

## THE ROLE OF EXTERNAL MANAGEMENT IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AT TEHSIL LAL QILLA, DIR LOWER, KPK, PAKISTAN.

### MUHAMMAD ISRAR

Lecturer Department of Sociology, Abdul Wali Khan  
University Mardan (Timergara Campus).

### HAMAD KHAN

Lecturer Department of Sociology, Abdul Wali Khan  
University Mardan (Timergara Campus).

### WAQAS

Research scholar Department of Rural Sociology, The  
University of Agriculture Peshawar Pakistan.

### MANZOOR QADAR

Research scholar Department of Rural Sociology, The  
University of Agriculture Peshawar Pakistan.

### MUHAMMAD IBRAR

Research scholar Department of Rural Sociology, The  
University of Agriculture Peshawar Pakistan.

### S. FAZAL AZIZ

Lecturer Department of Sociology, Abdul Wali Khan  
University Mardan (Timergara Campus).

### ABSTRACT

**T**he present study was conducted in Tehsil Lal Qilla (Dir lower), to assess the role of external management in community development. The target area was purposively selected because of the numerous interventions of the organizations after war on terror in 2009 and flash floods 2010. The total population of the targeted three villages was 1986 households, from which a sample of 258 was selected randomly. To measure the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable, Binary Logistic Regression Model was used. The results showed that independent variable 'role of external manager' where ( $p=0.004$ ) was found highly significant and thus has strong relation with the dependent variable, 'community development'. The Odds Ratio found was 6.016 and thus one unit increase in the given independent variable the results of dependent variable would increase by 6.016. Negligence of external management or its negative manipulation lead the program to low results or negative repercussions, because the skills of the community's needs improvement from outside to better utilize community resources.

**Key words:** External Management, Community Development.

## INTRODUCTION

Development in its real sense is capacity building which means the members of a community are managed, channelized and mobilized in such a way, to improve their human and natural resources through a justified distribution, according to their own aspirations for sustainable improvement (Kamath, 1961). But for mainstream development the easiest way is to emphasize maximum participation through Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA). This criteria lead to the rejection of conventional strategies of positivism, reductionism, standardization and top down approach by the intervening organization (Chambers, 1997). Consultation is an important pillar, which means engaging the people in dialogue and probing people's views by the external management. This is a two way flow of information which makes acquaintance with the project manager and addresses the views of the community members on the project proposal. An undertaking taken after such discussion would be more fruitful. Consultation is a continuous process which should be sustained in implementation so that opportunity may be given to the neglected people (Lodhi, 2003).

Community Development is a process to channelize community efforts for them through themselves. Based on practice dealing with individual and work where people are taken up as the basic stimulator of social action through the process of channelization of efforts as central theme of community development. Community development is a comprehensive terminology which encompasses so many practices and academic disciplines; believe in the improvement of local communities through the involvement of officials, activists and volunteers. This process seeks to promote the skills of community members for a positive change in their own communities through community based organizations on the basis of outside expertise. Thus community development is actually community participation, an extensive process through which the citizens respond the issues of general mass concerns by including their say in the decisions they are affected this lead to accept the obligation for changes to their communal life.

(Community Development Exchange, 2008; Christenson, 1989; Passmore, 1971; Kamath, 1961 and Ntini, 2006). Boyce and Lysack (1997) opines that community development focuses on the democratic process of just participation , equitable distribution of resources, infrastructure development, elevating the skills, accentuating self-help, and a due emphasize on the emergence of local leadership in community revitalization. Also, Rifkin (1988) is of the view that, actual development means equitable distribution of benefits and redistribution of the goods and services among all. This would enable the poorer to have a reasonable share of the community wealth and fair participation in the development with a full swing.

Community development is basically the services to the people for their encouragement and involving them in the process of development through participation. It is an action oriented process with the sole aim of intervening into an organization for empowering the people while equipping them with skills to play their due role in the aftermath of services provision. However, Fruitful Community Development comes when innovative projects are launched to aware the people regarding their resources and how to utilize them. Effective community participation enhances peoples' capacity to perceive their own needs and relevant goals of any program (Hakanson, 2006; Cary, 1992).

Community participation is a mean to educate citizens by enhancing their skills. It includes influencing their choices for the betterment of population in a particular area with reference to social, economic and political dimensions. This process carries on a mechanism of taking community interests, sensitivity, awareness and answerability to the customers at the tail. It is a two prong phenomena that is a 'mean' and 'end' respectively. It focuses on insuring cooperation of locals for any external program being introduced for the betterment through implementation and achievement of the desired objectives. It has a very role of 'participation' stands for giving skills, knowledge and experience to the locals with the basic aim of exploring the developmental sector like health environment and governance etc. It has got eminence based on its vital role of efficiency, impartiality and social cohesion. Moreover, continuous interaction leads to scrutinizing the deserving beneficiaries in the provision of services to the community (Helpdesk Research Report, 2008; Midgeley and Hardiman, et. al., 1986; Chamber, 1997; Hamilton, 1992; Schwartz, 1981; Chowdhury, 1996 and Torczyner, 1987). However this process of development is usually based on two important stakeholders i.e. the outsiders who normally include bureaucrats, technocrats or social providers of innovative experiences and the masses as recipients. Participation is a comprehensive process where stake holders influence by taking control over development activities and they are giving an important role in the

decision making and resource mobilization. A substantial number of individuals activities with the psyche to improve their welfare, generate their revenue, defined their safety measures with self esteem are some other measures explicit elements of development and to help in improving the existing professions through provision of skills (Oakley and Marsden 1987; Chowdhury, 1997; Williams, 1976; Roper and Harvey, 2006; Ajayi and Otuya. 2006; WHO, 1997). After planning stage the people are involved in the later process; 'Interactive Participation' here cooperative investigation to combined activities through Community Based Organizations (CBOs) takes place where the groups participate in decision making process; however 'Self-Mobilization' is the kind of initiative taken independently without outside interference. The need for a change and a desired solution is devised by the community and the resources and technical advices are received from outside the community. However, sustainable development means cooperative investigation and combined activities through Community Based Organizations (CBOs) as a permanent strength of the community people (Plant, 1974). Thus, the chief advantage of the active community involvement in developmental works lead the implementers to have easy accessibility to human and natural resources and the attainment of collective goals. These in turn enhance the sense of ownership in the members and mature exit strategy (Arnstein, 1969).

This study revolves around the assessment of community development through different initiatives taken by the government and non-government organizations in different districts of the province. The research focused on the use of some (Independent Variable) community participation and developmental approach which lead to the success and failure of community development (Dependent Variable) programs.

### Materials and Methods

This study revolves around the assessment of community development through different initiatives taken by numerous non-government organizations in three villages of Dir (lower), KPK, Pakistan. The universe of this study was confined to Tehsil Lal Qilla, Dir Lower, purposively, because of the numerous interventions by different NGOs and INGOs as external agents after the war on terror in 2009 and the flash floods 2010. This research specifically focused on role of external management which lead to the development of a community. A sample of 258 was selected through purposive sampling from the target area through a statistical formula devised by Sekaran (2003). The analyses of the study were carried out through Logistic Regression, which measured the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable by converting the dependent variable to probability scores while univariate regression was used to explain the frequency and percentage of the data collected. In the given study Binary Logistic Model was used as an appropriate tool for regression analysis.

$$Y = a + bX_i + \epsilon_i$$

Where, (Y) is dependent variable, (a) is Y-intercept of dependant variable, (X) is independent variable, (b) is slope of the line and ( $\epsilon_i$ ) error term which is negligible.

Models Specification: Binary Logistic Model

$$\text{Logistic Regression Model: } Y = \beta_0 + \beta X + \epsilon$$

Where; (Y) is dependent variable; ( $\beta_0$ ) is intercept; ( $\beta$ ) is regression coefficient of independent variable (X); while,  $\epsilon$  is standard error. The variables can be described as under:

Y: Community Development

X: Role of External Management

The data were analyzed using Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS 20). The dependent variable (Community Development) was in binary form hence, Binary Logistic Regression Model was used to predict the effect of independent variable on the dependent variable (Berkson, 1994).

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The Univariate analysis was applied through SPSS 20 to explain the frequencies and percentage of the data collected from the sample. The following Table I and II will univariately explicit the values of the independent variable, Role of External Management and the dependent variable Community Development.

Logistic Regression has been used for bi-variate analysis which results would be discussed in Table III.

## 1. UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS

Role of external management is the independent variable of this study. The variable tells us about role played by the external management as an element of social change and community development. This is obvious that the programs are to be run by outsiders who have improved skills.

### 1.1 Role of External Management (X)

**Table 1 Role of External Management (X)**

<b>Were the projects launched were innovative</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	185	71.7
No	73	28.3
Total	258	100.0
<b>Opportunity to the People in decision making process</b>		
Yes	165	64.0
No	93	36.0
Total	258	100.0
<b>Work of Organisations according to community's desired needs</b>		
Yes	137	53.1
No	121	46.9
Total	258	100.0
<b>Proper scrutiny in the provision of services</b>		
Yes	103	39.9
No	155	60.1
Total	258	100.0
<b>Reached assistance to deserving People</b>		
Completely	22	8.5
Partially	160	62.0
Negatively	76	29.5
Total	258	100.0
<b>Contribution of programs to major professions</b>		
Yes	55	21.3
No	203	78.7
Total	258	100.0

Table I reveals the role of external management in the process of community development programs. The first part of the table showed that out of total 258 (100%), 185 (71.7%) were of the opinion that the projects were quite innovative and skill enhancing, while 73 (28.3%) responded that the projects were not completely new for them. The results were similar to the findings of Cary (1992) "Fruitful Community Development comes when innovative projects are launched to aware the people regarding their resources and how to utilize them."

The table explained further the opportunity given to the people in decision making regarding the community development programs. Out of the total 258 (100%), the majority being 165 (64.0%) responded that the external management gave opportunity to locals in decision making process, while 93 (36.0%) responded that they were not given an opportunity in decision making. The results are synonymous with the finding of Ntini (2006), who opined community participation is an extensive process through which the citizens respond the issues of general mass concerns by including their say in the decisions they are affected this lead to accept the obligation for changes to their communal life. The table further investigates that out of total 258 (100%), majority 137(53.1%) responded that the organisations worked according to the community desired needs, while 121(46.9%) answered that the programs were not according to the felt need of the

people. The findings support the results of Hakanson (2006), 'Effective community participation enhances peoples' capacity to perceive their own needs and relevant goals of any program'. The table also explained the follow-up and scrutiny of the organisations. Out of the total 258 (100%), majority 155(60.1%) responded that no follow-up mechanism was in place during the implementation, while 103 (39.9%) responded that proper scrutiny and follow-up was followed in the process. In this case the organisations have been criticized by the community people that the follow-up was in place and therefore the services were extended to a wrong person. As discussed by Chowdhury (1996), a continuous interaction leads to scrutinizing the deserving beneficiaries in the provision of services to the community.

The table further revealed about the reaching of assistance to the deserving beneficiaries. Out of the total 258 (100%), majority 160(62.0%) responded that the assistance reached partially to the deserving, 76(29.5%) answered that the deserving people were completely neglected and 22 (8.5%) opined that all deserving were assisted. The results approve the findings of Rifkin (1988) who, is of the view that, actual development means equitable distribution of benefits and redistribution of the goods and services among all. This would enable the poorer to have a reasonable share of the community wealth and fair participation in the development with a full swing. Similarly, the table explains the contribution of the NGOs toward major profession of the area which has long lasting impacts. It describes, that out of the total 258 (100%), majority 203(78.7%) responded that no contribution was made to improve the major profession, while 55(21.3%) responded that the NGOs helped in the enhancement of the major professions of the area. The results are contrary to Chowdhury (1996) who believes that sustainable success of a program lies in role of external organisations in development of existing professions and skills development of the area.

## **1.2 Community Development (Y)**

Community Development was the dependent variable of the study through which we were ascertaining the possible changes made by the organisations through their implemented programs in the target area. The sub sections of the table will guide us regarding the magnitude of the changes brought by the work of organizations.

**Table II Community Development (Y)**

<b>Contribution to CD through Infrastructure Development</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
<b>Yes</b>	239	92.6
<b>No</b>	19	7.4
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Contribution to CD through distribution of FIs and NFIs</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	202	78.3
<b>No</b>	56	21.7
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Contribution to CD through Human Capital Development</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	213	82.6
<b>No</b>	45	17.4
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Promotion of Self-help Lesson</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	173	67.1
<b>No</b>	85	32.9
<b>Total</b>	258	
<b>Utilization of community's human resources</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	89	34.5
<b>No</b>	169	65.5
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Utilization of community's natural resources</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	144	55.8
<b>No</b>	114	44.2
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Guidance about sustainable development</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	144	55.8
<b>No</b>	114	44.2
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Contribution of organisation toward the local leadership</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	113	43.8
<b>No</b>	145	56.2
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0
<b>Formation of CBOs by external management</b>		
<b>Yes</b>	194	75.2
<b>No</b>	64	24.8
<b>Total</b>	258	100.0

Table II states that, out of 258 (100%), 239 (92.6%) were of the view that the organisations were successful to bring community development through reconstruction. A minority of 19 (7.4%) were of the opinion that community development was not brought through reconstruction of infrastructure. The results of variable showed that extremely positive role had been played in the mention regard and the results were tangible. To another question of the same nature, out of the total 258 (100%), 239 (92.6%) of the target population answered that the organisations contributed to community development through distribution of Food Items (FI) and Non-food Items (NFI), while 19 (7.4%) responded that no positive impacts were brought by the mentioned distributions. The table explicit further that, out of 258 (100 %), 213 (82.6 %) argued that the organizations were successful in the development of human capital while 45 (17.4%) were of the view that they were not successful in their goal to develop human capital. The table further expressed the promotion of the self-help by the intervening organisations. It came to knowledge that out of the total 258 (100%), 173 (67.1%) are of the view that yes, the community development programs promoted the lessons of self-help in the target area while 85 (32.9%) expressed their views that the organisations have failed to promote the lessons of self-help in the target community. The results showed that the organisations were successful in promoting the main idea of community development. Complying with the findings of Boyce and Lysack (1997); community development focuses on the democratic process of just participation, equitable distribution of resources, infrastructure development, elevating the skills, accentuating self-help, and a due emphasize on the emergence of local leadership in community revitalization.

The table further explores that, out of the total 258 (100%), majority 169 (65.5%) of the target population answered that human resource of the target community were not utilized for the process of the community development, while 89 (34.5%) responded that human resources of the community were utilized on and off in the programs. The next part of the table clarify that, out of 258 (100 %), 144 (55.8%) argued that the organizations used the natural resources of the community in the developmental programs. On the other hand 114 (44.2%) were of the view that natural resources of the community were not brought in direct use for the community development. The output of the first variable is against while the second one supported the findings of Arnstein, (1969) the chief advantage of the active community involvement in developmental works lead the implementers to have easy accessibility to human and natural resources and the attainment of collective goals. These in turn enhance the sense of ownership in the members and mature exit strategy. Moreover the table showed that out of the total 258 (100%), 144 (55.8%) claimed that the organizations guided the people regarding sustainable development through their different programs. On the contrary 114 (44.2%) were of the interpreted that no such guidance was underscored by the intervening organisations through their community development initiatives in the target community. The table clarified that, out of the total 258 (100%), majority 165 (64.0%) of the target population responded that no such proper training was arranged for the target community, 93 (36.0%) replied that they got proper training in the community development programs. The findings of this variable contradict Schwartz (1981) conclusion, who opines that community participation is a means to educate the citizens and escalate their skills. The table further depicted that, out of the total 258 (100%), majority 145 (56.2%) of the target population responded that the programs contributed to the development of local leadership, 113 (43.8%) replied that no contribution was made by the programs toward the development of local leadership. Complying with the findings of Boyce and Lysack (1997), community development method focuses on the democratic process of just participation in the developmental activities by accentuating self-help, and a due emphasize on the emergence of local leadership in community revitalization. The final part of the table clarifies that out of the total 258 (100%), 194 (75.2%) opined that the organizations did not form any CBO for the implementation and sustainability, 64 (24.8%) orated that the organisations have been working through the local CBOs. The results of this study were found in consonance with Plant's, (1974) findings, who strictly observes that sustainable development means cooperative investigation and combined activities through Community Based Organizations (CBOs) as a permanent strength of the community people.

## 2. BIVARIATE ANALYSIS

To find out the relation between dependent and independent variables logistic regression was used. Details of the model have been given in the following headings.

### 2.1. LOGISTIC REGRESSION MODEL

To get the relation between independent and dependent variables Binary Logistic Regression was used as given in the following table.

**Table III Logistic Regression Model**

Variables	B	S.E.	Wald	Df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Role of External Management	1.794	0.626	8.211	1	0.004	6.016
Constant	-1.927	1.022	3.554	1	0.059	.146
*Variable(s) entered on step 1: X1						

The given data in (Table III) highlights the significance level of independent variable upon dependent variable. The table contains an observation expressing the independent variables i.e. Role of External Management and its ultimate relation with the dependent variable Community Development. The value found ( $p = 0.004$ ) was highly significant, hence a strong relation between the two variables (Independent and Dependent Variables) have been found. Also the Exponent/Beta (Odds Ratio) showed us a value of 6.016 and thus one unit increase in the given variable would result an increase of 6.016 in corresponding dependent variable. The results have been supported by numerous researchers who claim that, the process of development is usually based on two important stakeholders i.e. the outsiders who normally include bureaucrats, technocrats or social providers of innovative experiences and the masses, as recipients (Oakley and Marsden 1987; Chowdhury, 1997; Roper and Harvey, 2006; Ajayi and Otuya. 2006).

## **SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This study was carried out with the main objectives, to assess the role of external management in community development as per the initiatives carried out by organizations through different developmental programs in the target area. Major findings of this study disclosed that external management had close and long lasting impact on community development because of diversifying skills, innovative experiences and accessible resources. Taking in consideration the given variable the community development program would certainly yield long lasting effects in term of skills provision, sustainability and better implementation which ultimately lead to the development of a community. Maximum utilization of community human resource would lead to acculturate the residents and thus would deliver long lasting effects. A maximum say of the commoner in project designing and implementation would literally enhance the capacity of the locals in term of their issues and possible solutions.

## REFERENCES

1. Ajayi, A. R, N.Otuya. 2006. "Women's participation in self-help community development projects in Ndokwa agricultural zone of Delta State". *Community Development Journal*. Nigeria. 41 (2). 189-209.
2. Ajayi, A.R. 1995. "Community self-help projects implementation procedures. A case study of Ekiti South-West Local Government Area of Ondo State". *Agro search*, 1. Pp. 47-55.
3. Arnstein S. 1969. "A ladder of citizen participation". *American Institute of Planners Journal* 1969; 35 (4). pp. 216-224.
4. Berkson, J. 1994. "Application of the Logistic Function to Bioassay". *J. Amer. Statistic. Assoc.* 39: 357-365.
5. Boyce, W., and Lysack, C. 1997. *Understanding the Community in Canadian CBR: Critical lessons from abroad*. *Canadian Journal of Rehabilitation*. 10(4). Pp. 261-271).
6. Cary,L.J. 1992. "The Concept and Context of Community Development, Community Development as process, in *Adult education for Community Development*. "New York: Greenwood Press. Pp: 47-69.
7. Chambers, R. 1997. "Whose Reality Counts?". *Putting the First Last, Intermediate Technology*, London. 22. (10). Pp. 1437-1454.
8. Chowdhury. 1989. "Let Grassroots Speak: People's Participation Self-Help Groups and NGO's in Bangladesh". *University Press Ltd., Dhaka*. P. 50.
9. Christenson, J.A., 1989. "Community development in perspective". *Ames: Low a State University Press, Ames*, pp: 3-14.
10. Community Development Exchange. 2012." [Internet] Available at <http://www.cdx.org.uk/community-development/what-community-development>. Accessed on 13-5-2012.
11. Hakanson. J. W. 2006. "Community development: who benefits?" *The participation of rural based teachers in community development activities Chivi district masvingo Zimbabwe, M . Sc. Thesis, South Africa, Univ., pp: 29*.
12. Hamilton. E. 1992. "Adult Education for community development". *New York: Greenwood Press*. Pp. 47-69.
13. Helpdesk Research Report. 2008. "Community Participation in Disaster Rehabilitation and Recovery". [Internet] [http://banglapedia.search.com.bd/HT/C\\_0309.html](http://banglapedia.search.com.bd/HT/C_0309.html). Accessed on 24/5/12.
14. Kamath, M.G. 1961. "Extension Education in Community Development, India". *Glasgow Printing Co., UK*. Pp. 3-4.

15. Lodhi T. E. 2003. "Need for paradigm shift from top-down to participatory extension in the Punjab, Pakistan: perceptions of farmers, change agents and their supervisory staff". Ph. D. Thesis. Department of Agricultural Extension, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad-Pakistan.
16. Michener. V. 1998. "The Participatory Approach: Contradiction and Co-Optation in Burkina Faso". *World Development*. 26 (12). Pp. 2105-18.
17. Midgeley J, Hall A, Hardiman M, et. al.1986. "Community Participation, Social Development and the State". London. Great Britain.
18. Ntini, E., 2006. "The participation of rural based teachers in community development activities chivi district masvingo Zimbabwe". M. Sc. Thesis; University of South Africa. P. 29.
19. Oakley P. 1991. "Projects With People: The Practice of Participation in Rural Development". ILO. Geneva.
20. Orapin, S. 1996. "People's participation in community development". TDRI. Quarterly Review. 11 (3). Pp. 19-25.
21. Passmore. G. C. 1971. "Theoretical aspects of local Government action in the African rural areas of Rhodesia" In: Ntini, E. 2006. "The participation of rural based teachers in community development activities chivi district Zimbabwe", M .S. Thesis. South Africa. Univ. Pp. 29.
22. Plant, R. 1974. "Community and Ideology". Routledge & Kegan Paul. London, United Kingdom.
23. Reid. J. N. 2000. "How People Power Brings Sustainable Benefits to Communities". USDA Rural Development: Office of Community Development. Washington. USA.
24. Rifkin SB, Muller F, Bichmann W. 1988. "Primary health care: On measuring participation". *Social Science & Medicine*. 26. Pp. 931-940.
25. Roper, L., Utz, E, and Harvey J. 2006. "The TsunamiLearningProject: LessonsforGrantmakers in Natural Disaster Response". Grantmakers Without Borders. Boston.  
<http://www.internationaldonors.org/issues/pdf/tlp>
26. Roper. L., Utz, E. ,Harvey J. 2006. <http://www.benfieldhrc.org/activities/> visited at 13/5/12.
27. Schwartz NB. 1981. "Anthropological views of community and community development. *Human Organisation*". 40. Pp. 313-320.
28. Sekaran, U. 2003. *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Willey & Sons, Inc.
29. Williams R. Keywords. 1976. "A vocabulary of culture and society". Oxford University Press. New York.
30. World Health Organisation. ICIDH-2. 1997. "International Classification of Impairments, Activities, and Participation". A Manual of Dimensions of Disablement and Functioning - Beta-1 draft. WHO. Geneva.