those to be developed include the poor, the non-productive, the Third Word, the Global South, and those who are economically and politically less powerful.

Beginning in the 1980s, some scholars wrote critically of international development interventions. Post-structural theorists such as Gustavo Esteva believe that development is a loaded word that requires critical examination (3). Esteva argues that the Global North conceived of and perpetuated underdevelopment to legitimate American and European supremacy while simultaneously undervaluing the lives of billions of people in the Global South. Residents of the Global South "ceased being what they were, in all their diversity, and were transmogrified into an inverted mirror of others' reality: a mirror that belittles them and sends them off to the end of queue, a mirror that defines their identity, which is really that of a heterogeneous and diverse majority, simply in the terms of a homogenizing and narrow minority" (Esteva 2). "Fixing" underdevelopment through disbursements of development aid thus became an organizing principle of American and European foreign policy in the mid-twentieth century. Meanwhile, underdevelopment became a "life experience of subordination…discrimination, and subjugation" (Esteva 3). The metaphor of development, as employed by many Northern development "experts," consequently constructs an "Other" that has come to define the majority of global citizens; this process of epistemic violence ultimately silences subaltern groups such as the poor, women, and ethnic minorities by privileging organizational knowledge over local knowledge (Spivak). The word development itself will always be inextricably linked to the terms from which it originated – growth, evolution, and advancement.

Development insists that many “old ways” of living are now obstacles to progress. To overcome these behaviors, development experts must “dissect and reassemble” the “traditional” social fabric in order to rebuild cultures around patterns of accumulation. Development ideology insists not that societies have an economy but rather that societies become their economies (Sachs 29). Countries that follow the ideas of “proper” development then come to partially resemble the capitalist and consumerist societies of the Global North.

When discussing different methods of development intervention it is important to remember that the word “development” is itself an assertion of Northern hegemony and Southern marginalization. Although it is unlikely that development and its associated “industry” will disappear completely, it may be possible to pursue a course of development that minimizes some the development industry’s manipulative and disempowering qualities. Additionally, radical anti-development theorists have been unable to either challenge the norm of development or provide adequate solutions to poverty. How then, can concerned individuals address these problems? This thesis evaluates a small-scale, situated, and place-based participatory development program in hopes of learning new ways to address the problems of destitution and want without promoting marginalization.

Even with all of its limitations, it is impossible to abandon the dream of development. Residents of the Global North will continue to fulfill their philanthropic tendencies by donating money to nonprofits that participate in development interventions. The American public has not yet rejected the use of taxpayer money for foreign aid. In addition, it is generally considered immoral to deny food, shelter, education, and

infrastructure to those who need help. Most citizens of the Global South desire "development" in some form. It is important, however, to ensure that the development programs that organizations fund are appropriate, acceptable, and desirable for those at the receiving end of the development intervention.

In this thesis, I conduct an in-depth analysis of an organization – the Center for Renewable Energy and Appropriate Technology for the Environment (CREATE!) - that funds and generates a variety of participatory development projects in the West African nation of Senegal. I use this analysis as an illustrative case study of a small-scale and participant-focused development intervention in West Africa.

Situated and participatory development pushes back against the disempowering consequences of large-scale interventions such as infrastructure projects and agricultural modernization programs. Organizations such as CREATE! that specialize in participatory projects recognize the importance of indigenous landscape and situated knowledge and understanding. Similar interventions include and often privilege indigenous knowledge, including environmental knowledge, over the knowledge of international development "experts." For these reasons, small-scale and participatory projects might be more successful in producing lasting change in poor communities.

Thesis Overview

This section briefly describes the objectives that I will be addressing in this thesis. In Chapter II, I contextualize CREATE!'s development interventions with a brief history of development theory and practice, including historical practices specific to Senegal. In

this chapter, I also define and discuss participatory development. Chapter II concludes with a description of my research questions and objectives.

In Chapter III, I discuss the research methods that I used to evaluate CREATE! and the methodological approach upon which this thesis relies. Specifically, this chapter demonstrates the effectiveness of ethnographic research methods as part of development studies.

Chapter IV describes CREATE!'s organizational structure and personnel. In addition, this chapter designates the reasons by which CREATE!'s founders decided to intervene in Senegal. This chapter concludes with a brief discussion of CREATE!'s organizational mission.

Chapter V details CREATE!'s development methods and programs. In this chapter, I also describe CREATE!'s goals and objectives and the ways in which they monitor development outcomes.

Chapter VI contains the bulk of my analysis of CREATE!'s development interventions in Senegal. In this chapter, I use staff interviews and my own personal observations to describe (1) how CREATE! understands and responds to beneficiary needs through participatory development, (2) how participatory methods influence CREATE!'s programs, and (3) the organization's sense of success or failure in its work.

In my concluding chapter, I offer conclusions based upon this analysis. In addition, I include some policy recommendations for multilateral development organizations based upon my experiences with CREATE!

This thesis focuses on development interventions in Senegal. To provide context for this analysis, I have sometimes broadened the scope of my argument to include the

shared colonial and neo-colonial legacies of Africa and the Global South. Although each country (and each community) is different, a broad discussion of development theory that encompasses the Global South is necessary to fully understand the global impacts of theory on development practice. For this thesis, Senegal provides a case study that typifies the experience of development recipients throughout the Global South.

CHAPTER II

CONTEXTUALIZING THE CASE STUDY

This chapter includes a brief history of development theory and practice from World War II to the present. This chapter also reviews the complicated history of development practice and government intervention in Senegal. In this chapter, I also focus on a recent major trend in development theory and practice – participatory development. This chapter concludes with a discussion of my research questions and goals.

Development History, Theory, and Practice

Since the earliest days of European colonialism, the United States and countries in Western Europe have given financial assistance to the people and governments of Africa. Over the past 70 years, however, donor nations have codified their generosity into bilateral and multilateral aid organizations that have provided help in the form of official development assistance. A cottage industry of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), both small and large, has also emerged to contribute technical and financial assistance. Although the form and purpose of aid has evolved, its contributors and recipients have not. In the decades since the initial disbursement of foreign aid, both aid organizations and development NGOs have shadowed trends in development theory and practice; these major trends in industry practice have subsequently shaped the lives of development recipients across the Global South.

Prior to the twentieth century, however, it was rare for governments to give resources to citizens of another country, even in instances of famine and war. Interest in

foreign aid increased as Europe and the United States grew in wealth and their residents began vacationing in foreign colonies. In the 1920s, Western exposure to extreme poverty encouraged empires such as Great Britain and France to increase infrastructure spending in their African holdings. Britain's Colonial Development Act of 1929 provided grants for infrastructure projects across the continent. This act addressed agriculture, transportation, harbors, fisheries, the provision of electricity, and public health. At this time, the British government initiated the funding of loans and grants to support these types of infrastructure and development programs. Though the global economic depressions of the 1930s restricted spending in the colonies, Europeans gradually grew to accept the concept of their taxes subsidizing the needs of colonial subjects. Although the United States encouraged financial self-sufficiency in its territories, it did give small amounts of publicly financed development assistance to several Latin American countries during World War II. These initial disbursements supported political endeavors in that region (Lancaster 26-27). Large-scale development interventions did not really exist before the 1940s.

In July 1944, delegates from 44 countries met in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire to discuss the future of international financial and monetary management. This conference produced funds for the reconstruction of Europe in addition to the creation of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (later the World Bank), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the International Trade Organization. The Bretton Woods representatives gave the IMF the task of supervising the transfer of funds between nations (Moyo 10-12). Thus, these countries created the framework for the disbursement of international aid.

A series of labor strikes in British colonies in Africa and Asia in the 1930s and 1940s produced panic among colonial officials. Strikes were both an embarrassment to colonial authorities and a threat to economic development. In an attempt to quell strikes, the colonial government undertook programs of "economic development" aimed at providing infrastructure to allow for large and more efficient extraction and production (Cooper 31). Ultimately, these programs aimed to create an urban working class "capable of living in the city and producing a new generation of workers in the city, independent of the 'backward' countryside" (Cooper 34). These policies would, however, produce a complicated legacy.

The Second World War produced crises in colonial policy across the African continent. Colonization simultaneously impoverished the rural peasant class and produced an educated and urban bourgeois elite in countries such as Ghana, Nigeria, Senegal, and Kenya. Colonial officials believed in the ability of African farmers to participate in commercialized agriculture; these officials also assumed that African farmers relied on backward techniques. By the 1930s, agricultural workers had established programs to combat inadequate agricultural practices (Cooper 23). Meanwhile, the "self-conscious, professional Christian class" of urban West Africa began to protest the inequities of colonial rule. In Senegal, citizens of four cities (*communes*) that had lived under colonial rule for longer than the rest of the country gained most of the rights of French citizens while rural peasants had almost no rights at all (Cooper 25). Following French victory over the Axis Powers in 1945, members of the four *communes* capitalized on the anti-racist rhetoric of the Allies to question "the entire edifice of colonialism across Africa and its diaspora" (Cooper 26). Later colonial attempts at

development in Africa were consequently fumbling efforts at maintaining control over an increasingly restive population.

In 1944, General Charles de Gaulle and French officials divided colonial subjects into two categories: the *évolués* (Western educated Africans) and *paysans* (peasants). The French permitted the *évolués* to participate in elections; by 1945, 20 Africans had assumed seats in the legislature in Paris. Although the French had extended more rights to these "citizens", the French government insisted on centralized authority, ultimately giving Africans only a minority voice in the affairs of the empire. Rural "subjects," who had no access to citizenship or the democratic system, responded with a series of organized labor strikes in Dakar, Senegal. Wanting to stabilize labor relations, the French utilized French tax revenues to support the expansion of services in Senegal, including the introduction of schools, electricity, and piped water. By 1946, the French extended voting rights to some *paysans*; by 1956, suffrage in Senegal was universal (Cooper 43-45). Ultimately, development in Senegal was from the beginning tied to colonial definitions of citizenship and belonging.

The multifaceted colonial and developmental history of Africa has produced a continent that defies simple definitions. Many scholars define Africa using its shared political history of oppression at the hands of slave traders, European colonial powers, and multinational corporations and political organizations (Cooper 13). Development in Africa was once a colonial problem but is now a national one; the development idea, however, has retained its "belief that 'experts' should make decisions for others" (Cooper 16).

The modernization theory of development governed aid disbursements and development practice, including USAID grants, for much of the twentieth century. Early sociological theorists, guided by the tenets of social Darwinism and environmental determinism, claimed that culture could be an impediment to economic development. Talcott Parsons, a sociologist, believed that social and economic development occurred through variation and differentiation from simple social forms such as hunter-gatherer societies, to complex and modern social forms, such as industrial societies. In this classification, modern societies exhibit specialization in economic activities, growth in markets, urbanization, social mobility, education, democracy, the weakening of traditional elites, and secularization (Peet and Hardwick 103). Modernization can occur not just to economies but also to social and cultural systems.

Development specialists saw modernization as a spatial diffusion process, originating at points of contact with Europeans. In the 1960s, development experts applied aspects of modernization theory to development policy and practice. Indices of modernization included the development of transportation networks, the expansion of communication and media sources, urbanization, the breakdown of "traditional" "ethnic" ties, the emergence of a market economy, the development of formal Western-style education, participation in community groups, and geographic mobility (Peet and Hardwick 130). Consequently, aid disbursement during this time focused on projects that would modernize infrastructure and promote free market economic practices. During the 1960s, aid subsidies focused on the construction of large-scale industrial projects such as hydroelectric dams and highway systems (Moyo 14). Many newly independent African countries aligned themselves with either the United States or the Soviet Union, thus

securing a source of development assistance for the next 30 years. In 1970, the USSR and the Peoples' Republic of China each gave $1.1 billion in aid to poor countries (Lancaster 31). This era of development practice is now known as the "big push," implying that the Global South at this time needed coordinated economic expansion and the intervention of the sate in development planning (Peet and Hartwick 78). A fundamental belief in the ability of countries to economically and socially modernize still characterizes many development projects in the Global South.

In the 1970s, wealthy oil-producing nations gave more to international banks. The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund eagerly lent this money to developing countries at extremely low interest rates. In addition to providing extra resources, the embargo produced economic recessions and high food prices in many African countries. Multilateral development organizations recognized the increase in poverty among many countries in the Global South; consequently, donor nations shifted their funding from infrastructure projects to poverty alleviation programs. New projects included resources for agriculture and rural development, social services, mass inoculation programs, adult literacy campaigns, and food aid. The proportion of aid directed towards programs for the poor rose from five percent in the late 1970s to 50 percent in the early 1980s (Moyo 15-16). By the end of the 1970s, multilateral development agencies controlled the majority of aid disbursements.

Under Robert McNamara in the 1970s, the World Bank grew in size and changed its objectives. McNamara's ultimate goal was to raise the productivity of the poor so that they could join the international economic market. World Bank aid thus pursued both rapid economic growth and a reduction in absolute poverty. Examples of these programs

include food distribution, the provision of water and other basic necessities, and the promotion of industrial-style agriculture (Peet and Hartwick 88). Within a few years, however, international economic policies shifted again.

Even as aid payments to Africa grew, public satisfaction with aid in donor countries was declining. By 1980, the continent had received a total of $36 billion in foreign assistance. The recession of 1982 caused several countries to default on their IMF and World Bank loans. In response, the IMF created the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, which lent money to defaulted nations so that they could repay what they owed. During the 1980s, neoliberal political philosophers encouraged African nations to embrace the free market, lower trade tariffs and taxes, and privatize national corporations (Moyo 17-21). Neoliberal development theories overwhelmingly continue to characterize development practice today.

Neoliberal economists believed that “imperfect market mechanisms do better, in practice, than imperfect state planning mechanisms” (Peet and Hartwick 75-76). This revival of nineteenth century liberal economic characteristics such as free trade is called neoliberalism. Neoliberalism dominated international politics and development policy in the 1980s; by the end of the decade, neoliberal ideas were standard in international economic policy.

In 1989, a group of American politicians, members of international financial institutions, and economists from think tanks crafted a set of policies intended to guide the economies of Southern debtor countries. The major tenets of this Washington Consensus include (1) fiscal discipline and reduction of national deficits, (2) reduction in public expenditures, (3) tax reform, including cuts to marginal tax rates, (4) market-

determined interest rates, (5) competitive exchange rates, (6) trade liberalization and the elimination of quantitative restrictions on imports, (7) the encouragement of foreign direct investment, (8) the privatization of state enterprises, (9) economic deregulation, and (10) the establishment of secure and well-defined property rights (Peet and Hartwick 85-86). Under the tenure of A.W. Clawson, the World Bank also altered its policies to reflect neoliberal economics and the Washington Consensus. At this point, the World Bank concluded that the key problems facing Africa were low economic growth, poor agricultural performance, rapid population growth, and problematic economic policies; in addition, many African countries owed external debt for previous development loans (Peet and Hartwick 88). The World Bank and the IMF decided that these deficits provided an ideal opportunity for the intervention of international financial institutions. This is yet another example of the propensity of the World Bank and other multilateral development organizations to unilaterally determine the causes of African "problems" and their solutions.

Both private and public multilateral banks continued to loan money to debtor nations, including loans to cover the costs of previously incurred debt. Consequently, many countries spiraled into economic crises. The World Bank and IMF then encouraged debt restructuring while imposing structural adjustment conditions to receive restructured loans (Peet and Hartwick 88). Examples of structural adjustment conditions include the privatization of publicly owned companies and reductions in government spending; the majority of structural adjustment policies followed the tenets of the Washington Consensus (Peet and Hartwick 89-90). Poor countries received budgetary support and in return agreed to free market principles. Many states minimized the role of

the state by reducing the civil service. For example, between 1989 and 1996 six African countries each lost more than ten percent of their civil society workforce (Moyo 21). These mass layoffs in turn contributed to further unemployment and poverty. Structural adjustment did not produce economic growth or poverty alleviation. Instead, exposure to the global capitalism market resulted in weak economic performance, increased poverty and unemployment, and additional debt.

In 2002, President George W. Bush made the first major change to United States aid policy since the Kennedy administration. In a speech to the Inter-American Development Bank, the president claimed that giving aid was a moral imperative of the United States and announced that he would increase development assistance by 50 percent over the next five years, resulting in a five billion dollar annual increase over 2002 levels. These additional funds are associated with the Millennium Challenge Account (USAID, "A History"). The United Nations Millennium Development Goals for the year 2015 include halving the proportion of people who live on less than a dollar a day, ensuring environmental sustainability, and achieving universal primary education, among other objectives (Lancaster 55). Much of the current aid disbursements to Africa are in pursuit of these goals.

As evidenced by this short description of development policy and practice in the twentieth century, trends are an important part of the disbursement of foreign aid. The following section will delineate the most recent trend in development practice - participatory development.

The Promise of Participatory Development

The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines participation as "the action or fact of partaking, having or forming a part of" (Rahnema 127). Individuals tend to understand participation as a free exercise; participation can, however, be "either transitive or intransitive; moral, amoral, or immoral; either forced or free; either manipulative or spontaneous" (Rahnema 127). Development agencies first used the terms participation and participatory in the late 1950s; at that time activists and development professionals were advocating for alternatives to failed top-down policies and practices. By the early 1970s the World Bank recognized that its programs were not enriching the lives of the poor. In the 1970s, planners, NGOs, and development professionals concluded that many development projects had failed because they had excluded local people. The UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and other agencies recommended that member states "adopt participation as a basic policy measure in national development strategies" (Rahnema 128). Over time, participatory development projects have become the predominant method of including the voices of beneficiaries in development interventions. Today, the World Bank and other development agencies continue to promote participation as a vital component of successful and dynamic development interventions.

Encouraging recipient participation during development interventions is *currently* popular among development professionals for several reasons. First, governments and institutions no longer view participation as a threat; the majority of participatory development projects benefit national governments through the strengthening of the administration, communication services, and infrastructure. Participation is also a

politically attractive slogan and is a good fundraising device for development organizations. Donors prefer to give to organizations that devote the majority of their funds to recipients rather than bureaucrats. Many development professionals also believe that participatory programs are more efficient and cost effective. For example, rather than hiring contractors to build a school, development officials could instead encourage local residents to “participate” in the construction. There is no need to pay wages for this work because the school is itself a “gift” to the recipient community. These projects also appeal to those who want development organizations to bypass government in favor of individuals and the private sector (Rahnema 129-130). Participatory projects have the capacity to empower the poor while permitting development agencies to retain proprietary control over development projects.

Some scholars (Rahnema; Unwin; Peet and Hartwick) see participation as the best alternative to bureaucratic and top-down programs. Typically, participatory projects give development recipients an opportunity to participate in all activities related to their development. Participation expresses the will of the majority and is a way for development recipients to attain social, cultural, and economic goals in a humane and equitable manner. Some programs also permit people to organize themselves in way to best meet their desired objectives (Rahnema 132). Participatory development is a human-centered alternative approach to large-scale infrastructure and economic projects. Popular participatory models attempt to cognitively redefine development by incorporating local knowledge and cultural traditions. Participation can also politically empower targets of development interventions (Rahnema 133). After decades of failure,

development professionals used participatory practices to continually legitimate their policy choices.

There are two major types of participatory development practices. First, development agencies can include civil society in policy developments and agenda setting, thus promoting some (limited) local ownership of international interventions. Second, some agencies practice Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA) to promote local community empowerment (Kapoor 1203). There are both positive and negative implications for both of these methods of participatory development.

PRA is one participatory development method that development agencies and NGOs use to conduct research and introduce projects to beneficiary communities. PRA scholars claim that traditional development practices failed because they ignored the "complexities of the socioeconomic and cultural contexts in which indigenous livelihood and production systems function" (Binns et al. 1). PRA enables local people to share, enhance, and analyze their knowledge of their daily life and conditions. PRA scholars encourage development professionals to engage in direct observation and participation in targeted communities, including food preparation and agricultural work. Professionals should also meet with community leaders, discuss community goals and problems with residents, and model potential solutions with residents using local materials, among other activities (Binns et al. 4). Ultimately, development agencies only generate program ideas after extensively studying each individual community targeted for intervention. PRA can improve the quality of information available to planners while simultaneously improving communications between members and outsiders. The act of PRA itself can be a means of establishing trust between NGOs and citizens (Mosse, "Authority" 569). Conducting

PRA programs can be difficult. Some information gathered through PRAs can be problematic because they are produced in a social context where the influence of power and gender inequality is likely to be great (Mosse, "Authority" 577). Regardless of these problems, PRA is a good method of incorporating community needs and desires into small-scale development interventions.

Other development scholars have criticized or even rejected participatory development as an adequate alternative to top-down projects. Participatory development can ignore or reinforce patriarchal structures in targeted communities; these types of programs can also fail to address class inequalities or the negative impacts of local or international socioeconomic structures (Kapoor 1204). In the abstract, participatory development is both benevolent and neutral. In practice, participatory development projects can reflect the desires of development agencies more than those of residents. Kapoor claims that participatory development is "a vehicle for us to try and resolve real or imagined liberal democratic deficiencies" (1208). Participatory projects also tend to glamorize village communities or view local communities in isolation from broader economic and political structures, thus underplaying the context of community economic and social conditions. Villages are not monolithic and it may be difficult for residents to come to consensus decisions on development projects. Consensus decisions can ignore or suppress community differences and tensions (Kapoor 1210). Consequently, participatory development programs might not reflect the needs and desires of the entire community. Other agencies use popular participation as a measure of success and a condition for donor approval, rather than monitoring the outcomes of projects (Williams 563).

Despite these problems, participatory development can open new spaces for political action. PRA practices can successfully mobilize local capacities for self-management of development projects (Williams 559). The accomplishments of participatory development projects depend on the diligence of development professionals in creating interventions based on local conditions using the input and participation of development recipients at all stages of the process. Mosse claims that the most successful development professionals generate their practices by dwelling in targeted communities for extended periods of time. Development practice will always privilege Northern professionals, who will always retain power over recipients. Participatory development can give the poor a place and a voice within the development system; ultimately though, participation can only grant "power to" develop, not "power over" development.

Research Questions

Although development organizations have been active in Senegal (and throughout the Global South) for fifty years, the country still suffers from poverty and other problems. Why do development interventions continue to fail at alleviating poverty in Senegal? What can another analysis of a (relatively) new organization contribute to the discussion of development?

According to some post-structural and Marxist scholars, neoliberal models of economic development promote "Western" norms of development and modernity while simultaneously undermining indigenous cultural and economic traditions. According to this type of analysis, development interventions funded and undertaken by multilateral

developmental agencies are a new form of cultural and economic imperialism. Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o claims that African reality is a struggle between imperialist traditions and resistance traditions. Modern imperialism in African includes a culture of "apemanship and parrotry" in which members of Africa's rural classes imitate residents of the Global North. In contrast, peasants, students, intellectuals, and progressives resist imperialism through art, democracy, and grassroots actions. Ngũgĩ claims that the extensive debt that African nations owe the IMF and the World Bank represent a new imperialism that strips Africans of their real economic, political, military, cultural, and psychological wealth. Ngũgĩ writes of imperialism's most effective weapon: "the effect of the cultural bomb is to annihilate a people's belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves" (3). For Ngũgĩ, then, Africa's most critical problem is not poverty or corruption but rather the cultural bomb of imperialism that has resulted in a colonization of the mind. Loans for large-scale development interventions further indebt African governments while communicating to recipients of development aid that indigenous cultures and methods of agriculture and commerce are damaging and inferior.

Beginning in the 1980s, development theorists rejected neoliberal models of economic development in favor of Marxist and post-structural critiques of the development "industry" and its practices. Scholars such as James Ferguson and Arturo Escobar have produced extensive theoretical and empirical case study analyses of multilateral development projects and policies. In the past ten years, multilateral development agencies have started adjusting procedures to reflect earlier trends in development scholarship. Many agencies, including the USAID and the World Bank,

have recently professed a commitment to participatory and grassroots development schemes. In conjunction with the World Bank, governments receiving development loans prepare Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) that describe the countries' long-term development visions, including macroeconomic, structural, and social policy goals. Because the PRSP process includes stakeholders such as business leaders and members of civil society organizations, the World Bank claims that the program is inclusive and participatory.

The World Bank uses PRSP as a means of enhancing recipient government accountability for poverty reduction reform efforts and increasing coordination between multilateral development agencies and NGOs. Because of this trend in practice, it is likely that, in the near future, multilateral and bilateral aid agencies will devote more funding to participatory development projects rather than traditional large-scale infrastructure and agricultural development projects (World Bank, "Country Strategies"). Assuming that NGOs and multilateral development organizations continue to fund development interventions, it is important to understand the most efficacious methods of "participatory" interventions. The World Bank can draw on the knowledge and experiences of NGOs to strengthen the capacity of their participatory PRSP programs.

Although many scholars (Mosse; Ferguson; Escobar) have published critiques of large-scale development projects during the past two decades, there is less theoretical or empirical scholarship that focuses on small, NGO-led participatory development projects. It is important for scholars and development practitioners to analyze existing participatory projects in anticipation of a more general shift towards these types of practices. Additional case study analyses of participatory and grassroots development

projects might also encourage multilateral development agencies to evaluate and amend their own practices.

This thesis explores the work of CREATE!, an organization that funds and implements rural and community-based projects that address the increasingly devastating impacts of climate change in Senegal. CREATE! has institutional goals that are radically different than those of the World Bank and other multilateral organizations. CREATE! staff rely on innovative participatory development practices. My thesis offers an illustrative case study of a United States-based development organization that funds participatory and small-scale development interventions in Senegal. Broadly, as part of this analysis I hope to understand how CREATE! responds to beneficiary needs through a participatory process. I determine how the inclusion of participatory practices influences CREATE!'s development interventions. I also use interviews with CREATE! staff to evaluate their sense of organizational success or failure in alleviating poverty and promoting economic and environmental sustainability in rural Senegal. Finally, I attempt through this thesis to offer policy recommendations to multilateral development organizations based on the experiences of CREATE!

Multilateral development agencies and development critics valorize participatory and grassroots development projects. In the past few years, the World Bank and other multilateral organizations have devoted additional financial resources to this type of project. It is important that scholars investigate and analyze participatory and grassroots projects in anticipation of further expansion in this field. My thesis addresses the current lack of analyses of participatory development projects, with the intention of both

contributing to the knowledge of these programs and applying this new information to the future of development practice.

CHAPTER III

AN ETHNOGRAPHY OF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICE

This brief chapter describes the materials and methods through which I investigate and evaluate CREATE!'s participatory development interventions. Primarily, I rely on David Mosse's reflections on development practice through ethnographic and participant research in his book *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice.* This book is especially relevant due to the hands-on research methods that I used when gathering materials on CREATE!

Material Evidence on CREATE!

For this thesis, I chose to analyze CREATE!'s development interventions in Senegal. As an undergraduate, I studied abroad in The Gambia, a small country that borders Senegal. While in The Gambia, I traveled extensively through Senegal and became acquainted with many environmental and development issues that plagued both countries. In September 2012, I took a Wolof language course with Louise Ruhr and Robin Weil, two of CREATE!'s staff members based in Eugene. I decided to intern with CREATE! because I was interested in the organization's approach to development interventions.

For my analysis of CREATE!, I interned with the nonprofit for eight months as a means of understanding its organizational approach to development policy and practice. In addition to firsthand experiences and observations, I conducted a textual analysis of documents concerning CREATE!'s development interventions. I use a combination of newsletters, grant proposals, reports, webpages, photographs, and interviews to evaluate

the work of CREATE! I also use primary documents from the World Bank for comparison purposes in this paper, including webpages, technical reports, and data sources. Although I was not able to travel to Senegal to conduct research, I did have access to testimonials and interviews with participants in CREATE!'s programs.

Evaluating Development NGOs

Within the field of development studies, a group of (mostly) anthropologists has conducted a series of ethnographic studies that focus on different types of international development interventions. This section will briefly describe this tradition of ethnographic work in relation to my own research for this thesis.

Although many scholars have published critiques of large-scale development projects during the past two decades, there is less theoretical or empirical scholarship that focuses on small, NGO-led participatory development projects. Mosse does address the ability of actors within the development industry to implement and alter development theory. Mosse argues that "subordinate actors in the field," including villagers, fieldworkers, and office staff, create "spheres of action autonomous from the organizing policy models" (Mosse, *Cultivating* 10). He claims that development interventions are driven not by general policies but rather by the exigencies of organizations and the need to maintain relationships between development "experts" and those who are receiving development assistance. Development consultants frame knowledge, discourse, and legitimization for allocating sets of resources in particular ways (Mosse, *Cultivating* 45). For example, using Mosse's model, CREATE! staff do not design and implement programs around participatory development theory. In contrast, CREATE! fieldworkers

make decisions based on the needs and desires of the organization and discussions with program recipients; their programs, however, tend to follow many of the aspects of grassroots participatory development theories.

Mosse's book also has important methodological implications for this paper. Mosse uses an ethnographic approach to his evaluation of a United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) project in India. An ethnography of development rejects the "monolithic notions of dominance, resistance, hegemonic relations, and the implication of false consciousness among the developed (or developers)" (Mosse, *Cultivating* 6). This type of ethnography also draws on James Scott's idea of hidden transcripts, or the lived experiences of development aid recipients that exist separately from the public transcripts of development policy. Using Scott's ideas, Mosse claims that development recipients sometimes feign their acceptance of development interventions while simultaneously sabotaging their progress. Development ethnographers also understand that governance brought by development schemes cannot be imposed but instead requires collaboration and compromise.

Anthropologists write from "inside development." Ethnographic research occurs not just in, but also as part of, the development process. Ethnographers must also "explore rather than conceal" personal connections and affinities that tie them to their subject (Mosse, *Cultivating* 11). For Mosse's research, he acted as both an observer and a participant in the development process during the ten-year DFID project in India.

Like Mosse, I am both an observer of CREATE! and a participant in their development interventions. As an intern with CREATE!, I conducted program research and assisted staff in raising money from donors. I am both tied to and invested in the

success of CREATE!'s development interventions. My analysis of their work, consequently, requires me to question my beliefs about development and my place within the industry as both a scholar and participant. I also better understand the complexity of development 'success' and 'failure' and the ways that organizations can use language to demonstrate either. Mosse writes,

> While I draw from the stories of other actors, it is my experience, values and interpretations, my self-critical…judgments, my historical sense derived from being part of the design team, and my continuing involvement that impose coherence; it is my narrative that becomes the meta-narrative. Mine is an interested interpretation not a scientific judgment; it adds interpretations to those of actors whose experience I share. (14)

While I did not spend ten years conducting the research for this thesis, I can sympathize with Mosse's views. This paper represents my attempt at conducting an ethnography of a small international NGO with which I have worked for eight months. All opinions here are my own and are thus subject to my own interpretations and biases. In this paper, I have tried to include the voices of both CREATE! staff and intervention recipients in hopes of offering other interpretations as well.

My insider perspective is actually an advantage for my analysis of this development organization. My extensive ethnographic and participant research with CREATE! afforded me the opportunity to understand and translate the organization's perspectives, goals, and outcomes into a comprehensive organizational evaluation.

CHAPTER IV

CREATE! AS ORGANIZATION

The Center for Renewable Energy and Appropriate Technology for the Environment (CREATE!) is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization that addresses the felt needs of the residents of six communities in rural Senegal. This chapter describes CREATE!'s organizational structure and introduces CREATE!'s primary staff members. In addition, this chapter discusses the reasons that CREATE! has decided to intervene in rural Senegal.

Organizational Structure

CREATE!'s organizational structure reflects its unique approach to development interventions. CREATE! Founder Barry Wheeler, who has years of experience working with development and refugee organizations in Africa, established CREATE! in 2008 as an alternative to already existing development organizations. CREATE! staff strive to help rural populations in Sub-Saharan Africa "cope with water, food, and fuel shortages resulting from the impact of climate change on their communities" (CREATE!, "About"). CREATE! staff work with rural Senegalese communities to identify and meet their basic needs in three sectors: (1) water, (2) food, and (3) energy and environment. CREATE! staff use a "participatory development approach" and "appropriate technologies" in all of their programs. Staff members work with local communities to increase access to water and food, introduce new income generating activities, instruct residents in the construction of alternative cook stoves, and establish tree nurseries to provide fuelwood, living fences, and reforestation (CREATE!, "About").

Four individuals work in CREATE!'s Eugene office: Barry Wheeler, Louise Ruhr, Robin Weil, and Liz Martin. Barry Wheeler, CREATE! Founder and Executive Director, has spent the past 28 years working to alleviate suffering and to provide basic human needs for rural villagers, displaced persons, and refugees in several countries in Sub-Saharan Africa. After serving in the Peace Corps for six years as an Appropriate Technology volunteer, trainer, and technical advisor in Togo, Barry earned a Master's degree in International Agriculture and Rural Development from Cornell University. Barry has served as Country Director for the American Refugee Committee's programs in Uganda, Sudan, and Rwanda; as a consultant for UNICEF and UNHCR; and as a team leader and training coordinator in local capacity building, renewable and appropriate technology, and sustainable rural development.

Louise Ruhr, who is the Chief Operations Officer, oversees the implementation of program activities and handles finances and administration. She has more than 26 years of private sector and nonprofit management experience and has spent the past ten years working with international NGOs, including the American Refugee Committee, to support women's cooperative groups in Rwanda and Senegal. Robin Weil, who is a Development Associate, handles fundraising and donor communications and serves as office manager. Robin spent more than twenty years working for a public utility company on energy conservation initiatives and programs for low-income families. In 2009 and 2010, she worked with the American Refugee Committee in Rwanda to implement and coordinate alternative cook stove and cooperative garden projects. Liz Martin, CREATE!'s Director of Individual Donor Development, engages in fundraising and public relations, writes press releases, maintains the donor management system, and

updates CREATE!'s social media accounts. Liz has a background in nonprofit management and fundraising with several nonprofit organizations in Florida. I am also currently supporting CREATE!'s Eugene-based staff through part-time research and grant writing.

CREATE! also has an office in Gossas, Senegal. Country Director Omar Ndiaye Seck, who is Senegalese, oversees programs and operations at the local level. He also engages in strategic direction, planning and implementing activities, and monitors and evaluates CREATE!'s programs. He manages CREATE!'s finances and staff in Senegal. CREATE! also has three Senegalese field technicians that work and teach in beneficiary communities: agro-foresters Macky Ndour and Ibrahima Ndiaye, and Field Assistant Abdou Baa. In the Gossas office, CREATE! employs a logistic assistant who also serves as a solar power technician; and support staff including guards and cleaners (Martin; Ruhr; Weil). The Eugene and Gossas offices are in regular communication via phone and Skype. The Chief Operations Officer travels to Senegal approximately twice each year to review progress in beneficiary villages.

CREATE! in Senegal

CREATE!'s Senegal program, which was initiated in 2008, includes six villages in two regions of Senegal. CREATE! decided to work in Senegal because of need and established connections with local Senegalese officials. CREATE! works in the village of Ouarkhokh in the northern Louga Region and in five villages in the central-west Fatick Region (see Appendix). These six villages have a total population of approximately

12,000 people, comprised of agricultural Wolofs and pastoral Puelhs (CREATE!, "About"). The average annual household income for these villages is $350.

CREATE! works in Senegal because residents of rural Senegal suffer from the combined effects of poverty and global climate change. Senegal is a former French colony in West Africa that has been independent since 1960. According to the World Bank, Senegal has a population of approximately 13 million individuals, of which almost half are under the age of 14. (World Bank, "Senegal"). The Senegalese economy grew by an average of four percent since 2000. Currently, Senegal's GDP is $27.01 billion (2012 US dollars) and its GDP per capita is $2,100 (2012 US dollars). Senegal relies heavily on donor assistance and foreign direct investment. Its key exports include phosphates, fertilizer products, and seafood. Important economic sectors in Senegal include groundnuts, fisheries, tourism, and services. Senegal's major agricultural products are groundnuts, millet, corn, sorghum, rice, cotton, tomatoes, green vegetables, cattle, poultry, pigs, and fish. About 77 percent of Senegal's labor force works informally in the agricultural sector.

Over 40 percent of the Senegalese population lives in urban areas, including the capital of Dakar. About half of the population is unemployed at any given time; Senegal's unemployment rate is one of the highest in the world. It is important to note, however, that official unemployment numbers do not account for individuals engaged in subsistence agriculture or those who participate in the informal economy. Examples of informal work include selling food or other items in the market. The informal sector accounts for about 60 percent of Senegal's GDP.

Slightly more than half of the Senegalese population remains in rural areas. The rural population is composed mainly of women, the elderly, and small children. Due to a lack of economic opportunities in rural Senegal, many men and adolescents have migrated to Dakar and other urban areas to look for work. Consequently, the urban population is growing at three times the rate of the rural population (Scheffran et al.). As many urban workers migrate seasonally to Dakar to look for work, the composition of the rural population varies throughout the year.

Climate change is also impacting the livelihoods of the residents of rural Senegal. In 2007, the United Nations organized a conference on global climate change that included over 500 NGOs from 80 countries. Conference delegates concluded that global climate change "is potentially the most series threat humanity and our environment have ever faced" (Wheeler and Ruhr 5). Climate change threatens the global availability of food, water, energy, and transport. According to former UN Deputy Secretary-General Asha-Rose Migiro, "for one-third of the world's population living in dry lands, especially those in my home continent Africa, changing weather patterns threaten to exacerbate desertification, drought, and food insecurity" (Wheeler and Ruhr 5). Senegal is representative of many Sub-Saharan African countries suffering from the impacts of climate change.

In Senegal, both droughts and floods have become more common and more extreme. Many climate models show increases in the overall number of drought years and in the number of days in which the temperature is above 91 degrees F. This is an important temperature because above 91 degrees F cereal crops suffer major physiological damage. By the end of the century, some models predict an average annual

rainfall of about one inch less per year (Mertz et al.). Rural Senegalese villages, which are already under stress, are "increasingly subjected to the aggravated inter-connected effects of global climate change, threatening their access to water, their ability to grow sufficient food, their health, their livelihoods, their way of life and their lives" (Wheeler and Ruhr 5).

Global climate change is affecting rural communities across Sub-Saharan Africa, including Senegal, causing shortages of water and food, reducing agricultural productivity, and bringing about widespread deforestation forcing some rural residents to flee to urban areas to survive. Even small changes in climate can have profound implications for agriculture and other life-sustaining activities in rural Senegal. Scientists predict that the amount of arid and semi-arid regions in West Africa will increase over the next two decades as the Sahara Desert migrates south into the Sahel. Climate change will subsequently produce additional pressures on water availability, accessibility, and water demand. Many water tables have dropped, rendering some wells inaccessible (Gueye; Fischer et al.). As the Senegalese population increases, so does demand for limited water resources.

In rural Senegal, where the population relies heavily on subsistence agriculture for survival, the consequences of climate change are particularly troubling. Almost all Senegalese farmers rely exclusively on rainfall to water crops. Scientists also predict a shorter growing season for much of Senegal. By 2050, the World Bank predicts that yields of many cash and subsistence crops will significantly decline (Khouma et al). Many subsistence farmers already struggle to adequately feed their families, even a small decline in cereal yields could result in starvation.

At the 2007 UN-sponsored NGO conference on climate change, Deputy Secretary-General Migiro told delegates that the UN relies on its partnership with the NGO community "in virtually everything the world body does. The United Nations depends upon the advocacy skills, creative resources, and grassroots reach of civil society organizations in all our work" (Wheeler and Ruhr 5). At this conference, the United Nations asked NGOs to assist the multilateral organization in mitigating the impacts of climate change on communities in the Global South. CREATE! recognizes the need for grassroots civil society to intervene in Senegal to mitigate the consequences of climate change and reduce poverty.

In CREATE!'s initial planning documents, staff members Barry Wheeler and Louise Ruhr claim that they have the knowledge, skills, and experience to constructively respond to the inter-dependent crises of poverty and climate change in rural areas through "a strategy that decreases dependency on fossil fuels and increases the use of renewable energy and appropriate technologies for a more sustainable human needs-based development at the village level" (Wheeler and Ruhr 6). CREATE! funds development programs in rural Senegal that address water provision, local food production, energy, hygiene and sanitation, income generation, and environmental protection and maintenance. All of these issues are closely connected to global climate change. While many NGOs work to alleviate suffering brought about by conflict, natural disasters, and poverty, CREATE! focuses its efforts exclusively on programs that mitigate the impacts of climate change while addressing basic needs.

CHAPTER V

"USING A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH AND APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGIES": CREATE! PROGRAMS IN SENEGAL

This chapter details CREATE!'s programs in rural Senegal. I will begin this chapter by outlining CREATE!'s mission and vision for establishing development interventions. After describing CREATE!'s program areas in detail, this chapter also summarizes the organization's goals and objectives. I conclude this chapter by discussing the strategies that CREATE! staff use to monitor and evaluate the organization's development interventions in Senegal.

Mission

CREATE! staff members, many of whom have worked for the organization since its creation in 2008, use detailed founding documents to guide development programs in Senegal. The mission of CREATE! is:

> To assist indigenous rural populations in developing countries in improving the conditions of their lives through the application of renewable energy and small-scale technologies that are appropriate to the local environment and which employ methods and strategies of community self-development that are likewise appropriate, based on local organization, participation, and social mobilization to maximize self-reliance and self-sufficiency. (Wheeler and Ruhr 1)

CREATE!'s underlying philosophy includes respecting local cultures and traditions, acknowledging and building on "local knowledge," responding to the felt needs of rural communities with techniques and technologies that are appropriate to their local conditions and that can empower them, and acting as a partner in helping to build local capacity and meet basic human needs (Wheeler and Ruhr 3). From observation, I have concluded the CREATE! staff typically define "local knowledge" as an individual or

community understanding of agricultural and technological practices that existed in recipient villages just prior to CREATE! interventions.

The organization recognizes the consequences of global climate change on the livelihoods of rural Africans and attempts, through its development interventions, to ameliorate these consequences by investing in water, food, and fuel sources. Climate change is connected to the exacerbation of many problems in Senegal, including malnutrition, lack of potable water, decreasing health, increasing scarcity of fuelwood, decreasing capacity for animal husbandry, increasing poverty, urbanization, and the disintegration of "traditional village life" (Wheeler and Ruhr 1). CREATE! believes that reliance on increasingly scarce fossil fuels, including diesel and kerosene, for energy, lighting, transportation, and generators also contributes to poverty and other issues in rural areas because many rural Senegalese cannot afford to purchase these expensive fuels. Reliance on fossil fuels also results in dependence on unreliable, unstable, and inequitable international markets. CREATE! attempts to address these "inter-connected crises" through an integrated strategy that reduces reliance on fossil fuels while increasing the use of renewable energy and "appropriate" technologies.

According to CREATE! founder Barry Wheeler, technology does not exist separately from values but rather reflects the values of those that shaped the technology. Elite minorities can monopolize the power of some technologies. These technologies are often capital intensive and use relatively little labor; replace the work of humans; operate only on a large scale; centralize production and operation; are complex, expensive, and "difficult to understand;" require changes in culture and traditions; and create and maintain dependencies on foreign consultants, capital, and resources. According to

Wheeler, examples of inappropriate technologies range from mechanized agricultural equipment to expensive, manufactured cook stoves. In contrast, appropriate technologies decentralize power; require little capital and are more labor intensive; are tools that help humans do work; work well on a small scale; are accessible; are simple, cheap, and easy to understand and manipulate; adapt and respect local culture; and promote self-reliance, participation, and local control (Wheeler). Through its development interventions in Senegal, CREATE! hopes to rely solely on appropriate technologies that empower rather than stifle local people and their abilities.

This false dichotomy of "inappropriate" versus "appropriate" is reductive and makes assumptions about culture in rural Senegal. Local culture is not static; change happens both organically and through interactions with other cultures. For example, cultural practices in Wolof communities in rural Senegal have reacted to encounters with French colonial officials and other ethnic groups. For this reason, it is difficult to determine which types of change are "good" or "bad" for rural communities.

CREATE! strives to promote "good" development in their target villages. What, however, is "good" development? Barry Wheeler believes that "good" development encourages self-reliance and sustainability, builds local capacity and skills, and empowers people to locally solve their own problems. CREATE! staff design interventions that attempt to accomplish these goals (Wheeler). Wheeler identifies several factors that are present in "good" development interventions. First, development organizations should respect local cultures, traditions, and habits. Tradition, however, is not easy to define. CREATE! staff seem to define "tradition" using cultural and economic activities that have *recently* characterized life in rural Senegal. Unfortunately,

these practices are themselves the result of centuries of cultural change. It is therefore problematic to preface development interventions on a simplistic definition of existing practice.

CREATE! believes that development professionals should “start where they [project recipients] are,” meaning that interventions should use the most basic technologies available. Ideally, development professionals should design agricultural or household strategies that are already familiar to the development recipients. Development organizations should also avoid creating dependence, which can be debilitating, disrespectful, and disempowering. All technologies should be simple, easy to understand and implement, and low cost. In addition, all development interventions should occur in response to felt needs. During interviews, CREATE! staff indicate that they wanted communities to complete projects because communities wanted change, not because CREATE! wanted the communities to act differently (Ruhr). Barry Wheeler strongly believes that development recipients will not adopt new technologies if they do not understand or like the new technologies. Finally, Wheeler indicates that villagers should have a stake in the process; development interventions should ultimately be self-sustaining so that development recipients have ownership over the intervention (Wheeler). CREATE! staff design interventions to last approximately five years, with the understanding that communities should be able to sustain the programs themselves after that period (Weil). CREATE! staff repeatedly indicated that they pursue interventions designed to produce lasting change in targeted communities (Ruhr). Generally, appropriate technology and “good” development interventions respect human potential; they are neither violent to humans nor to the environment. This type of intervention uses

renewable resources, adapts to the needs and resources of the locality, and seeks to serve and benefit the people in whatever capacity serves them best.

CREATE! Programs

CREATE! staff members work with local communities to expand and rehabilitate village wells; build low cost cisterns for in-ground water collection and storage; establish vegetable gardens and tree nurseries that efficiently use available water; and utilize renewable solar energy to pump water from wells into cisterns. In the food sector, CREATE! offers comprehensive training in year-round sustainable crop cultivation as a means of restoring productivity to unused agricultural land. CREATE! communities have established cooperative community vegetable gardens that yield food for sale and for household use. CREATE! addresses energy problems by teaching community members to construct and use fuel-efficient cook stoves made from free, local materials and establishing tree nurseries to provide fuelwood, living fences, and reforestation (CREATE!, “About”).

CREATE! partners with communities that approach the nonprofit organization and request development interventions or communities that CREATE! invites to participate in the program. Potential beneficiary communities sign a *protocole d’accord* (contract) with CREATE! in which the community agrees to repay a percentage of CREATE!’s financial input, promise to deliver community labor and participation at each stage of the project, and agree to provide security at project installation sites. CREATE! provides the initial inputs for the projects. Communities then give CREATE! a percentage of their earnings from community gardens each year to pay back the cost of

the initial inputs. Communities aim to repay input costs within four years; CREATE! does not provide loans and does not charge interest. After communities repay the initial input costs, they are able to save all of the profits from their community gardens. CREATE! does not work with communities that do not agree with the terms of these contracts (Martin; Ruhr; Weil; Kanneh). The goal of this intervention structure is to encourage community ownership of development interventions.

Since 2010, CREATE! has provided agricultural training and farming inputs and "has ensured the availability of water with improved wells, solar powered pumps and gravity fed irrigation systems so that cooperative groups of women are now able to grow vegetables year-round on land previously limited to the cultivation of traditional crops during the two to three month rainy system" (CREATE!, "Letter"). Women are now able to grow a variety of crops, including vegetables and cashews, throughout the year using the solar-powered pumping system that CREATE! staff installed. In some villages, cooperative community gardens have produced enough vegetables that members were able to sell some produce in local markets. Women are consequently able to earn and save money for household use.

CREATE!'s improved cook stove project has produced change in recipient communities. Women in targeted villages report a savings of approximately 50 percent of the fuelwood that they used in a "traditional" three stone fire. Before CREATE! intervened in these six villages, women and girls spent several hours each day collecting fuelwood for cooking. Since building fuel-efficient cook stoves, women spend about half as much time collecting fuelwood. Food also cooks more quickly on the improved cook stoves. Enclosed cook stoves are also safer; women no longer have to closely watch their

children to ensure that they are not burned on open fires. One woman says of her improved cook stove, “I no longer have to worry about animals tipping over the pot. I only use two pieces of wood to cook a meal. Before a large pile of wood would last only three days, but now it will last more than one week” (CREATE!, “Blog”). The installation of solar-powered pumps and water collection systems has also improved the lives of women and families in targeted villages.

CREATE! field staff has also led solar, irrigation, and agricultural trainings for both men and women in targeted villages. Men have used this knowledge to install solar pumping systems and construct the gravity-fed irrigation system for the community gardens. Men also support the gardens by working as watchmen for the gardening and infrastructure sites and by assisting women with vegetable cultivation (CREATE!, “Improving”). CREATE! has been able to produce lasting change in these six target villages.

Binta Fall, a 26 year old mother of two, lives in Diender, Senegal, which is one of CREATE!’s targeted villages. Binta’s husband lives in Dakar and before CREATE! came to the village, Binta had to walk five kilometers to Gossas to buy vegetables for her family. Now that she participates in the community garden in Diender, Binta is able to grow vegetables for her family. She is also able to save money and is less dependent on her husband in Dakar for support. Before CREATE!’s intervention, Binta paid for water to drink and was unable to water vegetables. Now, she has access to enough free water for household and garden use. An improved cook stove has also helped Binta. She claims, “before I built the improved cook stove, I had to search for fuelwood at least ten times each month; now I only search for fuelwood once per week. Also, I no longer have

to buy as much firewood – only one third as much as I used to buy. So I am saving money too" (CREATE!, "Improving"). Binta's story is typical of the experiences of women in CREATE!'s targeted villages. Because CREATE! participates only in small-scale interventions, it is possible for CREATE! staff to discuss the progress of projects with most participants.

CREATE! recently held a training session on Voluntary Savings and Loan Associations (VSLA) at the Appropriate Technology Training and Demonstration Center in Fass Koffe, one of its targeted villages. CREATE! introduced VSLA in response to community members' need for a simple but effective way to manage their money. VSLA is a self-managed, organized, and democratic money management system. Amady Kane, a resident of Fass Koffe, notes "at microfinance institutions you have to pay money even to save money because you are paying for their staff. With VSLA, members are the staff, and they are paying themselves" (CREATE!, "Voluntary"). Unlike other microfinance programs, VSLA has no involvement with outside institutions. Association money stays within the community. Associations comprise 10 to 25 people who save together and take small loans from their savings over a one-year cycle. Members attend weekly meetings where they deposit their savings and collectively make decisions on loan disbursement. As the association participates in all activities together, members are able to build trust. Over the next year, CREATE! staff will partner with each VSLA to provide on going training and support as needed. The training program was collaborative and participatory. Participants in the training returned to their home villages to introduce VSLA programs. Within one month of the training, 14 associations with 317 total members formed in four of CREATE!'s targeted villages.

CREATE! Director Barry Wheeler claims that with the VSLA approach, the emphasis is placed "on capacity building and providing education on money management" (CREATE!, "Voluntary"). The program focuses on savings over lending. This focus on comprehension of core principles, processes, and skills will be self-perpetuating. CREATE! hopes that the skills associated with VSLA will transfer between targeted villages. In addition, participation in VSLA increases self-sufficiency among participants. Seynobou Dieng, the Cooperative Secretary of the VSLA in Fass Kane, claims,

> CREATE! gives us an education – it gives us knowledge to benefit our lives. It's not like the microfinance programs that just want to lend you money. The VSLA training was excellent. I wish we had learned this program a long time ago. It's an excellent way to save money and to make money. I am definitely going to participate because I am looking for a way to make money! (CREATE!, "Education")

VSLA, like improved cook stoves, are examples of appropriate technology that have been enthusiastically adopted by residents of CREATE! villages.

Goals and Objectives

In 2008, CREATE! staff produced an executive summary that outlined the organization's plan to combat the local effects of global climate change, reduce poverty, increase water provision and food production, and improve livelihoods in Africa over the next three years. This document details CREATE!'s organizing goals and principles that guide their development interventions. The organizations goals are: (1) to promote sustainable community development, (2) to combat the local effects of global climate change, (3) to reduce poverty, (4) to increase water provision and food production, (5) to improve hygiene and sanitation, (6) to improve opportunities for sustainable livelihoods,

and (7) to protect and maintain the environment (Wheeler and Ruhr 7). CREATE!'s goals clearly reflect the organization's desire to promote "good" development (as they define it) that relies on appropriate technology. The following section will closely examine CREATE!'s specific project goals in Senegal to better evaluate CREATE!'s claim that they use "good" and appropriate development practices.

CREATE! currently manages development programs in six different rural Senegalese villages. Programs do not vary much between villages. Each village participates in the core programs including community gardens, solar powered hand-dug wells, and improved cook stoves. As noted in previous sections, some villages also have education centers and voluntary savings and loan association (VSLA) programs. CREATE! hopes to achieve several objectives in their targeted villages. Objectives include: (1) to increase the acquisition, provision, storage, and distribution of water in all six targeted villages, (2) to increase food production in all six villages, (3) to conserve energy and utilize renewable energy technologies to improve the conditions of life in all six villages, (4) to improve hygiene and sanitation in all villages, (5) to increase the capacity for sustainable livelihoods and improve the standard of living in villages, and (6) to reduce deforestation and desertification and to protect and maintain the environment in all six villages (Wheeler and Ruhr 8). These specific objectives closely follow CREATE!'s broader intervention goals in Senegal. In addition, CREATE! staff believe that these objectives are realistic and attainable within a five year time period. Staff members are confident in these goals because villagers in the targeted communities participate in all stages of the development process, including the formation of goals and objectives and the creation of a timeline towards project completion (Martin).

CREATE!'s improved cook stove programs best exemplify their approach to development interventions.

CREATE!'s improved cook stoves are an excellent example of the use of appropriate technology in development interventions. Executive Director Barry Wheeler designed an improved cook stove using the existing local model of the three stone fire. In this method, African cooks used the three stone fire method in which they set a cooking pot on three stones arranged in a circle. Three stone fires are inefficient because they result in the loss of a lot of heat and lengthen cooking time. Wheeler's improved cook stove uses locally available resources and materials, including clay and straw, to trap heat and efficiently cook food. To build the stove, women make balls of mixed clay and straw and arrange them around the stones and cooking pot, resulting in a durable mud oven that withstands use for long periods of time. CREATE! field technicians teach women in the targeted villages to build these improved cook stoves. It is easy for women to build and reproduce these stoves if needed. Stove owners can repair damaged stoves by adding additional mud. CREATE! staff do not need to remain in villages to teach additional individuals to construct stoves or to repair stoves; villagers are able to easily complete these tasks (Wheeler). Consequently, these improved cook stoves adhere to all of the characteristics of appropriate technology. Improved cook stoves use locally available materials, are easily and cheaply constructed, and can be built and maintained by local villagers. These cook stoves also adapt to local culture by maintaining the essence of the three stone fire. CREATE!'s improved cook stoves are appropriate, participatory, empowering, and sustainable – a good example of appropriate development interventions.

In contrast, other alternative cook stoves are manufactured in the United States and exported to beneficiary communities. Made of metal, these cook stoves require a change in cooking techniques. In addition, cook stove recipients might not have the materials or skills necessary to maintain the stoves over an extended time period. Beneficiaries may abandon these stoves without ongoing financial and technical support from development organizations.

Many CREATE! documents (and programs) rely on problematic assumptions and oversimplification. Like the World Bank, CREATE! tends to infantilize development recipients by assuming that individuals living in rural Senegalese villages *need* the knowledge and assistance of CREATE! staff members. Although CREATE! staff claim that they are encouraging interventions that are "appropriate" to specific villages, these programs still privilege a certain type of development over others. CREATE! projects also assume that residents of these villages are helpless without outside assistance.

Monitoring and Evaluation Techniques

When establishing measurement protocols, CREATE! staff have attempted to adhere to their belief in participatory development experiences. As a result, CREATE! beneficiaries work with staff members to develop locally "appropriate" monitoring and evaluation techniques.

CREATE!'s three-year plan for development interventions in Senegal includes a section on outputs, activities, and verifiable indicators. Specially, this section describes CREATE!'s primary program objectives, how the organization will achieve these objectives, and indicators that CREATE! staff can use to determine the success of these

interventions. I will describe this section at length as a means of linking CREATE!'s objectives with the organization's overarching organizational principles.

CREATE!'s first objective is to increase the "acquisition, provision, storage, and distribution of water in all six villages of the project zone" (Wheeler and Ruhr 8). To achieve this objective, CREATE! will install solar water pumps to replace diesel pumps and generators; build ferrocement water storage cisterns for year-round water storage; dig wells or boreholes at schools, community centers, and health clinics; install irrigation systems in some villages; and train individuals in each village in the construction of ferrocement cisterns, solar pump installation, operation and maintenance, and crop irrigation. To measure the success of CREATE!'s water-related projects, staff will monitor the number of solar water pumps installed at existing boreholes, the number of solar water pumps installed, the number of ferrocement cisterns constructed and installed, the number of wells or boreholes dug, the number of water pumping stations installed, the number of trainers educated in skills related to water acquisition in in each village, and the increase in water acquisition, provision, and storage through the project zone as measured by pre-project baseline surveys and post-project surveys.

CREATE!'s second objective is "to increase food production beyond the rainy season" in all targeted villages (Wheeler and Ruhr 9). To increase food production, CREATE! will identify the water gap in each village for dry season agricultural production; identify the appropriate variety of vegetables and cereals for each location; extend the water network where appropriate and applicable; create at least one farming group per village; and create year-round community gardens at each CREATE! training and demonstration center and at primary and secondary schools in each village. To

measure the success of these endeavors, CREATE! staff will identify the water gap in each village and the appropriate vegetables and cereals for each location. In addition, staff will measure the percentage increase in dry season agricultural production as measured by pre-project baseline surveys and post-project surveys. Currently, women who are participating in cooperative community garden groups are weighing the vegetables that they produce and tracking the amount of money that women make by selling produce at market.

CREATE!'s third development objective in Senegal is " to conserve energy and utilize renewable energy technologies to improve the conditions of life" in rural villages (Wheeler and Ruhr 9). CREATE! pursues this objective by constructing two CREATE! training and demonstration centers in Fass Koffe and Ourkhokh, which demonstrate working examples of improved cook stoves, solar panels for lighting and solar water pumps, low-water cisterns, solar water dryers, solar ovens, and solar thermosyphon hot water systems; conduct three training sessions for 54 participants in improved cook stoves each year; each group of two trainers will instruct 500 families yearly in improved cook stove construction. In addition, CREATE! staff will install solar panels and water pumps at selected schools, communities, and health centers for lighting, water pumping, and vaccine refrigeration at health clinics; conduct training sessions for participants from each of the nine villages in the design and construction of solar ovens, solar food dryers, and solar hot water systems; and implement one bio-gas demonstration project in both the Fass Koffe and Ourkhokh project zones. Indicators for this objective include the successful completion of the above construction projects and training sessions. In

addition, CREATE! staff will measure the percentage increase of households with improved cook stoves using pre-project baseline surveys and post-project surveys.

CREATE!'s fourth objective is "to improve hygiene and sanitation" in all of the targeted villages (Wheeler and Ruhr 10). Outputs include the construction of self-composting latrines; CREATE! staff will measure success of this objective using the percentage decrease of water and sanitation related diseases in project villages. CREATE!'s fifth objective is "to increase the capacity for sustainable livelihoods and improve the standard of living" in villages (Wheeler and Ruhr 11). To achieve this objective, CREATE! staff will identify and train cooperative groups for income-generating programs; facilitate the implementation of micro-finance projects through micro-finance institutions; establish Voluntary Savings and Loan Associations (VSLAs); identify vocational training needs for rural youth; and select and train 15 to 30 youth per village per year in vocational trades such as tailoring, hair dressing, and poultry raising. CREATE! staff will measure their success towards this objective by identifying the number of cooperative groups established and trained, in addition to the number of loan and VSLA groups initiated.

CREATE!'s final objective is "to reduce deforestation and desertification and to protect and maintain the environment" in their intervention areas (Wheeler and Ruhr 12). To achieve this objective, CREATE! staff will develop at least one tree nursery and tree planting program in each of the project locations; will select and train five persons per village to launch the village tree nursery; will select the areas for tree planting in the villages and surrounding areas; will select the appropriate varieties of trees for reforestation in each location; and will plant and protect 2,000 trees per village each year.

Indicators of success for this objective include the number of trees planted and measuring the number and percentage of households in all six villages with wood-saving and fuel-efficient improved cook stoves as measured by pre-project baseline surveys and end of project surveys.

Based on their underlying philosophy of respect for local culture and tradition and acknowledging and building on local knowledge, CREATE! employs "methods and strategies of community self-development that are based on local organization, local participation, and social mobilization to maximize self-reliance and self-sufficiency" (Wheeler and Ruhr 13). CREATE! collaborates with local and traditional authorities and village residents at each stage of the intervention process, including the development of progress indicators. For example, CREATE! established Village Development Committees that, in conjunction with local leaders, ensure appropriate participation by the project's beneficiaries in all phase of the project including planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Monitoring is an on-going process. CREATE! staff evaluate progress through "the collection of qualitative and quantitative data: staff observation, supervisor reports, client interviews/focus groups, participant feedback, case review, training post-tests, monthly reports, feedback on training, and discussion sessions" (Wheeler and Ruhr 13). Currently, CREATE! staff collect the majority of information using pen and paper. Then, the Country Director enters collected data into an Excel spreadsheet that is then sent to CREATE! staff in Eugene. The Executive Summary notes that the collection of data and monthly reports on all sector projects will allow for adaptation and revision of activities

as needed to increase effectiveness. CREATE! evaluates project success using the evaluation schedule seen below in Table 1 (Wheeler and Ruhr 14).

Although CREATE! has adhered to this monitoring and evaluation schedule over the past few years, the organization has not always collected satisfactory information on development interventions. While inhabitants of the villages and CREATE! staff report improvement in diet and nutrition, CREATE! lacks a method of adequately measuring the quantitative increase in agricultural production. Members of the garden cooperatives use produce in their households and sell excess vegetables in local markets.

Table 1. CREATE! Evaluation Methods

Indicator	Verification Method	Verification Interval
Percentage of households with improved cook stoves	Field monthly report	Monthly
Number of public infrastructures and households with renewable sources of energy	Physical verification by site	Six months
Number of locations with tree nurseries, appropriately maintained	Physical verification by site	Six months
Number of trees planted per location	Quarterly field report/Field visits	Quarterly
Number of latrines built per location	Physical verification	Quarterly
Percentage decrease of water and sanitation related diseases	Health report	Quarterly
Agriculture outcomes earned in the dry season	Beneficiaries individual interview	Yearly
Number of persons benefitting from micro-finance loans	Field monthly report	Monthly
Number of chicken raising enterprises per location	Physical verification by site	Six months
Evolution of quality of life improvement of the beneficiaries	Beneficiaries individual interview	Yearly
Number of youths participating in vocational trainings	Vocational training centers registers and reports	Yearly

Any profits are reinvested into the cooperative. CREATE! would like to measure the total amount of vegetables produced and what proportion of that produce is used in households or sold at market. Data collection methods should provide meaningful information for CREATE! staff and donors while respecting the needs of cooperative members. A prior attempt at data collection failed due to lack of recipient participation. It is imperative that CREATE! uses a data collection method that is acceptable and meaningful to those individuals who are participating in the agricultural cooperatives. The monetization of total food production is not an adequate measure of development success for this program, as monetization does not account for household use nor does it recognize important cultural considerations. I have worked with CREATE! to develop "culturally appropriate" data collection methods that can track progress without imposing false external boundaries on measurement. For example, CREATE! staff members approach community leaders for assistance in data collection. CREATE! is moving towards more participatory approaches to data collection. These changes will be discussed below in comparison to the data collection methods of large multilateral organizations such as the World Bank.

Although the World Bank exhibits deficiencies in monitoring and evaluation strategies, these problems are common across the development industry. Because it is difficult to quantify changes in behavior and long term economic, social, and cultural health, many organizations choose to ignore these outcomes in favor of monetized and quantified results such as improvements in income and the adoption of new technology. Some smaller development organizations have, however, attempted to adopt more comprehensive measurement strategies. For example, CREATE!'s efforts to include pre-

project and post-project surveys indicate a desire to include real input from project beneficiaries. Typically, World Bank projects are so large as to render individual surveys and interviews impractical. CREATE!'s project evaluations, because they occur on a smaller scale, can include subjective questions and measures. Survey questions can cover a variety of development indicators and can include both quantitative and qualitative data. Some sample survey questions could include:

(1) Approximately how many buckets of eggplant did you take from the garden?
   a. How many buckets did you consume?
   b. How many buckets did you sell at the market?
(2) Do you believe that your family now has access to more nutritious foods?
(3) Do your children have more energy and appear healthier?

CREATE! staff believe that gathering qualitative data on indicators that are important to recipients is more important than the scientific collection of quantitative data. It is important that survey participants understand that failure is normal and that it is acceptable to claim that the introduction of vegetable gardens has not improved health.

There are many advantages to participatory assessment. These questionnaires help recipients and staff members create and measure development objectives. Surveys can also communicate shortcomings, inform group members, set priorities for improvement, and assist in the planning of future projects. Surveys are a good method of data collection because of their dynamism; each village can develop their own indicators and data collection methods. Consequently, each village will measure the indicators of development that are most important to participants in the cooperative garden projects. These techniques permit beneficiaries to judge for themselves the outcomes of CREATE!

interventions. Although this type of data collection is time consuming, CREATE! staff believe that it is the most technologically and culturally appropriate solution.

CREATE! uses specific intervention strategies that they believe adhere to their mission and vision for communities in rural Senegal. The techniques and activities detailed in this chapter provide a thorough overview of CREATE!'s activities in Senegal. In the following chapter, I will use interviews with CREATE! staff to investigate the organization's relationship with participatory development theory.

CHAPTER VI

REFLECTING ON CREATE!

CREATE!'s organizational structure and development interventions richly illustrate a small-scale and participatory approach to development in Africa. In this chapter, I utilize interviews with CREATE! staff members to discuss CREATE!'s relationship with participatory development theory and practice. I begin by describing how CREATE! understands and responds to local needs through participant observation, community buy-in, and beneficiary involvement. I discuss how participation impacts CREATE!'s intervention planning and implementation. Finally, I assess CREATE! staff member's sense of success or failure in promoting poverty alleviation and community sustainability in rural Senegal.

Responding to Felt Needs

CREATE! staff claim that their work in Senegal is an alternative to the type of development interventions that the World Bank and other multilateral organizations fund and perform in the Global South. CREATE!'s explicitly participatory approach to development is the main way by which the organization distinguishes itself from other development groups. In interviews, CREATE! staff members repeatedly emphasized that the organization responds to the felt needs of rural Senegalese residents.

David Mosse claims "development interventions are not driven by policy but by the exigencies of organizations and the need to maintain relationships" (16). Following this conclusion, one could speculate that CREATE!'s interventions have been successful not because the organization adheres to a particular development ideology, but rather

because CREATE! staff listen carefully to the needs and objectives of their village partners. Thus, relationships are a better determinant of project success than is any arbitrary determinant of participatory practice (Mosse, *Cultivating* 19). For CREATE!, staff relationships with beneficiaries are very important.

CREATE! staff are very concerned about including village residents in all stages of the development process, including the formulation of objectives and the measurement of intervention results. CREATE! Executive Director Barry Wheeler insists that villagers must have a stake in the development process for the projects to succeed; he claims that CREATE! staff "strive towards making the solution self-sustaining, that they [village residents] have ownership with, that they are proud of – having done it themselves" (Wheeler). This insistence on the use of appropriate technology and participatory process is what sets CREATE! apart from other development organizations.

Most of CREATE!'s Eugene-based staff met while working for the American Refugee Committee in Rwanda, where Barry Wheeler tested many of the prototypes for the appropriate cook stoves and other appropriate technologies. Louise Ruhr, CREATE!'s Chief Operations Officer, left the American Refugee Committee because she was attracted to Wheeler's philosophy of participation and appropriate technology and because she desired to work with a smaller organization in Africa. In addition, Ruhr claims that she "wanted to build something new [a new organization] that worked differently from others" (Ruhr). All of the CREATE! staff that I interviewed expressed their appreciation and preference for CREATE!'s approach to development. CREATE! staff claim that the organization pursues a participatory approach to development by asking the targeted communities about their felt needs and responding to those needs. In

addition, participation in CREATE! programs includes literal participation from community members, including clearing fields, digging, planting crops, and maintaining crops. CREATE! also expect communities to make a financial contribution to the development projects.

CREATE! staff members include village residents at a number of levels. In addition to consulting important village leaders on development decisions, CREATE! has also established a paid "volunteer" system to incorporate other community members. According to CREATE! Chief Operations Officer Louise Ruhr, CREATE! interventions have increased income in targeted communities and empowered women through cooperative groups. CREATE! also ensures that men are not excluded from development projects, as men are the primary leaders in rural Senegalese communities. For example, CREATE! established positions called community volunteers; all individuals currently serving in these positions are men. CREATE! pays community volunteers a small stipend to advise and train other community members and participate in training. CREATE! staff believe that women are more likely to participate in community development projects if men are also engaged in these projects. Many women would be unable to participate in programs without the approval of their husbands (Ruhr). Other development organizations address the participation of men in different ways. Some organizations reject the contributions of men completely. Others fully incorporate men and women into projects together. CREATE!'s programs include men while simultaneously empowering women to improve their livelihoods.

CREATE! staff use their participatory approach to differentiate their projects from those of other development organizations in West Africa. In interviews, staff

insisted that their small-scale approach and participatory approach is more sustainable. Louise Ruhr cited an example in one of CREATE!'s target villages, which contains an abandoned irrigation system. Another development organization installed this system in the 1990s but did not provide maintenance nor trained recipients in operations or up-keep. Consequently, the villagers abandoned the irrigation system and the basins had sat empty for twelve years. CREATE! rehabilitated the old well in this village and taught residents how to maintain the system so that it might benefit the community. By including residents in all aspects of the project, CREATE! staff hope to encourage project ownership and reduce the rate of abandonment, which is a chronic problem in the development industry. In addition, CREATE!'s small size privileges fund saturation, meaning that the organization is able to direct all of their funds and attention to only six small villages; this concentration is consequently able to produce real impacts.

Many villages in rural Senegal lack access to electricity, gasoline, and other fuel sources. For this reason, CREATE! avoids using fossil fuels in development interventions, because these fuels are unreliable and increase dependence on outside resources and technologies. According to CREATE! staff members, these technological innovations are also not culturally or materially sustainable for their beneficiary communities. In addition, CREATE! does not pursue funding from governments or multilateral organizations because of the restrictions and requirements that accompany these funding sources.

CREATE! staff believe that their place within the development "industry" will always be limited. Louise Ruhr claims that CREATE! will never attempt to build their organization nor would they measure success by the size of the organization or the

number of communities in which they work. Instead, CREATE! measures success by "improving the lives of people while maintaining their ways of life" (Ruhr). Because CREATE! has eschewed the temptation of high-tech solutions, organizations that do use this approach have sometimes criticized CREATE! for "not doing enough." In response, CREATE! staff claim that their approach is best for rural Senegal, but other technologically enhanced development strategies might be more appropriate for urban areas or other geographical regions.

Adapting for Participation

CREATE! staff members occasionally change the trajectory of their development interventions based upon the needs and feedback of their village-based beneficiaries. By improving access to water, CREATE! has helped six cooperative community garden groups produce vegetables, nuts, and fruits year-round. In the village of Fass Koffe, cooperative members have recently initiated a pilot poultry production project. Although several members of the cooperative community garden group in Fass Koffe raised chickens individually at home for household use, the group wanted to expand their operations. These women approached CREATE! field staff and asked for financial and technical assistance.

CREATE! was able to help the garden cooperative scale up their poultry production by installing a poultry shed. After three successful cycles of poultry production, cooperative members have now decided to double (to 200) the number of chickens produced per cycle. Cooperative members sell fresh chicken at local markets and freeze dressed chickens for later sale. Because of the success of the poultry project at

Fass Koffe, cooperatives in other CREATE! villages are now eager to start projects of their own. I am currently in the process of writing grants for funds to start similar projects in the other five beneficiary communities.

Village residents are comfortable approaching CREATE! staff members for assistance when needed. Village residents occasionally reject CREATE!'s suggestions for new projects. CREATE! Executive Director Barry Wheeler has spent years engineering solar cooking technology for food preparation and storage. Although CREATE! staff members have included prototypes of solar cookers in their Demonstration Centers for the past few years, no villages have been interested in adopting the technologies. Instead, community members have continued to dry food spread on cleared ground under the sun. Barry Wheeler and other CREATE! staff members have consequently decided to abandon their plans for solar cookers in favor of further investment in the new poultry production projects.

CREATE! staff members are sometimes frustrated when they must change their plans or pursue different funding sources to adhere to beneficiary needs. My observations indicate, however, that CREATE! staff members are very concerned about following the lead of beneficiaries and usually place those needs over the desires or wants of donors of staff members.

"The Grease in the Anti-Politics Machine": CREATE! and Participatory Development Theory

Many scholars have used participatory development projects as an example of Ferguson's anti-politics machine. The World Bank and other large multilateral

development agencies have weakened the promise of participatory development and empowerment. The aim of many participatory methodologies is "achieving a visible kind of outcome capable of convincing donors that their money will be spent in accordance with the capacities and the needs of beneficiaries in what have become shameful rituals of legitimation" (De Vries 30). The anti-politics machine operates through the construction of an institutional space in which buzzwords, forms of expertise, and methodologies are continually replicated. Currently, the most important buzzword in the development industry is participation. Some scholars claim that the use of participatory projects by large multilateral organizations is a form of political control; if development is an anti-politics machine, then participation is "a remarkably efficient means of greasing its wheels" (Williams 557). Participation can be disempowering if development organizations include only nods to participation that do not truly acknowledge the needs and desires of the poor. For example, participatory development can emphasize personal reform rather than political struggle, can obscure local power differences by uncritically celebrating local communities, and by using the languages of emancipation to incorporate marginalized populations "within an unreconstructed project of capitalist modernization" (Williams 558).

Participation, empowerment, and poverty reduction are the most important buzzwords in modern development interventions. Both multilateral organizations such as the World Bank and small groups like CREATE! use these buzzwords to frame solutions within the bounds of the development process. According to Cornwall and Brock, "participation, poverty reduction, and empowerment epitomize this feel-good character: they connote warm and nice things, conferring on their users that goodness and rightness

that development agencies need to assert their legitimacy to intervene in the lives of others" (1045). These authors claim that the Millennium Development Goals associated with PRSPs and institutionalized participatory development will never produce legitimate change but are instead tools for changing minds and for holding accountable the powerful (1050). Thus, while the ideology of participatory development is powerful, it may not have the impact that development officials desire.

Enlisting and demonstrating popular participation in development programs has become an end in itself, a crucial measure of success and a condition of donor approval (Williams 563). Participatory development can also be gender biased and can ignore or reinforce patriarchal structures by privileging the opinions of male community leaders (Kapoor 1204). Kapoor asserts that when participation is incorporated into development programming, it is subjected to organizational demands, thus becoming institutionalized and then branded as the new ideology of development (1211). Because participation is public, public participatory space can be panoptic and can result in the reconfiguration of power relationships and ways people interact, express information, and exchange knowledge (Kapoor 1212). These alterations in power differentials reinforce the superiority of the multilateral development organizations.

The two major types of participatory development are those arising from the PRSP process and programs based upon participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques. Participation is not necessarily oppressive if development agencies promote meaningful forms of participation that ensure equity for the poor and marginalized. While participation may be a form of subjection, its consequences are not predetermined and its subjects are not completely controlled. All forms of participation open spaces for

political action and moments of resistance towards the development paradigm (Scott). Participation has extensive historic associations with social movements and with struggles for citizenship and voting rights (Cornwall and Brock 1045). Goals of PRA include improving the quality of information available to planners and improving communication between members and outsiders. Drawing on personal experiences, techniques, and practical knowledge, PRA is a means of establishing trust and rapport between nonprofits and citizens in preparation for participatory development programs (Mosse, "Authority" 569). Generally, PRA techniques enable local residents to share and analyze their life experiences with development organizations. Some PRA techniques include direct observation, discussion with key informants, group discussions, case studies, participatory mapping and modeling, transect walks, timelines, seasonal calendars, and daily time use analysis (Binns et al. 4-5). Development officials conduct all of these activities in conjunction with local residents to ensure accuracy and equity.

Because of its participatory methods and small-scale approach, PRA is an appropriate means of pursuing equitable development programs. Although CREATE! documents do not explicitly name PRA as their approach to development, CREATE! programs closely adhere to the concepts of PRA. CREATE! staff utilize several PRA techniques including group discussions and training sessions. CREATE! staff also hold extensive meetings with "key informants" such as *alkalos* [chiefs] and important community leaders; these meetings reinforce existing power dynamics in the community. In addition, community residents approach CREATE! staff members with ideas for additional projects, thus indicating that community members have a stake in the development process and feel empowered to participate in their own development.

Assessing Success or Failure in CREATE! Development Interventions

It is impossible to determine the true efficacy of CREATE!'s development interventions without firsthand ethnographic research in Senegal. This section will use interviews with CREATE! staff members to assess the organization's sense of success or failure in promoting participatory development interventions in Senegal while simultaneously reducing poverty in beneficiary communities.

According to staff members, CREATE!'s interventions have produced overwhelming positive changes in their six targeted communities. CREATE! staff credit their success to their attention to community and cultural norms. Prior to CREATE!'s interventions in rural Senegal, many families struggled to feed their children. Many children were suffering from malnutrition and other diseases related to poor diet. Evidence now indicates that diet has improved due to increased access to fresh vegetables. Residents in one CREATE! village told Louise Ruhr that no children had suffered from kwashiorkor since CREATE! assisted in the creation of community gardens. CREATE! has amassed positive comments and interviews from participants. The majority of CREATE!'s staff are from rural Senegal and understand the needs of residents in targeted villages better than international "experts." Because CREATE! operates on a small scale, staff are able to fully incorporate villagers into the development process.

It is difficult, however, for an outside observer to correctly identify negative development interventions. Within development practice, there is little structural or discursive space to articulate negative consequences of interventions. Because the public

considers development to be a universal good, few consider that interventions could produce negative outcomes. In addition, the results of development are subjective. For example, officials at multilateral development organizations might identify a project as successive even if participants think otherwise. Alternatively, some village residents might benefit from a project while others do not. Without extensive firsthand documentation, it is impossible to determine the real outcomes of development interventions.

The inherently unequal power dynamics present in development partnerships discourages the articulation of problems. Development aid recipients do not want to jeopardize the continuation of financial or technical assistance due to disagreements over project results. For example, Senegalese women who participate in CREATE!'s development interventions have little incentive to speak out if they are dissatisfied. The six villages in which CREATE! works have all signed documents that codified the relationship between the two entities. To dissolve the partnership, all village members must agree. Although it is possible that certain individuals in CREATE! villages are unhappy with the results of projects, I was unable to find evidence of project failure or recipient dissatisfaction in CREATE! documents. It is unlikely, however, that such documents would include reports of dissatisfied recipients. It seems that village residents are overwhelmingly pleased with CREATE! Not all development interventions, however, produce effective results.

CREATE! staff members point to incidences of documented success. In a July 2012 newsletter, CREATE! staff inform supporters that their donations have led to the formation of 41 cooperative groups with a total of 881 group members. In addition,

CREATE! has rehabilitated two community wells and constructed three new wells. CREATE! field staff members have helped install three solar powered pumps that provide 15,000 liters of potable water each day and five gravity-fed irrigation systems. By July 2012, cooperative community garden groups harvested and sold 20,000 pounds of produce and planted 11,000 fruit, nut, and fuelwood trees. Also, CREATE! staff helped village residents construct over 350 fuel-efficient cook stoves.

All CREATE! staff members that I interviewed indicated that CREATE! development interventions have successfully provided for the basic needs of community residents while ensuring their input and participation. Louise Ruhr told me that CREATE! interventions have produced “big changes” in communities by introducing alternative cook stoves, reducing the need for fuelwood, planting more trees to counteract deforestation, increasing incomes, and empowering women through cooperative groups. Robin Weil agreed and emphasized that CREATE! has helped these communities prepare for the consequences of global climate change by ensuring continuous year-round access to water for irrigation, thus ensuring greater food availability.

CREATE! differs from other development agencies in their goals, outcomes, and strategic ideologies. Although other multilateral development organizations claim to pursue participatory and appropriate approaches to development, the work of these agencies tend to oversimplify and ignore the needs of the poor and marginalized in the Global South. Although CREATE! has intervened in only a few communities in Senegal, their grassroots, participatory, and appropriate development strategies have produced, according to staff members, sustainable and empowering change without evidence of marginalization.

CHAPTER VII

"WE HAVE DONE THIS OURSELVES"

Broadly, development interventions in the Global South have failed to produce sustainable solutions to the problems of poverty and need. Although multilateral development organizations have utilized many types of development programs during the past 60 years, few have been particularly effective. Globally, inequality has grown and poverty continues to plague many countries that have received development aid for decades. Currently, development professionals are promoting participatory forms of development practice that attempt to include beneficiaries in multiple stages of development interventions. This thesis offers a case study of one small international nonprofit that attempts to provide for the basic needs of six communities in rural Senegal using a participatory approach to development. I have described CREATE!'s structure, programs, objectives, and monitoring strategies to illuminate their development strategies. I have also used interviews with CREATE! staff to describe the ways in which the organization interacts with participatory development theory and practice. In this final chapter, I offer conclusions based on my analysis of CREATE!'s programs in rural Senegal. I then present some recommendations to large multilateral development organizations based upon CREATE!'s experiences with small-scale participatory development.

Addressing the Deficiencies of Development

How can world leaders solve global problems of poverty, disease, corruption, and destitution? Can development organizations attempt to meet the needs of the Global

South without abandoning ideals of democracy, autonomy, independence, and self-reliance? The World Bank paradigm of large-scale neoliberal development projects has repeatedly failed to deliver durable and sustainable changes for the world's poorest nations. Although the World Bank and other multilateral development organizations have committed themselves to forging new participatory intervention methods, the core objectives of development have not changed. Grassroots, participatory, and situated development projects do offer a radical alternative to conventional development methods. But, are these innovations applicable to large-scale innovations?

Typically, the World Bank grants large loans to poor countries to support economic growth, job creation, and better living conditions for the poor. These loans usually charge little interest and repayment periods stretch over 35 to 40 years. Even with long repayment periods, many countries are unable to reimburse the World Bank for the cost of the development loan. For example, although the World Bank has given nearly four billion dollars in loans to Senegal, the Senegalese government has repaid only about half of what it owes the World Bank. Currently, the Senegalese government is repaying its loans in monthly increments of about $500. At this rate, decades will pass before Senegal will fulfill their debt obligations. Ultimately, this process is unsustainable. Like many poor countries, Senegal may need to take out additional loans to finance the repayments on current loans. In 2005, a former cultural minister of Mali wrote an "open letter" to French President Jacques Chirac in which she claims that Africa now wanted independence from the conditions of aid. She argues that, "The fight against poverty amounts to begging and submissiveness, leading to reforms that make us even poorer. The more the North cooperates with the South, the worse off we become"

(Calderisi 13). Ultimately, this practice results in increased dependence on multilateral development organizations rather than self-sufficiency or sustainable economic growth and poverty alleviation.

The World Bank's approach to development is often unproductive. Evidence asserts that development recipients either lack access to the benefits of development projects or abandon ill-fitting or defective projects. The World Bank sees development as "a practical tool for the solution of universal problems" and produce uniform development "solutions" to alleviate poverty in diverse world regions (Ferguson 10). It seems that many of the negative implications of development arise from ignorance of local cultures, languages, landscapes, and people. Projects appear to fail because World Bank officials ignore the intricacies of local conditions. Before the World Bank initiated the PRSP program in 1999, it was common for the World Bank to suggest, fund, and implement nearly identical projects in multiple countries across the globe. Although one goal of the PRSP process is to include the input of recipient governments and members of civil society, the inherently unequal power relations within the process favor the knowledge of the World Bank over that of residents of the recipient country. For example, the PRSP for Senegal includes language that criticizes the economic culture of the Senegalese people. A more inclusive and participatory process would not include comprehensive judgments about cultural "traditions" but would instead more accurately account for the lived experiences of local residents.

In addition, development projects that attempt to remake landscapes and people on a large scale ignore the permanent scars that these projects sometimes leave. For example, these projects often ignore local environmental knowledge in favor of the

expertise of international development officials. By ignoring the intricacies of local conditions, development organizations doom their projects to failure and abandonment. This disavowal of landscape and culture is disempowering for development recipients because it encourages the abandonment of traditions in favor of the methods and beliefs of Northern development "experts." It makes sense, then, that recipients sometimes abandon development projects that are alien and condescending.

In the past decade, the World Bank and other multilateral development agencies have decided that participatory practices will solve many of the problems with current development policy. The World Bank concept of participation, however, is limited, controlled, and highly bureaucratic. The PRSP process is exclusionary and does not truly reflect the needs or lived experiences of the poor and marginalized (Unwin 1511). The PRSP programs consequently represent a nod towards participatory practices without promoting real change. The USAID has pursued similar changes in practice. The administrator of the USAID, Rajiv Shah, recently highlighted the problems of aid dependency in a speech on his organization's evolving strategy. Shah asserted that USAID "must seek to do our work in a way that allows us to be replaced over time by efficient local governments, by thriving civil societies, and by a vibrant private sector" (Pincus). USAID intends to allocate more funds to local NGOs and entrepreneurs, rather than use aid money to hire American-based contractors for infrastructure projects. Shah believes, "that if we're not building real incentives into the system to transition to make our projects more sustainable, to work through host-country systems and ministries or local institutions…we're not going to have viable, long-term sustainability strategies" (Pincus). Currently, USAID's Feed the Future program in Senegal is partnering with the

government and private sector investment to construct an agricultural development program based on rice and dairy products for local distribution (Pincus). This renewed focus on local enterprise and development could promote sustainable and independent growth while still advancing American interests. Partnering with local NGOs is a different, and perhaps more effective approach, than is the PRSP process. Ultimately, USAID remains the dominant partner in these types of programs and could discourage project recipients from fully voicing their opinions.

Some academics have claimed that the problems of development are so severe that the only solution is a complete rejection of the idea of development itself. Arturo Escobar and other post-structural development theorists assert that development interventions are a form of epistemic violence that systemically dismantle the cultures and lived experiences of aid recipients. The radical solution to the problems of development is thus the rejection of development in all of its forms. Ultimately, this is not a feasible resolution to development's negative consequences. Men and women of all cultures are in a continuously process of dynamic change, though most development organizations –including CREATE! and the World Bank – continue to fund development programs that do not reflect this reality. It is immoral to deny to the Global South the benefits of development. In addition, poverty is not random but rather the result of international policies that have for more than five centuries favored the Global North over the Global South. It is thus the responsibility of Northern countries to change their own policies. Instead of giving traditional ODA, donors can spend money on the development of new life-saving drugs, low-cost renewable energy technology, and other public goods. The UN can overturn global patent laws that prohibit poor nations from

producing their own medications from local ingredients. Governments can devote more money to medical research on life-threatening diseases and conditions. One of the most important contributions that Americans and Europeans can offer is a reduction in their carbon emissions (Glennie 137-139). Global climate change disproportionately affects tropical nations that have contributed little to its perpetuation. By reducing emissions in rich countries, Africa will not suffer the harmful effects of climate change. Rejecting Northern ideas of development does permit Southern residents to reassert their ability to determine their own destinies. Rejecting development does not, however, solve problems of poverty, corruption, and inequality.

As abandoning development is unfeasible, it is imperative that scholars discover ways of alleviating poverty and suffering without disempowering recipients of development aid. CREATE!'s small-scale and participatory approach to development might be a feasible alternative to conventional development practice. The mission of CREATE! is to help rural communities improve their lives through locally appropriate and small-scaled technologies "based on local organization, participation, and social mobilization to maximize self-reliance and self-sufficiency" (Wheeler and Ruhr 1). CREATE! staff claim that they listen and respond to the felt needs of residents of their targeted villages. By following the aspirations of local residents, CREATE! staff ensure that aid recipients desire the changes that the intervention will bring to their lives. Rather than relying on high-technology solutions, CREATE! uses low-cost and locally available techniques that build on existing local practices.

CREATE! programs empower project participants by incorporating their ideas and needs into all stages – planning, implementation, and monitoring – of the

development process. In addition, CREATE! staff do not reject the cultural and situated knowledge of rural Senegalese residents but rather welcome the insights of local people. In sum, CREATE! attempts to treat village residents as clients rather than as children. CREATE! provides a service – technical training in low-cost and low-tech development solutions that could increase access to necessities such as food and water. In return, CREATE! villages provide labor and repay CREATE! for the cost of inputs. Consequently, village residents are empowered to determine their own course of development.

CREATE!'s programs are not perfect. Like the World Bank and other development institutions, CREATE!'s approach remains ignorant of the lived experiences of local residents. CREATE! staff repeatedly emphasize the importance of maintaining "traditional" culture and technology. CREATE! staff ignore Senegalese cultural history by asserting that existence of a "primeval" tradition before development interventions. Culture is not static and tradition is not monolithic.

Policy Recommendations

Grassroots, participatory, and place-based development interventions are inherently better suited to small projects. It is not impossible, however, for the World Bank to include aspects of these practices in their development programs. The World Bank could partner with local NGOs for education, agricultural, and other social programs. NGOs that have operated in recipient countries for years and their local staff members have situated knowledge about the lived experiences of development recipients.

These organizations, because they work on a small-scale, can actually have conversations with the impoverished and the marginalized to ascertain their needs.

The World Bank is an enormous international bureaucracy that will never be able to spend years in remote villages listening to the people. There are, however, local NGOs and village leaders who can provide invaluable information about development needs and expectations. For these partnerships to be feasible, however, the World Bank will also need to modify their monitoring techniques. The World Bank will no longer be able to judge the success of their projects based on the amount of goods disbursed. To gauge real change, World Bank officials could hire local residents to conduct surveys and should then respond to these surveys in meaningful ways.

CREATE! staff members claim that they are successful because the organization works at a scale that can produce lasting change without dismissing the lived experiences of residents. According to my observations, CREATE! staff are genuinely interested in the needs of residents and actually listen and act on their concerns. Regardless of CREATE!'s faults, the organization does offer development interventions that are a vast improvement on those of the World Bank and other large multilateral organizations. CREATE! Executive Director Barry Wheeler frequently uses a quote by Lao Tzu to summarize the organization's approach to development: "Go to the people. Live with them. Learn from them. Love them. Start with what they know. Build with what they have. But with the best leaders, when the work is done, the task accomplished, the people will say 'We have done this ourselves'" (Wheeler). We (residents of wealthy countries) cannot ignore the needs of the world's poor, nor can we claim to know what is

best for them. By listening to the people, loving their land and their culture, we can forge futures that bring prosperity and hope to all.

APPENDIX

MAP OF CREATE! PROJECT LOCATIONS

REFERENCES CITED

Binns, Tony, Trevor Hill, and Etienne Nel. "Learning from the People: Participatory Rural Appraisal, Geography and Rural Development in the 'New' South Africa." *Applied Geography* 17.1 (1997): 1-9. Print.

Brigg, Morgan. "Post-Development, Foucault, and the Colonisation Metaphor." *Third World Quarterly* 23.3 (2002): 421-36. Print.

Calderisi, Robert. *The Trouble with Africa: Why Foreign Aid Isn't Working*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006. Print.

Cooper, Frederick. *Africa since 1940: The Past of the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Print.

Cornwall, Andrea, and Karen Brock. "What Do Buzzwords Do for Development Policy? A Critical Look at 'Participation,' 'Empowerment,' and 'Poverty Reduction'" *Third World Quarterly* 26.7 (2005): 1043-060. Print.

CREATE! "CREATE! Blog." 2013. Web. <http://createaction.org/blog/>.

---. “Education for Money Management.” *Voluntary Savings & Lending Associations (VSLA) Fact Sheet* (Aug. 2012): 2. Print.

---. "Improving the Lives of Women and Girls in Diender, Senegal." *CREATE! Newsletter* (June 2012): 1-2. Print.

---."Letter of Intent." Letter to Weyerhaeuser Family Foundation. 27 Mar. 2013. MS. CREATE!, Eugene, Oregon.

---. "Voluntary Savings and Lending Associations Keep Money Within the Community." *CREATE! Newsletter* (Aug. 2013): 1-2. Print.

Dafrallah, Touria. “Energy Security in West Africa: The Case of Senegal.” ENDA. 2009

De Vries, Pieter. "Don't Compromise Your Desire for Development! A Lacanian/Deleuzian Rethinking of the Anti-Politics Machine." *Third World Quarterly* 28.1 (2007): 25-43. Print.

Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2012. Print.

Escobar, Arturo. "Imagining a Post-Development Era? Critical Thought, Development and Social Movements." *Social Text* 31/32 (1992): 20-56. Print.

Esteva, Gustavo. "Development." *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. Ed. Wolfgang Sachs. 2nd ed. London: Zed, 2010. 1-23. Print.

Ferguson, James. *The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1990. Print.

Fischer, Günther, Mahendra Shah, Francesco Tubiello, and Harrij Van Velhuizen. "Socio-Economic and Climate Change Impacts on Agriculture: An Integrated Assessment, 1990-2080." *Philosophical Transactions: Biological Sciences*, 360.1463 (2005): 2067-2083.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1995. Print.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things: An Archeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Vintage, 1970. Print.

Glennie, Jonathan. *The Trouble with Aid: Why Less Could Mean More for Africa*. London: Zed in Association with International African Institute, Royal African Society, Social Science Research Council, 2008. Print.

Gueye, Yacine Diagne. "Case Study: Gender, Human Security, and Climate Change in Senegal." *Environmental Development Action in the Third World*. 2008.

Kalpagam, U. "Dominating Knowledges and Subjugated Practices." *Economic and Political Weekly* 27.20/21 (1992): 1068-070. Print.

Kanneh, Sidiki. "Country Director." E-mail interview. 22 Aug. 2013.

Kapoor, Ilan. "Participatory Development, Complicity, and Desire." *Third World Quarterly* 26.8 (2005): 1203-220. Print.

Karp, Ivan. "Development and Personhood: Tracing the Contours of a Moral Discourse." *Critically Modern: Alternatives, Alterities, Anthropologies*. Ed. Bruce Knauft. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2002. N. Pag. Print.

Khouma, Mamadou, Abdulai Jalloh, Timothy St. Thomas. "West African Agriculture and Climate Change: A Comprehensive Analysis – Senegal." International Food Policy Research Institute. 2011.

Lancaster, Carol. *Foreign Aid: Diplomacy, Development, Domestic Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago, 2007. Print.

Martin, Liz. "Director of Individual Donor Development." Personal interview. 17 June 2013.

Mertz, Ole, Sarah D'haen, Abdou Maiga, Ibrahim Moussa, Bruno Barbier, Awa Diouf, Drissa Diallo, Evariste Da, and Daniel Dabi. "Climate Variability and Environmental Stress in the Sudan-Sahel Zone of West Africa." AMBIO - a Journal of the Human Environment, 41.4 (2012): 380-392.

Mosse, David. "Authority, Gender, and Knowledge: Theoretical Reflections on Participatory Rural Appraisal." *Economic and Political Weekly* 30.11 (1995): 569-78. Print.

Mosse, David. *Cultivating Development: An Ethnography of Aid Policy and Practice*. London: Pluto, 2005. Print.

Moyo, Dambisa. *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is a Better Way for Africa*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2009. Print.

Ngugi, Wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. Oxford: Heinemann, 1986. Print.

Oxford English Dictionary. "Development, N.". OED Online. September 2013. Oxford University Press. 24 September 2013 <http://www.oed.com.libproxy.uoregon.edu/view/Entry/51434?redirectedFrom=development>.

Peet, Richard, and Elaine Hartwick. *Theories of Development: Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives*. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford, 2009. Print.

Pincus, Walter. "USAID Leader Outlines His Change in Strategy." *The Washington Post*. 25 Jan. 2011. Web. 2 Feb. 2011.

Rahnema, Majid. "Participation." *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. Ed. Wolfgang Sachs. 2nd ed. London: Zed, 2010. 127-44. Print.

Ruhr, Louise. "Chief Operations Officer." Personal interview. 15 May 2013.

Sachs, Wolfgang. *Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment & Development*. London: Zed, 1999. Print.

Scheffran, Jurgen, Elina Marmer, and Papa Sow. "Migration as a Contribution to Resilience and Innovation in Climate Adaptation: Social Networks and Co-development in Northwest Africa." Applied Geography, 33 (2012): 119-127.

Scott, James. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1992. Print.

Spivak, Gayatri. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Champaign: University of Illinois, 1988. N. pag. Print.

United Nations. "Millennium Goals." *Millennium Development Goals and Beyond 2015*. United Nations, 2013. Web. <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/>.

Unwin, Tim. "Beyond Budgetary Support: Pro-Poor Development Agenda for Africa." *Third World Quarterly* 25.8 (2004): 1501-523. Print.

U.S. Agency for International Development. 2011. Web. 06 Jan. 2011. <http://www.usaid.gov/>.

---. "A History of Foreign Assistance." *U.S. Agency for International Development*. 2002. Web. 17 Nov. 2010. <http://www.usaid.gov/>.

Weil, Robin. "Development Associate." Personal interview. 15 May 2013.

Wheeler, Barry, and Louise Ruhr. *Renewable Energy, Appropriate Technology, and Sustainable Community Development to Combat the Local Effects of Global Climate Change, Reduce Poverty, Increase Water Provision and Food Production, and Improve Livelihoods in Senegal, West Africa: A Three-Year Plan 2008 - 2010*. N.p.: CREATE!, 2008. Print.

Wheeler, Barry. "Sparking Solutions: Stoves and Development Alternatives." SPARK 2013. EMU Fir Room, Eugene. 17 May 2013. Speech.

Williams, Glyn. "Evaluating Participatory Development: Tyranny, Power, and (Re)politicization." *Third World Quarterly* 25.3 (2004): 557-78. Print.

World Bank. "Country Diversity." *Projects*. World Bank, 2013. Web. <http://go.worldbank.org/VQL6L02HC0>.

---. "Country Strategies." *Projects*. The World Bank, n.d. Web. <http://go.worldbank.org/IOZD56V7S0>.

---. "Poverty Reduction Strategies." The World Bank, 2013. Web. <http://go.worldbank.org/FXXJK3VEW0>.

---. *Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper II*. Rep. N.p.: n.p., 2006. Print.

---. "Senegal." *Countries*. The World Bank, 2013. Web.

---. "What Is IDA?" *International Development Association*. World Bank, 2013. Web. <http://www.worldbank.org/ida/what-is-ida.html>.