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I. INTRODUCTION

In most LDC's, as high as 85 percent of the population is engaged in subsistence agriculture and as high as 90 percent of the population live in the rural sector which comprises the population engaged both in farm and nonfarm activities. The level of income of the rural population is very low compared to the small urban sector of these countries and the income per capita growth rate is excruciatingly slow.\(^1\) At the same time this sector contributes 50-60 percent of the GDP in most countries with an average growth rate of 2.5 to 3 percent. Economists estimate that with population growing at 2 to 3 percent per annum and per capita income consumption rising at 1 percent, there will be an annual increase of 4 percent in demand for food. This growth in food production is not within the reach of most developing countries and as a result, malnutrition and food shortages will likely plague many countries. Moreover, people in this sector suffer from extreme poverty, disease, illiteracy, low level of productive employment, etc.

These conditions have forced many developing countries and lending agencies to put more emphasis on the development of the rural sector by introducing integrated activities that can tackle most of the problems of the rural population simultaneously. The emphasis in the development of this sector would enable production of sufficient food to satisfy

---

the increasing food demand; creation of productive employment for the growing labor force and for those who can not secure employment in the modern sector; implementation of income equalizing policies through resource ownership distribution, or other means; accumulation of surplus resources (higher per capita income and saving) above consumption requirements; and, establishment of rural institution that protect and provide incentives to the rural population. Moreover, it develops the large reserve of "human resource"—labor and associated human capital—to effectively utilize in rural as well as urban sectors of the economy.

Various approaches are being used to develop the rural sector and improve the standard of living of the people. Community development programs were used quite extensively in the 1940s and 1950s and are still being used in many developing countries. Agricultural production projects have been common components of development plans and have attracted considerable assistance from donors. Cooperatives and community initiated organizations are also used as a means through which development programs are carried out. Integrated rural development programs are gaining increasing importance in the early 1970s as they

---


are assumed to be an effective means of bringing about rural change.

In this paper an integrated approach to improving the welfare of the rural people will be examined. This is a method of introducing different economic and social activities that have a converging effect of raising the level of living and bringing about a favorable change in the way of life of the rural population in a concerted and coordinated manner. The different activities to be coordinated have different objectives and is therefore a method of rural development where multiple objectives are pursued concurrently in the rural sector.

The discussion will concentrate on African countries with mixed economies. Part II of the paper is devoted to a discussion of the meaning and scope of integrated rural development and methods of integration of rural activities. Part III deals with the conceptual model that is developed for understanding the interactions and linkages among the components of the rural sector. Parts IV and V treats rural program planning and evaluation, respectively.

II. INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA:

MEANING, SCOPE AND METHODS OF INTEGRATION

Meaning and Scope of Integrated Rural Development

Millions of people live in the rural sector of African countries suffering from poverty, malnutrition, various kinds of diseases, high level of infant mortality, low life expectancy, illiteracy and low level of income. These countries seek a means and a strategy to alleviate the rural poverty and pursue as their national or rural development objectives the production of sufficient food to eliminate problems of food shortage
and malnutrition; creation of more productive employment; attainment of an equitable distribution of income; and expanding education and health services. In this list of overall goals, and objectives, are also included the development of an efficient communication and transportation system, establishment of rural electrification and water supply system, provision of recreational facilities for the people and maintenance of an economy that is politically and economically independent.

To achieve these multiple objectives, an integrated rural development strategy has been recommended by many scholars and government officers and numerous programs have already started in African countries. The integrated approach to rural development is very broad and attempts to bring about a transformation and an improvement in the economic and social welfare of the rural people. In addition to introduction of packages of coordinated activities, it is also viewed as the development of "...the ability of the individual and the community to increase their span of control over factors which affect them without undue governmental patronage, but as equal partners..." In this approach, there is a great concern for the well being of the rural population and particularly
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to that segment of the population that suffers from chronic poverty and constitutes the lowest portion of the rural family income distribution. Since the majority of the population in the rural sector of Africa falls in the lower three-fourth of the family income frequency distribution, there is a general consensus among scholars, government officers and lending agencies that efforts should be directed towards the lowest family income group.

**Methods of Integrating Rural Development**

Integrated rural development in Africa has emerged in response to a need for a program that can help achieve the multiple objectives of the rural sector. Most rural development programs, based on the fact that the rural population is predominantly agricultural, places more emphasis on raising the level of agricultural output than improving the level of living of the rural people because improvement in productivity is assumed to increase the rate of growth of an economy and indirectly improve the welfare of the masses.

Thus, a selective rural development program is often geared to meeting specific objectives.\(^7\) For example, wells are dug where there is a shortage of water; vaccines are rushed to a community after a typhoid epidemic has spread; or, fertilizer is distributed to increase the output from agricultural production. Other similar activities are carried at different times by different branches of the government or by the community on a selective basis to deal with a problem of the rural people.

Integrated rural development differs from selective rural

\(^7\)FAO/UN, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-9.
development in that it deals with two or more activities with the
intention of meeting the multiple objectives of rural development. The
size and number of activities that are integrated will vary depending
on the nature of problems and availability of resources. The use of
the word integrated does not necessarily mean that activities to
facilitate rural development will be started all at once. Most
countries have limited capital and skilled manpower resources to carry
an all-embracing rural program and lack institutions and organizational
set ups to run such programs. Therefore, the activities that are being
integrated in the on-going rural development programs in Africa are
very limited in number, involving either a single ministry or agency
or group of ministries and agencies. There is a contention that most
of the disappointing results of rural development programs might be
attributed to a lack of integration of program activities. The benefits
and positive externalities are over shadowed by already existing economic
and social problems as well as negative externalities that emerge as
a result of the selective program.

There are two functional levels of integrating rural development
programs: integration of the activities of an agency of a government
and integration of activities of different agencies of a government.

Agency Program Integration8

In developing countries, the government duties and responsibilities
are distributed among ministries, agencies or semi-autonomous organizations

(Boards, institutes, etc.). Their responsibilities are usually well defined and each develops and carries out programs of its own. There is a range of activities which a single ministry or agency can engage itself, even though there will be a cooperation of some sort. For instance, a government agricultural agency will have a partial or full responsibility of carrying on the following activities: research to develop mechanical and biological innovations to increase agricultural production; training of agricultural scientists, technicians, administrators and farmers; land development activities such as erosion control, irrigation and drainage; making the necessary farm inputs available; creating production incentives; and setting up and providing agricultural support activities such as credit, extension, market for outputs, retail outlets for inputs, feeder roads to connect farm areas to markets, etc. These are few of the activities that an agricultural agency has to be responsible for initiating and maintaining.

An agency that is responsible for the health services of a country is also responsible for a variety of activities. Clinics, hospitals, health education, inoculation services, family planning programs, education on nutrition and other similar activities that can help improve health conditions are responsibilities of this agency. A similar discussion of the various agencies of a country such as education, public works, transportation and communication can be made.

Agency program integration requires that each government agency establish and make available a package of its own activities when participating in rural development. To bring about a desired level of change in the rural sector, each government agency can best accomplish
this by providing services and establishing activities that support each other and makes the operation effective.

Inter-Agency Program Integration

In the case of agency program integration it is anticipated that the benefits and impact of integrated programs will be greater than a selective and unintegrated activities. In a multi-agency integration approach the same argument is used to include not only integration of activities within an agency, but also between agencies. Not only are the various activities of an agency supportive and complementary to each other, but also, the activities between the different agencies are also supportive. It is thus anticipated that the more programs are integrated, more direct benefits and positive externalities can be generated. The coordination of inter-agency programs help establish various activities concurrently and bring the benefit of the program immediately or within a foreseeable future; it also reduces or eliminates waste of resources due to duplication of efforts; and finally, the objectives of each agency can more easily be achieved because of the reinforcement that its activities receive from the activities of other agencies.

III. A CONCEPTUAL MODEL FOR UNDERSTANDING RURAL DEVELOPMENT

An economy is divided into different sectors for different purposes; on the basis of location, firm or farm size, kind of output, kind of input, structure of employment, etc. Most of the sectors are so large and

---

9 Ibid.

complex, a further breakdown into subsectors is essential to understand how the sector operates, how it interacts with other sectors, and how the subsectors under each sector function and interact with each other. In this paper a tri-subsector framework of analysis will be developed to understand the planning and evaluation of integrated rural development programs. The subsectors are the agricultural, rural nonfarm and government subsectors. A description of these subsectors and how they interact will be discussed in the following section (See Figure 1).

**Agricultural Subsector**

This subsector comprises 50-85 percent of the population of most LDC's. The population in this subsector is primarily engaged in crop and/or livestock production on very small holdings to satisfy basic needs of food, housing and clothing. Most of what is produced is consumed at home and some cash crops are grown by small and large farmers for export purposes. Export crops constitute a very high percentage of the total foreign exchange earnings in most African countries.

The population in this subsector has a very low level of per capita income and leads a subsistence type of living. They have very little opportunity for employment in activities other than agriculture. They usually use traditional technologies in the agricultural production process and work within a limited capital resource constraint. There is a low level of formal education and political and administrative environment that accomplishes little to the improvement of the welfare of the people.

---

This subsector is usually divided into small scale and large scale on the basis of the number of employees, capital intensity of farms and whether the farm is run by self-employed family labor or not. The large scale farms employ modern agricultural technologies, mechanical as well as biological, that are usually capital intensive and use hired labor at various stages of operations. On the other hand, the small-scale farms are geared towards subsistence type of production.

**Rural Nonfarm Subsector**

Aside from those people who are directly engaged in agricultural production, a significant portion of the rural population is engaged in nonagricultural activities. There are relatively few studies on nonfarm activities of rural sectors of African countries. Liedholm has recently summarized the literature for Africa. He reports that some of the studies in Africa revealed that 10-30 percent of all employed males in rural areas are principally engaged in this subsector.\(^{12}\) Oshima has summarized similar studies on this subsector in Asia.\(^ {13}\)

The demand for labor in the agricultural subsector is highly seasonal. During the period of peak demand only the people who are engaged in full-time nonfarm activities make up the ten to thirty percent estimate

---


stated above. Once the season for high labor demand is over a large size of the agricultural labor force perform nonfarm activities until agricultural activities can be resumed fully. Such seasonal variation cause a large percent of the rural population to engage in nonfarm activities directly for a short period of time or to devote part of their time on nonfarm and the rest on farm activities.

Most of the description used for the people in the agricultural subsector also fits the nonagricultural population of the rural sector. These people are engaged in different kinds of occupations such as traders, local craftsmen, small-scale rural manufacturing and processing workers and various other hosts of activities.¹⁴ Those engaged as traders, as craftsmen and workers in small rural manufacturing and processing plants account for the majority of the employment in this sector. The product from the diverse activities of this subsector is also diverse, but for the purpose of this paper, the outputs will be divided into two groups: products used for consumption purposes, mainly processed agricultural products, clothing and consumer durables; and products used as input for the production of other products such as agricultural implements.

Usually, most nonfarm activities have very low capital intensity; however, some small-scale rural manufacturing or processing activities are capital intensive. Except for these kinds of activities, most other activities are accommodated within a family property and the material inputs used in the production process are indigenous to the locality

¹⁴ Liedholm, op. cit., p. 4.
or are home produced. It draws heavily on family labor and utilizes labor that is considered traditional and inappropriate for other sectors.\textsuperscript{15}

\textbf{Government Subsector}

This subsector plays a crucial role in translating national and regional objectives into reality. Improving the well-being of the rural people involves diverse activities and facilities. Introduction of these activities and provision of facilities under manpower, capital and institutional constraints as well as under such national objectives as equitable income distribution, employment creation, etc., is an arduous and intricate task. In most developing countries where neither the resource endowment, the skilled manpower, nor the income distribution pattern seems to be favorable, the government has the responsibility to allocate and distribute resources where maximum social benefit can be realized. The government must provide certain facilities and services or else organize people so that they can acquire by themselves. Most social services mentioned are indivisible and hard to acquire for individuals and should be provided up to a minimum level by or with the help of the government. Quite often, the government looks after research, extension, credit programs and other firm and farm support activities. It is bestowed with the power to formulate price policies,

\textsuperscript{15}For a discussion on this characteristic of the nonfarm sector, see D. W. Norman, "Economic Analysis of Agricultural Production and Labor Utilization Among the Hausa in the North of Nigeria," African Rural Employment Study, Paper No. 4, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, (1973), pp. 7-16.
declare tax or subsidy or other support programs to encourage or discourage output growth and help shift livestock or crop-mixes. It can create institutions that enhance the development effort and should stand ready to enforce rules and regulations and maintain peace and order.

In general the overall activities of the government subsector can be viewed as dealing with the "human resource investment" aspect of rural sector that is very much "people oriented" and activities that improve the production and consumption process of the rural sector. "People oriented" activities of the government include education, health, employment creation, income distribution, etc. while the latter deals with activities such as research, price policies public work programs, etc. It does not necessarily mean that the production and consumption oriented activities have nothing to do with people. But, it means that the effects on people's social welfare are indirect and in a round about way.

**Interactions and Linkages Between Subsectors**

The kind of outputs, inputs, and services that are used produced or provided by each of the subsectors can reveal the degree of interdependency between them. It was mentioned that the nonfarm subsector produces processed food materials, clothing, consumer durables, farm

---


implements, blacksmithing, etc. These products are regarded as necessities for the population in the agricultural subsector, and the bulk of the production is sold to farmers and wage earners within the sector. The farmer population in turn sells food and raw materials, and provides off-season farm labor for work in the nonfarm subsector. Moreover, as productivity in agriculture increases, the demand for output from nonfarm activities increases and this in turn enables the nonfarm subsector to employ more farm labor during slack season.\textsuperscript{18} Byerlee and Eicher, while discussing the interrelationship between the nonfarm and agricultural subsector noted:

"...the 1972 ILO study of unemployment in Kenya noted that about 75 percent of all rural nonfarm enterprises are owned by predominantly larger farmers, suggesting significant transfer of savings and entrepreneurial ability from agriculture.

In the product markets, the demand for the output of the rural nonfarm enterprises depends largely on (a) consumer demand for rural households and (b) the backward and forward linkages of agricultural production, particularly processing and marketing of agricultural products."\textsuperscript{19}

The interrelationship between the government subsector and the other two subsectors is difficult to describe in terms of flow of inputs and outputs from one to the other. In integrated rural programs there will be more flows of resources from the government to the other two subsectors more than what is usually expected in selective programs and the flow of resources from these subsectors into the government is

\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 171.

\textsuperscript{19} Byerlee and Eicher, op. cit., p. 17.
not as large as the government expenditure. The interdependency and interaction between the government and the other two subsectors is more obvious in the stage of program implementation where a government initiated programs needs the willingness of people to accept and participate in its operation to be effective. In addition to the participation in implementation of programs, organized groups or communities can also contribute by suggesting and recommending to the government what will be best for the community and what things the community needs.

In subsequent parts of the paper, planning and evaluation of rural programs will be discussed and the frame of reference will be the three subsectors mentioned above. Planning for rural development will involve planning for the agricultural subsector; nonfarm subsector; and planning of the institutions, policies and organizations of the government subsector. Similarly, the evaluation process will focus on how each subsector operates and how much of the stated objectives are achieved.

IV. INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT:
PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Planning for integrated rural development is quite different from planning for selective programs like agricultural production, road construction, health, etc.\textsuperscript{20} It includes a large number of

activities that are planned simultaneously for execution and operates with the objective of improving the welfare of the lower income group of the rural population. Moreover, integrated rural development covers a wide geographical area and attempts to reach a large segment of the rural population. It is, therefore, a systematic, economic organization where physical planning (agriculture, transportation, education, etc.) takes its direction from human values, needs and available resources, thus providing a coordinated unit to achieve the maximum satisfaction of the people within a given time and place.21

One of the important components of planning for integrated rural development is the presence of a committed leadership to the general rural development objectives and efficient administrative organization in the rural sector. Another component of equal importance is an inventory of the human and physical resources of the area, which should include basic technical data about rainfall, soils, crops, etc.; geological surveys; and household consumption, production and other behavioral studies. It is also important that the various studies, the inventorying of resources, and the actual preparation of the plan, should be done by competent technocrats drawn from a wide range of disciplines. Thus, providing a comprehensive plan of activities for the rural and urban sectors to avoid inconsistency.

Organization of Plans for Rural Development

Plans for integrated rural development should be formulated at three different levels: national, regional and firm or farm level.\(^22\) The national plan or "macroplan" is a generalized aggregative effort to set national priorities and allocate resources among ministries and agencies as identified by national planners or expressed by people involved in the activities. It deals with aggregation of quantitative and qualitative information, forecasting future trends and determining the kinds of activities that are consistent with the national objectives and resource constraints.

The farm or firm planning or "microplanning" is, on the other hand, planning for and of individual operations. Because of variation in resource endowments, natural conditions and income level among localities and people, there can not be a single plan that serves everybody, everywhere. This is particularly true for agricultural activities. Therefore, plans are formulated for a particular locality and for a specific purpose. Under micro level planning there might develop a conflict between the national and individual or group activities and objectives, particularly if people are free to make any kind of decision and plan their own activities. A method of attuning the individual plans with the national plan and organization of local or individual plans within the framework of the national plan should exist.

This brings forth the need for an intermediate level of planning that has the responsibility of regionalizing national plans in line with the overall rural development objectives taking into consideration what would be best for the individual or locality and what can be and should be performed by people of certain locality. This level of planning looks at a great percentage of the people in the rural areas and includes a wide range of activities within a region. Various sectoral and subsectoral plans at the national level are apportioned into a region and then coordinated with local operations and production and consumption processes. Regional plans serve as a link between the micro and macro plans and as a coordinating mechanism of the activities that ensue from the plans. In planning for integrated rural development, the regional level of planning should play an important role in bringing about the desired changes that will improve the life of the rural people.

Regional Level of Planning for Rural Development

Realization of the objectives of rural development through integrated agency activities or inter-agency activities requires a well thought out plan, a concerted effort, and private and public expenditure for planning, 1) productive activities—introduction of mechanical and biological technologies to increase productivity and to substitute the relatively abundant factors for the scarce and expensive factors; (2) planning supportive infrastructure such as roads, railways, storage facilities, etc.; and (3) for planning social investments.23 Neither

---

23 Yudelman, op. cit., pp. 6-11.
all the above activities nor the whole rural sector can be covered or mobilized simultaneously in most African countries for lack of skilled manpower, resources and administrative and institutional set up.

Therefore, programs considered to be most needed and most beneficial to the rural sector are integrated, and an area or group of people that need most these activities are identified. Plans are thus formulated in the context of a region to serve a specified number of people with a set of integrated activities. Moreover, at the regional level, the macro plans are disaggregated on a regional basis, agency programs and participation in the development effort specified and inter-agency activities are integrated so that each could reinforce the activity of one another to benefit more than what individual agencies would contribute. It also examines the economies of the operations and activities of individual farms in the agricultural subsector and firms in the nonfarm subsector, observes the social and cultural value systems of localities and help formulate micro plans consistent with the rural development effort.

A regionalized approach to rural development often raises controversial problems. One of the most difficult to resolve is the choice of region(s) to be developed. Some areas are selected because it best suits an already designed program. It is selected not because this area needs the program more than other areas. Nor is it selected on the basis of its potential to fulfill the rural development objectives, but as a test ground for activities of the program. On

---

24 Food and Agricultural Organization of the UN, op. cit., pp. 11-15.
the other hand, there are programs that emerge as a result of a concern
for the welfare of a particular group of people in an area and programs
are designed to alleviate problems or expedite the development of
natural or human resources. The "human factor" directly or indirectly
is an important consideration in the selection of areas and activities.

In the actual planning process two diametrically opposite consider-
atations make the selection process difficult. First, is the predilec-
tion to design programs for areas where it is easy to harness physical
resources, where local people are interested or the potential for
participation is high, and where financial resources from domestic or
foreign source can be raised easily. In general, areas with a potential
for high and immediate growth draws the attention of most planners.
The other consideration is taking local needs as the criteria for
selection of an area. Programs are sited where there is the most
need for it regardless of the physical, human and financial resource
limitations and the potential to be productive or self-sustaining.
Both extremes have some desirable and undesirable features. One has
to settle in between these extremes to avoid the creation of a
"cumulative circular causation" on the one hand and the wastage and
depletion of scarce resources in a totally unproductive activities on
the other. There are some general considerations in the selection of
an area that could help from falling into the two extremes. These are:

1. Identification of areas that can be considered as representative
   of a wide range of areas of the rural sector not only in terms
   of physical resource endowments, but in terms of rural social
   structure and economic problems and needs.
2. Natural and physical conditions such as rainfall, soil, agro-economic conditions for the agricultural subsector, and availability of raw-materials for the nonfarm subsector.

3. Availability of facilities and services that can be used by both the agricultural and the nonfarm subsector such as marketing services and facilities (credit, storage, etc.) rural feeder roads that are connected to market centers or main highways and social infrastructure; and how much more of these services and facilities will be needed.

4. The attitude of the people towards change. Programs within the bound of the socio-cultural system that takes the traditional values and gradually work to improve it in the desired direction is important. The extent of perceived bottlenecks and intensity of need for goods, and services in a region need to be understood and areas need to be ranked according to intensity of problems and needs.

5. Government subsector involvement in rural areas, the efficiency of its lowest level of administrative unit that is in direct contact with local people, and operational institutions under the guidance and control of government must be understood.

This consideration must be approached in reference to what its performance has been in the past, what kind of level of administrative units and new institutions will be needed under an integrated rural development program, and what kind of modifications will be needed in the already institutionalized policies.
6. Selection of a large enough area so that there can be an economy of scale in operation of various activities and supply of inputs; but, not large enough to cause diseconomies. The optimum size is determined by efficiency criterion in the use of resources for a given capital investment, skilled manpower and administrative capacity,\textsuperscript{26}

Another aspect of regional level of planning that needs to be considered and planned is the funding of the programs. In integrated rural development programs, a substantial amount of financial resource will be tied up in some kind of fixed capital investment or human resource investment and will also be spent on recurrent costs. These financial demands are usually met from, (1) central or local government budget, (2) voluntary contributions and direct investments from and by local participants, (3) private profit making firms, corporations or organizations, (4) foreign aid and assistance.

Funds from central or local government are in the form of annual budgets assigned to different ministries and agencies to carry out their operations at national or local levels. Each ministry or agency further subdivides its budget and allocates it to regional and specific programs. When a region is identified for a rural development program, the first task will be to coordinate the flow and use of government funds that come from different ministries and agencies. Usually, coordination and efficient use of government funds is not sufficient to run integrated development programs. There must be another source from which additional funds can be drawn. Quite often, integrated

\textsuperscript{26}Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, \textit{op. cit.} pp. 11-15.
programs, instead of drawing their funds from various ministries and agencies are given an autonomous status where the government allocates a certain amount of money exclusively for its operation, and functions with limited financial cooperation with other ministries or agencies.

Contributions from local people and investments by local people is a possible source depending on the economic well-being of the community. One does not expect small farmers and rural craftsmen and processing workers to contribute a huge sum to run local development programs or to save and make large investments. Where local people are well-off economically, they might be willing to contribute some amount of money or to invest directly into the programs if they are convinced that there will be direct or indirect gains. This is not to say that small farmers and nonfarmers will not respond to profit and other incentives, but to point out that this group usually contributes better in kind, usually labor and planners should not count on this subsector as a main source of funds.

The introduction of private profit making bodies into the rural development efforts tends to be controversial.\textsuperscript{27} This is because some people feel that every activity should be carried by the government, at least in the initial stage. However, it should also be recognized that there are activities that lend themselves to operations by non-government bodies. To avoid the fear that private operation are anti-social, government should check that excess profits are not made by private businesses and services and goods are made available at the

\textsuperscript{27}A. T. Mosher, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 7.
right time and place. The advantage of the private sector can contribute to rural development by reducing the amount of scarce government funds that will be tied up and the burden of administering operations. It is also particularly difficult to perform all rural activities by and through government channels.

The external source of finance comes in the form of financial aid or technical assistance supplied bilaterally or multilaterally. The technical assistance is provided as technical assistance proper or for surveys, feasibility studies and establishment of training institutions; and aids take the form of grants, loans and transfer of resources through sales for the recipient's country currency. It is important to try to utilize domestic resources as much as possible and revert to external sources if and when it can not be met from domestic sources for economic as well as political reasons.

Each of the rural subsectors utilize funds from a combination of the above sources. The government subsector divides most of its revenue earnings, financial aid and technical assistance between the two subsectors. It bears the burden of financing most programs whose cost it might be able to recover in the long run. The agricultural subsector utilizes the greater percentage of the funds that come from the government because of the high percentage of population in this subsector and because very little effort has been made to improve the nonfarm subsector. Except for some large processing or manufacturing rural industries, which are either publicly or privately owned, most activities in the nonfarm subsector are privately owned and use private funds. Some of the investments belong to individuals in the urban

sector or to large farmers in the agricultural subsector. There is very little known about this subsector and also there are no large scale development programs for this subsector that the writer knows about. Therefore, programs that directly deal with this subsector or encourage the flow of resources from other sectors should be formulated and the kind of attention that is given to the agricultural subsector should also be shared to the nonfarm sector.

Implementation of Plans

Implementation of rural development programs is a continuation of the planning process in the rural sector where institutional structures, services and facilities required to carry out a plan are established, maintained and managed so as to achieve the objectives. Because of the amount of resource that goes into the planning process, failure to execute a plan is a waste of resource and is mainly caused by a failure to plan properly.

Planning is not a once and for all operation. It should be modified whenever it encounters a situation that tends to disrupt its realization and new plans formulated in view of the state that emerge as a result of the implementation of initial plans. Therefore, a broader and more dynamic concept of implementation should be adopted and it will be used here to mean the surveillance of the activities of a program; a close contact with bureaucrats and local people to secure their commitment and gain their confidence; physical execution of

29 Byerlee and Eicher, op. cit., p. 17.
of programs; and, formulation of plans in emergency situations when initial plans can not be carried out.\textsuperscript{30}

How well a program can be implemented depends on how well it is planned and how much people are willing to accept and act on the program.\textsuperscript{31} The willingness of the rural people to accept and act on the development programs is of crucial importance. It is very much influenced by the institutional systems or arrangements, and the structure of the political system.\textsuperscript{32} The kinds of rural development institutions referred here are arms of the government subsector or, institutions created by the local people. These include the executive branches of the government that takes the responsibility of managing development programs; government departments and local organizations that provide services; and national and regional policies like positive or negative price policies,\textsuperscript{33} and the rate and kind of taxation and support programs. When these institutions are developed at the right time and the right place, and when the right mix of policies and programs are interposed it can generate a desirable performance and


\textsuperscript{32} Weitz, op. cit., pp. 91.

and response from the people. Weitz discusses the importance of institutions to get people into participation of rural development programs as follows:

"In the developing countries it is not sufficient to determine the environmental condition to select the best possible way of utilizing material resources, and to expect the people to follow the chosen way of action. The emphasis should be placed on the people themselves, their aspirations and motives—sometimes, known, sometimes only guessed at—and their capacity for utilizing the available resources. It is necessary to seek their participation, to provoke their interest, and at the same time to remove those barriers which prevent them from sharing in the development effort. The fundamental attribute of the approach required under such circumstances is its capacity to create such an institutional framework in which the people will not only be able to absorb innovations in the production process but will be interested in doing so."34

To understand how the political structure affects the willingness of people to accept and act on programs, we can view the political system of African countries of mixed economies as operating at three levels, similar to the levels of planning discussed in another section. These are (1) system that operates immediate to the individuals in villages and communities; (2) system at a level between the villages and the national political system at the center; and (3) system at the national level as a central authority.35 When discussing about the three levels of planning it emphasized that the proper coordination of

34 Weitz, "Regional Planning," p. 91.
35 For more discussion on the effect of political structure on the implementation of rural development programs see Clyde R. Ingle, From Village to State in Tanzania: The Politics of Rural Development. Ithaca: Cornell University Press (1972), pp. 185-251. For a similar discussion see also Moris, Administrative Authority, pp. 106-146.
activities at the three levels was important. Similarly, the coordination of the administrative or the political system at these three levels is crucial for the effective implementation of the plans formulated at the three planning levels. In Ingle’s words:

"The extent to which the political functions are performed by one system or another and the extent to which the goals of these political systems are the same suggest the nature of the sharing of the political functions. The nature of this sharing will also indicate the extent to which the goals of the political systems, in this case, rural development can be achieved."36

There must be a general consensus and understanding between the different levels of political systems about the objectives of the integrated rural development effort so that resources available can be committed to these objectives and the rural people encouraged at all levels to participate in the implementation of programs. The rural population can play an important role in rural development by influencing the political decision making process and by mobilizing people to work for a collective goal. They can take over some of the responsibilities from the government by articulating their local interests.

V. INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT: EVALUATION

Evaluation is an integral part of the rural development process that provides information on the objectives, plans and outcomes of implementing plans. It is a continuous process by which plans, actions and outcomes are tested for consistency and compared with initial

36 Ingle, op. cit., p. 186.
objectives and subsequent modifications or changes. Holmberg, in the master plan for the evaluation of CADU defined it "...as a process of appraising past and current activities with a view to improving the project's goal attainment." 37 The team from the University of Nairobi who undertook the evaluation of the Special Rural Development Program in Kenya defined it as "...gathering and interpreting relevant information about how well the strategies have worked to attain their objectives in order to derive more suitable strategies for future use." 38

The purpose of evaluation varies as a program goes through the stage of program appraisal or preparation, the stage of actual plan implementation, and the stage of program termination. In program appraisal, the purpose of evaluation is to "...provide a framework within which all aspects of a proposed project can be modified to improve its wealth generating capacity." 39 Evaluation at this stage is done to determine the program alternative that will generate the most social benefit, but not as an investment criteria. 40 During actual plan implementation stage, the purpose of evaluation is to report on the various activities of the program, the inputs and outputs utilized and produced, and problems confronted. It is mainly used to compare actual


40 Ibid.
performance with work plans drawn on a weekly, monthly or bi-monthly basis and for the purpose of internal control and management. At this stage occasional evaluation of the program objective are done to check whether it is in the right direction of fulfilling the initial objectives and to make modification in the plan or the objectives if there be a need. Evaluation at the stage of program termination, on the other hand, is exclusively carried to determine the effect of a program in general, and in respect of the stated objectives in particular. Actually, evaluations may be carried for different reasons and the above three purposes are mentioned so that it could provide a framework for analysing evaluation methods for integrated rural development.

Problems in the Evaluation of Integrated Development Programs

Development literatures have very little to offer in techniques for evaluation of rural development. Even for agricultural development programs on which there is a substantial amount of literature available, discussions focus mainly on program appraisal techniques. There could be many reasons for this; some of which are the differences in programs making it nearly impossible to design standardized evaluation methods; the differences in objectives, and the differences in people involved in the management and actual participation. The responsibility of designing and evaluation method is thus left to the management or to those charged with the task of evaluating a program and thus tends to be unique to the group.

41 Holmberg, op. cit., pp. 7-8.
Evaluation of integrated rural development programs is a difficult task. Integrated rural development has been discussed as a multi-objective concept that utilizes different programs and activities to achieve these objectives. An appropriate evaluation method would then be one that uses multiple objective evaluation techniques. There is no standard text that one can refer to to find out about these techniques and therefore one has to rely on his own ingenuity under such circumstances. The multiplicity of objectives is not the only problem, but also the variation from one area to another and from one group of people to another. Since objectives are frequently changed on the course of a rural development project, the evaluation processes should pay special attention to this problem. Moreover, the way objectives are stated or expressed causes a great deal of confusion and makes the planning, implementation and evaluation processes ineffective. Heyer, when discussing rural development objectives stated:

"A possible set of rural development goals might be stated, for the sake of argument, as: (1) to raise income; (2) to raise employment; (3) to raise the level of education and training; (4) to improve the development capacity of the government machinery; (5) to increase the capacity of local communities to plan and run things for themselves; (6) to improve the quality of rural life, etc.

These are not specific enough for planning. Whose income? Money income or some other measure of standard of living? What type of employment? What type of education and training? For what and for whom?"


43 Ibid., p. 5.
These are the kind of questions that emerge when objectives are not clearly specified. First, it has to be specified as to whom among the rural population the program is designed to affect. Is the program for those in the nonfarm subsector? In the agricultural subsector? For those within the lowest portions of the rural family income distribution or for those with a higher family income? These ambiguities should be reduced as much as possible. The second important point that needs specification is what exactly is to be accomplished. If it is employment creation, training or disease control, then, the kind of employment to be created, the kind of training to be provided and the kind of disease to be eradicated need to be specified. Thirdly, how these activities are to be accomplished and when they are going to be accomplished should be stated precisely. The importance of expressing objectives precisely makes the actual planning and execution of activities relevant and systematic, and also makes the valuation process a lot easier and more meaningful. Another difficulty in evaluation is the difficulty of quantifying some qualitative changes. For example, health and education programs are difficult to evaluate because, first the output is not apparent and second even if an output is identified, it is hard to measure. The only alternative in the absence of a measure for the real output is to use some kind of proxy measure which is a very close representative.

Thus the multiplicity of objectives; the ambiguity in the statements of the objectives; the variability of these objectives; and the difficulty in measurement of the outputs are the main problems in evaluation and these problems will get more serious as programs are integrated more and more.
Use of Development Indicators in the Evaluation Process

Changes in quantifiable inputs and outputs can be accommodated under the various methodologies while changes in structure and capacity of the rural area can not easily be assessed even with the detailed survey data. Collection of a data is not the end of an evaluation process. The available information need to be analyzed and interpreted and expressed in a way that is understandable and meaningful. Indicators that constitute direct and full measure of an aspect of rural development that is specified as an objective should be used or developed. It seems that economic development indicators are better developed than social or political development indicators.

The changes in most economic variables are to some extent directly or indirectly measurable in monetary terms. The traditional measures of cost/benefit analysis; GNP and national income contributions of the rural sector; income and expenditures; consumption and saving; investment and output; production and foreign trade contributions are conventional economic indicators that are used as main development indicators. Within the framework of economic theory, these economic indicators are incorporating upward and downward adjustments to allow for improvements or deterioration of quality, rise or fall of cost of living and other factors that lie within the boundary of both economic and social considerations. Employment and income distribution have become critical.

---

issues in economic development and measuring these aspects of rural change has been quite difficult. Attempts are made to approximate unemployment/underemployment by direct or indirect measurement techniques and income distribution or concentration by use of Gini coefficients or by expressing the lowest decile as a fraction of the median.\footnote{Dudley Seers, "What are We Trying to Measure," \textit{Ibid.}, pp. 21-36.} As long as the necessary data and information are available, different economic indicators can be designed for a particular purpose.

With respect to social indicators, this is not always true. Social indicators deal with various aspects of level of living, which are sometimes considered as economic variables, such as education, health, housing equality, food consumption and nutrition, clothing, recreation, social security, transportation and communication. These variables are not usually measurable and the indicators are proxy measures for the real entity we like to evaluate. What usually happens in using social indicators is there is no relationship between the proxy indicator and the entity to be measured or evaluated. The indicators measure things which are not desired for their own sake. Therefore, it is always instructive to identify the attribute which needs to be measured or evaluated and then articulate the procedure for measuring it. Various kinds of social indicators and units have been used for different purposes by different people in monetary and physical terms, in absolute or percentage values, as levels or as increments, in units measured at an instant of time and in units measured per unit of time; as single variables and as ratio of two variables. While information from
economic indicators can help very much in evaluating social conditions, a constant observation of the attitude, condition of living of the people and conditions of facilities and services of the rural sector by somebody who knows the areas is also as important in the evaluation process.

Methods of Evaluation of Integrated Programs

A method needs to be developed that can be used to evaluate the consequences of a multiple objective program. The methods discussed below have their own limitations, and one method might serve better for a particular situation than the others and information acquired through one method could be more reliable. The evaluation method adopted for a program depends on the amount of money that could be made available for the process and on the availability of qualified people to assume this task.

One method that is commonly used in rural development evaluation is the use of an ad hoc group charged with the responsibility of assessing how effective a program has been in performing the task it has set to accomplish. The ad hoc group, commonly made up of people outside of the program, often has to rely on secondary data or sources provided by the management of the program or other people within the program. Due to the short duration of the assignment, primary sources of information are not utilized for evaluation. Visits into areas and interviewing people who know the program well are the primary preoccupation of the group. The information gathered in this manner is then analyzed and interpreted.
and judgments passed on how efficiently and effectively the program operates.46

A recent evaluation that utilized the above method for evaluating a rural development program was in Kenya. The Special Rural Development Program was evaluated by an ad hoc group from the University of Nairobi at the request of the Ministry of Finance and Planning.47 The group approached the problem of evaluation by outlining a set of questions to be answered, and from whose answer it is expected to determine the extent to which the procedures and processes utilized adhere to the objectives of the program. The terms of references for the evaluation were the specific questions raised and the result of the evaluation depended on how well the questions were answered with respect to each of the activities.

While people with prior knowledge about the program and experience in similar programs can pass reliable judgments on various aspects of a program, the overall reliability of such methods of evaluation depend on the information that is made available to the group. The possibilities of withholding information from, or misinforming, the group that will lead to a biased assessment always exist. Another short coming of this approach is its limited usefulness of modifications of objectives and plans, since this kind of evaluation frequently lacks continuity.

46. The terms efficiency and effectiveness are frequently used in evaluation to express two different concepts. Effectiveness refers to "The extent to which the project given its overall total costs, has achieved its stated main goal." and efficiency refers to "the extent to which it has transformed its direct costs into productive services." See Holmberg, op. cit., p. 14.

47. Institute for Development Studies, op. cit., p. VIII.
Another method of evaluation which is continuous and more reliable than the previous method is one that uses an information-system built-in each of the activities of the program. It continuously reports on what, where, for whom and when certain activities were performed; and by the nature of its continuity picks up and reports on the changes brought about. Programs with different activities commonly have separate departments and sections to facilitate administration and implementation of plans. Work programs for each section are drawn, and each section includes in its work program a system that indicates the progress of the work, the resource inputs used, and the output or effects generated. When each section prepares such a report and these are pooled together, summarized, analyzed and properly interpreted, it indicates the lag in the execution of the plans for each section, the economic and social consequences of the activities of the sections, and the contributions of each section towards the main program objectives. The information is also helpful in revealing aspects of the work programs that requires corrections and in enhancing the coordination and cooperation of various sections where the information is made available to all.

This method is particularly important for evaluating and monitoring individual activities. It deals with the direct effects each activity has and some important indirect consequences are not usually dealt with. For instance, the credit section of a rural development program might report on the number of credit applicants, size of loan outstanding, repayment records, etc. It might, however, tell us very little about the change in the production or consumption pattern caused by the availability of credit. This happens because, usually it is not the
responsibility of this section to deal with these kinds of questions, and secondly, even if the indirect effects of the credit program are reported, there is no way to ascertain that the credit program brought about the change. The extension service section, education section or health section could as well claim the change. It should therefore be expected that activity evaluation methods will not tell us all we want to know about the effects of the overall program on people. Evaluation methods that can indicate the effects of the program as a whole, and if possible, that can identify the interacting variables that brought about the change are needed.

The methods mentioned above involve, directly or indirectly, information collected on the functional activities by staff members within the program. Assessing the activities of a section or a department can not show or tell the changes in per capita income, income distribution, the production and consumption structure, and social changes. What will be needed is an evaluation method that focuses on the effects of the various activities on the target population and that utilizes any information collected from the people who are affected by the program.

This is accomplished by using survey techniques, and then

---

48 CADU uses a bi-monthly report that specifies the work program of its various sections by activity and semi-annual reports on departmental level to assess the subgoals of the departments, and an annual report evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall project.

49 Holmberg, op. cit., pp. 77-83, has brief discussion on Methodology for field surveys and problems connected with statistical sample surveys for Chilalo.
conducting several surveys that cover as large an area as possible. The information to be included in these surveys depends on the kind and objectives of the program. Detailed information on size of holdings, land tenure patterns, land use, method of production, family income composition, family expenditures and revenues, and a study of employment, income distribution, health, education, etc., is essential. This kind of survey carried over a period of time or conducted to generate a cross section data provides an adequate information on both social and economic development objectives. There seem to be two different views as to how the survey needs to be organized.

First is a method that is presently used by CADU

"...which relies mainly on 'special' one-contact survey but is supplemented by detailed 'case studies' using the cost route or multiple visit technique for the generation of data that would allow the evaluation of overall project goal."\(^{50}\)

This method employs a structured questionnaire and covers a large random sample while at the same time making "depth studies" on very small samples.\(^{51}\) The other method, which Holmberg has identified as an alternative, and Spencer recommended for use in the evaluation of Ada District Development Project is "depth studies" that "...rely upon repeated contacts with the respondents or lengthy interviews."\(^{52}\) Spencer


\(^{51}\) Holmberg, op. cit., p. 20.

\(^{52}\) Ibid.
suggests "depth studies" using the "cost-route" method and supplemented by general macro-level surveys, rather than making general macro-level surveys and supplementing it with "depth studies". He argues that the CADU method of evaluation uses too small sample sizes in its detailed studies and therefore meaningful generalizations can not be made from the information. Holmberg, on the other hand, argues that the "depth studies" are time consuming, costly and involves a fundamental problem of adjusting the overall survey technique and the questions to be asked to the level of the people to reduce problems of communication.

Which one of these two techniques to use depends on the availability of resources, willingness of households to participate in this process, the ability to pick on representative samples and the nature of the program to be evaluated. At this moment the writer has no basis to recommend any one of these techniques for specific programs. If Ada Project is to adopt the detailed study alternative, it might be possible to compare the strength and weaknesses of both approaches. However, the writer feels that both approaches still lack comprehensiveness. A closer examination of the items to be surveyed makes no reference to the nonfarm subsector, and does not mention about policies and institutions of the government subsector. It is mentioned in part three that the nonfarm subsector in African countries is too large to be neglected for a better understanding of the effect of rural programs, information on the various components of the rural sector should be made available. Moreover,

---

53 Spencer, op. cit., p. 12.
existing government policies and institutions as well as new ones have a substantial bearing on performance of certain activities and response of rural people. Therefore, the consequences of the policies and institutions need to be identified with the help of the survey for future policy recommendations as well as to assess the objectives with respect to the rural population. In general, evaluation of programs based on information gathered by comprehensive surveys places due emphasis on how people are affected and provides sufficient information to modify objectives, plans and work programs.

**Evaluation Methods for Different Stages of a Program**

The methods of evaluations mentioned in the above section play an important role at different stages of life of a program. Evaluation methods to be applied are influenced by the stage of a program. For most practical purposes three stages can be identified in the life of a program: (1) program preparation and appraisal stage; (2) operational stage and (3) termination stage. Under each one of these stages the method of evaluation varies to some extent. Therefore evaluation of integrated rural development programs will be discussed with reference to these stages for the purpose of discussing the topic in detail.

The program preparation stage is the initial stage in the life of a project where reconnaissance surveys are carried to determine the natural and human resources of the area; possible constraining factors in future development efforts; technical matters such as soil, crops, livestock, etc., and household consumption, production and income pattern. Then the conventional procedure of appraising a program in terms of what its economic and social impact would be and what inputs it requires to bring
forth these impacts is carried out. It involves predicting what variables would come into the picture, how much the variables change through time and by how much it affects the outputs and inputs of the program. This is a stage where one looks at the future of a program and attempts to weigh the social costs and benefit streams, determine who will bear the costs and who will get the benefit, and decide on the sequence of activities. Since the calculation of most social benefit and cost streams and the derivation of the decision algorithms (benefit-cost ratio, internal rate of return, present worth) through financial and economic analysis 54 takes place at the planning phase of a program and since the aim of this section is to discuss evaluation of on-going programs, a discussion on the evaluation of the other two stages will follow.

Operational Stage

Operational stage is that part of the life of a program where the actual implementation of a plan takes place to achieve the objectives stated. It is a stage where the planned activities are executed and natural and human resources utilized in a systematic manner over a period of time in order to improve the welfare of rural people. This stage actually covers the period from the start to the date of termination of the program. The methods of evaluation that are relevant at this stage of program life are not the same as those at the program appraisal stage or program termination stage. Some important evaluation activities are started at this stage, and how well these initial evaluation activities,

54 See Gittinger, Economic Analysis, for a discussion on financial and economic analysis for agricultural projects.
such as baseline surveys, reflects how much subsequent evaluation would be meaningful.

The first task that needs to be undertaken for evaluation purposes at this stage is to carry out a baseline survey as detailed and informative as resources could permit. The baseline surveys will be the reference points that will help in determining the size and kind of change brought about as a result of programs and in the refinement of plans and development of work programs as detailed information are made available. The kind of information to be included in baseline surveys vary along with the specific activities included in the program and the specific variables that are to be examined for change or improvement. In integrated programs, where a wide range of activities are operating the direct and indirect impacts will somehow affect various aspects of rural life and hence, it is instructive to include as much information as possible.

Some of the data that needs to be collected to provide relevant information are summarized below and references are made both to the agricultural and nonagricultural subsectors of the rural sector.

1. Resource stock available for immediate use or that has the potential for exploitation in the future.

2. Production structure, which included the size of farm holding, the kind of land ownership pattern, kind of crops and livestock, yields on various crops, etc.

3. Inventory of the agricultural and nonagricultural labor, the labor time used in agricultural and nonagricultural subsectors, the kind (family or hired) and quality of labor, and other
sources of power such as animal or machines.

4. Family income by source, and expenditures specifying whether it is for consumption, investment on agricultural or nonagricultural activities, etc.

5. Establishments in the rural areas (performing nonagricultural activities), the fixed assets involved, the size and source of the labor, the output and inputs used, sources of inputs and markets for outputs, etc.

6. The health condition of the people, prevalent diseases of the area, birth rates, mortality rates, existing facilities, etc. Other information on education communication, government units of administration, local organizations, etc.\(^{55}\)

The baseline survey should be undertaken at this stage only if it was not done at the program preparation and appraisal stage. Regardless of the stage at which the baseline survey was carried, a survey which is to continue throughout the life of the program should start right from the beginning of the operational stage. The survey methods and objectives that need to follow the baseline studies are discussed in the previous section. Whether to adopt "depth studies" supplemented by macro-level studies, or make macro-level studies supplemented by "depth studies" will be decided by the evaluator. The important point is to devise a method that will help indicate problems and improvements and determine the gap between what is intended to be accomplished and how much is accomplished.

At this stage another important evaluation method is the use of internal reporting techniques that describe and specify the works accomplished; the outcome, if any; the lag in the operation of certain activities; on expenditures and problems that are internal or external. As was expressed previously, this method evaluates the efficiency of the management of a program and does not tell much about the effectiveness. Economic and financial analysis should also be carried occasionally to check on the initial calculations carried at the program appraisal stage and to update the analysis in light of the additional information available and the experience gained in due time.

The above evaluation methods combined together should provide sufficient information to check how much the economic or social objectives have been achieved at any point in time. Program impacts, particularly the social aspect are detected or felt very gradually and what an evaluator might see is nothing, but schools or clinics whose presence tells little about the educational or health conditions of the community and are, in fact, an input for the final output expected. Thus the quantifiable objectives can be evaluated regularly and the nonquantifiable objective and those activities whose outputs can only be estimated by means of a proxy, will be evaluated in terms of the specified proxies--such as number of schools or students representing level of education, number of clinics representing the health situation. With further development of the social development indicators, the above mentioned combination of evaluation methods can provide a fairly reliable result.
Termination Stage

Evaluations at the end of the life of a project has one major similarity with evaluation at the operational stage. That is another survey similar to that of the baseline survey, if it was carried at this stage, will be conducted. The main purpose of conducting a survey similar to that of the baseline survey at this stage is to compare, (1) the initial situation with the conditions at the end of the program, and (2) to compare the results of the program with the stated overall objectives and determine its effectiveness. For purposes of meaningful comparison it is instructive to follow the structure of the baseline survey in the termination survey and compare those information that are available for both instances. At the termination stage it is very likely that the kind and quality of information will improve considerably and the evaluators should be careful not to use the improvement in information for or against any of the two situations for it is not the information system that is being evaluated but the objectives.

An economic analysis and financial analysis is useful to determine what the actual stream of benefits and costs have been and to compare it with the expected streams of benefits and costs arrived at in the appraisal stage. The assumptions, predictions and estimates made in the project appraisal will be checked against the true experience of the program and the results of the evaluations carried when the project was on-going will also be revised. In economic analysis, it has become a standard procedure to project the conditions likely to happen in the absence of the program, thus using a "with and without" analysis
rather than a "before and after" analysis. An evaluation similar to the termination stage can be carried at any point in time if one desires to do so. Thus, an evaluation of a program in respect to its initial objectives can be accomplished.

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Rural development programs have been conducted under different names for many decades. Community development strategies have been commonly used strategies in Africa in the 1940s and 1950s. Cooperatives have also been popular in the past and are commonly used today in conjunction with different kinds of programs, particularly agricultural development programs. Most French speaking African countries use a strategy of rural "animation" for rural development. In the past few years agricultural development projects, whose main objective is increasing agricultural output, have also become a commonly used strategy in Africa and a sizeable amount of resources are devoted to these projects today. These rural development strategies that were and are used by many African countries are either agricultural production oriented or community service oriented and are not geared to introducing and providing different services and facilities concurrently to the mass of the rural population. Therefore, many developing countries and scholars are urging an integrated rural development effort which serves a large percentage of the lower income group of the rural population.

The emphasis on rural development and the use of an integrated approach to rural development in Africa was reinforced by the 1966 Kericho Conference in Kenya and other conferences in Africa in recent years. Outside of Africa, the 1971 FAO/IDA Symposium held in Rome and attended by many African countries, donor and international lending agencies highlighted the problems of integrating rural development activities and recommended solutions to some of the problems. The World Bank, realizing the importance of improving the welfare of the rural people, has recently decided to give loans to those countries that have rural development programs designed to help the low income group among the rural population.

These changes in policies of lending agencies and emphasis on many countries on rural development calls for a strategy that can be used to achieve the multiple objectives of rural development. In order to introduce integrated programs, the rural sector and its components need to be understood, the planning and implementation of the various activities properly articulated and evaluation of the activities with respect to the objectives be made continuously.

In this paper, I have developed a conceptual framework for understanding the main components of the rural sector. The government sub-sector is one component which is an extension of the public sector of the economy. The other two components are the agricultural subsector and the rural nonfarm subsector that are also a part of the private sector in the rural areas. These subsectors are interdependent and the improvement of one reinforces the other subsectors. Thus, planning of development activities should be geared to encouraging and facilitating the improvement of each one of these subsectors.
Since the agricultural and nonfarm subsectors are large in African countries and since there is a lack of resources to develop integrated programs for the whole rural sector, a regional approach to planning and implementation seems to be appropriate. This approach is not only a feasible solution under the resource constraints of African countries, but also serves as a link between the planning at the national level and planning that takes place at the individual or local level. When this approach is adopted, the area that is to receive integrated activities need to be carefully identified and the mixes of activities to be integrated properly selected.

Implementation of plans aside from the physical executions of plans, objectives are reviewed and whenever there is a change in objectives, plans are modified in light of the changes. To accomplish the reviewing and plan modification there need to be regional planners who are capable of handling these kinds of changes. There should also be a well developed feedback system where those charged with the responsibility of implementing the plans can communicate directly and freely with the planners in other levels.

Evaluation is an integral part of the rural development effort that starts with the inception of a program and ends when the project ceases to function. For an evaluation to be meaningful, the consequences of a program has to be precisely and fully disclosed; this usually is not possible for integrated programs because of the externalities that constantly affect the objectives, thus leading to variability and ambiguity in the objectives, and because of the incommensurability of some of the effects of the programs. In general, evaluation is not a
simple task and will not be as meaningful until more reliable techniques are developed. The writer hopes that the methodologies suggested in part of the paper will be of some help in assessing integrated programs.

The usefulness of integrating rural development activities seems to be obvious. The problem is how many of the rural development activities African countries can integrate and how fast these countries can develop the institutional and manpower capacity to handle the complex tasks of planning, implementation and evaluation of integrated programs. The skilled manpower and capital resources as well as the institutional capacities cannot be mobilized or organized in a short period of time.

Implementation of plans aside from the physical executions of plans, objectives are reviewed and whenever there is a change in objectives, plans are modified in light of the changes. To accomplish the reviewing gain experiences from the few integrated activities in the mean time and expand the extent of integration of activities until the rural population is well-off and can acquire the goods, services and facilities it needs with little or no government assistance.
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