Journal of Rural Development 3 (April 1980) : 51–63

MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AT THE VILLAGE LEVEL IN KOREA

WHANG, IN-JOUNG*

I. Introduction

Management techniques are defined as "instrumental devices which are used for determining goals and objectives of projects or activities and for providing effective communication and coordination, monitoring of performance, effective supervision and feedback within the organizational framework" (Whang 1978, p. 13). Management technique is one of the critical variables which contribute to the success of rural development. Appropriate management techniques for planning as well as implementation of development projects at the village level are lacking in most developing countries in Asia. What is meant by appropriate management techniques for community-level actions? How could management techniques be improved to fit into the managerial context of integrated rural development (IRD)?

An attempt is made in this paper to clarify the concept of appropriateness and also to identify variables which determine appropriate management techniques in the rural context. It also attempts to explore appropriate management techniques for IRD projects by making a critical review of management techniques which are applied, explicitly or implicitly, intentionally or habitually, in the case of Saemaul Undong in Korea.

II. Management Techniques in the Rural Context

According to organizational theories, organizational technology (or management technique) depends on four major variables of an organization. The four middle range variables are resources, organizational goals, environment—including clients—and the internal structure of the organization (Perrow 1967, pp. 194–208). In the same vein, it is viewed that management techniques for rural development projects at the village level largely depend on (1) the characteristics of resources to be

* Research Director, Korea Rural Economics Institute.

mobilized for rural development projects, (2) The goals and purposes of integrated rural development, (3) the environmental context in which IRD projects are to be planned and implemented, and (4) the social structure in terms of the patterns of interactions among individuals involved in the management of IRD projects.

In order to identify the characteristics of these variables which determine types and natures of management techniques, it seems to be necessary to clarify the concept of integrated rural development. The concept of IRD could be viewed from several different perspectives:

(a) "Integrated rural development is a radical concept. It is, in fact, an ideology, which carries implied criticism of existing institutions and socio-economic policies in the poor countries. It is multi-disciplinary in approach and multi-sectoral in operation. Hence, it is hard to comprehend and implement" (FAO 1977, p. 9).

(b) Integrated rural development is a growth strategy for a particular target population—the rural poor."It involves extending thebenefits of development to those whose future lies in the pursuit of a livelihood in rural areas. These include small-scale farmers, tenants and the landless." Rural poverty is the immediate objective. Because the rural poor tend to be the most deprived of all sectors of the community, they have very limited access to services such as health and education. In addition, they have very limited access to modern inputs for agricultural development. Unless special programs are developed to correct existing bias, "their poverty will become self-reinforcing and will increase even if economies grow" (IBRD 1974, p. 1).

(c) The concept of IRD requires "a fundamental review of policies and approaches for socio-economic progress in the rural sector." It is implied that in addition to changes concerned with production methods, changes also take place in social and political infrastructure. Policies to achieve such changes involve a comprehensive package by inter-locking factors—social, political, economic and technical—all closely interrelated within an overall institutional framework (FAO 1977, p. 10).

From the above discussion, it is viewed that IRD is a radical ideology, an equity-oriented growth strategy as well as an approach to rural development. The essence of IRD strategy may be summarized as "(1) adoption of a rural development philosophy which leads to modernization and integration of the rural masses into society as a whole, giving them more equitable access to productive resources, employment and income, and (2) recognition by governments that strong political will on a continuing basis is a pre-requisite to change. Without this quality of integration there will be no meaningful improvement of the quality of life of the rural people" (FAO 1977, p. 11).

Operational implications of the IRD approach are manyfold (Whang 1977, pp. 2–7). They include:

(a) "IRD could be viewed as a package program, of various rural development services and activities of government which are closely interrelated. This involves a conventional notion of horizontal integration, regardless of its operational level, among various programs.

(b) While horizontal integration is emphasized for functional complementarity between different sectoral programs, vertical integration is also to be introduced to improve the relationship between agencies at different levels—federal, state, and local.

(c) In addition to horizontal and vertical integration, the integration between the government machinery and rural people should be empha- sized with a view to promoting the positive participation of rural people in the decision-making process, especially at the local government level. Local needs for rural development at the village level should be reflected, through people's participation, into the package of government supports.

(d) It is also viewed as a nation-wide process of social change stimulated or guided by government, because IRD requires broadly based societal support to development projects.

(e) IRD includes the optimum utilization and mixture of all the resources and instruments relevant to rural development, including insti- tutional infrastructure, manpower resources such as extension workers, teachers, etc., technical resources, and material as well as financial resources.

(f) IRD is an integrated process of changes in values and perceptions of rural people, an increase in dynamism of rural organization, and concomitant changes in village economy and community structure. IRD consists of a process of fundamental change in people's motivation and also in their world outlook and perceptions which should be conducive to organizational performance and also lead to socio-economic development of the rural community[1].

The operational perspectives of IRD would provide enormous implications on the nature and characteristics of organizational variables such as resources, goals, environment and structure, which are determinants of the pattern and nature of management techniques for development actions at the community level. Rural development requires various kinds of resources including capital, technical know-how, manpower, materials, land, etc. Since mapower would be abundant but underutilized in most rural villages, rural people are identified as a major resource to be mo-

[1] Regarding analysis of an action process in terms of three levels: individuals, organization, and environment, see Litchfield (1956).

bilized for rural development projects. In most developing countries, however, financial captial is rather limited and therefore rural manpower is viewed as a strategic resource in most Asian countries. The quality of manpower is characterized by its poor motivation and low level of education (Haque, et al. 1975, pp. 1–10). The source of rural manpower tends to be quite stable in most rural villages in Asia because of low geographical mobility among rural populations. The nature and characteristics of major resources provide a constraint by which choice of management technique would be determined. It is implied that management techniques for IRD projects should be: (1) simple enough to be accessed by low-educated rural people or project managers, (2) mechanical for mobilization of people, (3) instrumental for people's participation, and (4) routine in nature for learning by repetitive actions.

The goals of IRD depend on the objectives of specific development projects. However, it is generally agreed that the objectives of IRD are the utilization of human resources and the development of the original environment of the rural people in the rural sector, rather than agricultu ral development. The operational objectives of IRD are identified as to:

(a) Raise productivity in the rural sector, of which agriculture may be the main activity in most developing countries at their initial stage of development;
(b) Ensure equitable income distribution and provide sufficient employment opportunities;
(c) Establish better social, economic, and physical infrastructures in the rural areas and ensure that the majority of the rural people benefit from them; and
(d) Institutionalize political and administrative capabilities, including decisive participation by the rural people in decision-making and in community activities (FAO 1977, p. 20).

In pursuance of these objectives, various types of development projects would be organized at the community level. Development projects should be tangible, concrete and directly beneficiary to the rural people, as they are supposed to be organized and implemented by the participation of the people themselves. Therefore, in spite of the vague and unspecific nature of IRD objectives, the goals of IRD projects at the community level would be identical among rural people. The goals of IRD projects are also tangible and concrete in nature. Therefore, the management techniques for planning as well as implementation of IRD projects must be those of simple, routine, and mechanistic techniques.

The environment of IRD seems to be quite complex because many layers of administration tend to be involved in planning for the package of government supports. Other societal supports are also necessary for successful implementation of IRD projects. On the other hand the nature of subject matters to be managed is also complex in the sense that:

(a) Successful implementation and efficient management of IRD projects require positive participation of people at the community level;
(b) The end-results and performance of project implementation should be recognized by the people and beneficiary to them; and
(c) Coordination with various kinds of agencies, reference groups, and other social forces seems to be a critical and inevitable process for the success of IRD projects (Whang 1978, pp. 117–121)

The complexity of environmental context would require rather simple and stable techniques at the early stage of rural development for facilitation of easy communication among several heterogeneous actors and agencies (Perrow 1965, pp. 121–131). In other words, methods and techniques for planning and management of IRD projects should be simple enough to allow the maximum participation of less-educated or sometimes illiterate rural people who also have little access to the modernity.

The social structure of community tends to be traditionally bounded. The pattern of interaction among people in the community would be stable and rather habitual. Nevertheless, when an innovative project is introduced it seems inevitable to rely on a new type of leadership. The emergence of new leadership requires a type of structure different from the conventional one. Nevertheless, because of the lack of mobilities among rural people as well as the long tradition of folk culture, the social structure of rural community is less flexible, sometimes rigid and resistant to change. In most developing countries, village members are heterogeneous in terms of land ownership, educational level, traditional sense of social status, etc.

The more heterogeneous the community members, the more rigid and less flexible the community structure (Skinner 1958). Under this structural circumstance, management techniques should be stable in the sense that mode of communications, symbol of authority, pattern of interaction, and coordination instruments would be based on the tradition and folk culture of the particular community (Tompson and Tuden 1959, pp. 204–205).

The close interaction for necessary cooperation among heterogeneous community members may require simple techniques to facilitate mutual interaction and easy communication between and among community members, administrators and managers at different levels.

From the above discussion, it is viewed that management techniques for IRD projects should be simple enough to be understood and utilized by every individual involved in the management of IRD projects, routine in nature for learning by repetitive doing, and instrumental in the mobilization of rural people to the maximum extent.

III. Specific Management Techniques Applied to Rural Development Projects in Korea

Beyond the general overview of the nature and characteristics of management techniques for rural development projects, it now seems necessary to identify specific techniques applicable to IRD projects in the context of rural villages in Asia. For the specificity as well as applicability of management techniques, Korea's experience in rural development will be reviewed from the management perspectives.

Rural development projects in Korea have been organized as integral parts of the Saemaul Undong (New Community Movement) which was launched in 1970. It is a kind of social movement based on voluntary participation of rural people with a view to sharing among them developmental values such as self-help, diligence, and cooperation. It is a nation-wide movement initiated by the late President Park and has been implemented with strong support from the top political leadership. Various kinds and forms of rural development projects have been organized and implemented by rural people. It is viewed that Saemaul Undong has made enormous impacts upon rural villages in Korea, including changes in individual values and attitudes, mode of village organization, economic performance and social consequences.

A question then arises as to what management system and techniques are applied to rural development projects organized within the framework of Saemaul Undong. An answer to this question requires two sets of analytical review of Saemaul projects focusing on (1) Who are really involved in various types and stages of management of rural development projects to be undertaken at the village level?, and (2) What are critical phases of the management process of rural development projects at the community level which are most relevant to the success of those projects?

As discussed concerning the socio-cultural and political context of rural development projects, individuals involved in the management of IRD projects differ from each other in terms of their organizational affiliations, social backgrounds, and, therefore, their professional interests. They can be grouped into two categories. The first group is those who are involved in actual management of rural development projects at the village level. In the case of Saemaul projects,village leaders and some influential village members are identified as managers at the village level. The second group is those who provide various kinds of supportive assistance for the promotion and facilitation of project management by the first group of managers. In the case of Korea, government administrations in various agencies at different levels of administration are identified again as managers who provide supportive actions. Governors of provinces, county chiefs, township chiefs, other local officials, and administrators at the

central level are constantly paying special attention to Saemaul projects at the village level in order to get such projects performed successfully, as the top political leadership is highly interested in the nationwide Saemaul Undong. They are supposed to utilize appropriate management techniques to get their supportive actions and services delivered properly to the village-level Saemaul projects.

Different techniques should be applied for management of activities at different levels of administration, as the needs and purposes of job performance and the knowledge and skills of administrations are different depending on the level. Therefore, it is noted from the Korean experience that appropriate management techniques for rural development projects should be different depending on the purpose of a certain management action and the technical competence of managerial personnel.

Critical phases of project management are identified in terms of the following action steps:

(a) Project identification and definition;
(b) Project formulation, preparation, and feasibility analysis;
(c) Project design;
(d) Project appraisal;
(e) Project selection, negotiation, and approval;
(f) Project activation and organization;
(g) Project implementation and operation;
(h) Project supervision, monitoring, and control;
(i) Project completion or termination;
(j) Output diffusion and transition to normal administration;
(k) Project evaluation; and
(l) Follow-up analysis and action (Rondinelli 1975; Baum 1978)).

These steps demonstrate the complexity and the comprehensiveness of project management, especially management of foreign assistance projects or development loan projects. However, the criticality of certain action steps should be defined in terms of their relevance and/or importance to the socio-political context and nature of the project for integrated rural development.

In view of Korea's experience, there are some criteria by which critical phases of the management process of IRD projects could be identified. They are, for some examples, participation of rural people to the maximum extent, better mobilization of idle manpower in the rural sector, optimum delivery of government support and assistance to the villages, continuous interest and support from the political leadership, and the societal recognition of the developmental performance of rural communi ties. According to these criteria, critical phases involved in the management of Saemaul projects at the village level in Korea are identified as planning, coordination, and monitoring and evaluation. It is again noted that different managment techniques would be applied to different

phases of the management process, although some techniques could be used consistently throughout several phases of project management. It now seems valuable to identify specific techniques for each of these critical phases in the management of Saemaul projects at the community level.

A. Management Techniques for Planning of Saemaul Projects at the Village Level

The planning of Saemaul projects at the village level involves mostly (1) project identification by village members, (2) simple project implementation design, (3) identification of kinds and amounts of necessary inputs or resources, and (4) the proper communication of project ideas with local officials for mobilization of administrative supports. These activities and steps are to be taken by village leaders (namely Saemaul Leaders) and village members in collaboration with local officials. As discussed before, not all of them are well prepared for these kinds of activities in view of their educational backgrounds and experiences. However, it is noted that most village leaders served in the military as officers or sergeants. Most village members also experienced military service during or after the Korean War. The fact implies that management techniques applied in the military organization have been a common denominator among the village members, as well as village leaders, for their concerted action with respect to decision-making at the project planning stage (Whang 1980, pp. 132–133).

One of the important factors in defining the most appropriate techniques is the ability to allow the maximum participation of rural people in the decision-making process, which would be viewed as a precondition for the successful implementation of the particular project later on. Therefore, projects tend to be identified by rural people in terms of their felt-needs, rather than logically derived from the rigorous analysis of gaps between ideals and realities. The list of required inputs and resources tends to be identified by items and the amount of respective items is estimated on the basis of their previous experiences. Estimates of labor requirements and major material inputs are the most common procedure of planning at the village level. Saemaul projects tend to be designed in terms of a simple statement on when the project will be activated and when it should be completed. They are also defined in terms of work volume and project location.

Project ideas clarified by village members tend to be communicated to local officials with a view to obtaining administrative supports. A simple notion of cost-benefit analysis tends to be applied even implicitly by government officials at the local government level when they have to make some decisions regarding to assistance and support to the project.

The level of techniques applied to identification of projects, necessary

inputs and resources, project design as well as proposals for government support would be simple for ease of communication as well as for people's participation to the maximum extent. Nevertheless, it seems quite clear that military-oriented management techniques applied at the village-level planning stage are simple but complete in defining objectives or goals of project (why), a certain volume of substantive activities to be organized and undertaken (what), site of project (where), time period required for project undertaking (when), responsibilities for performance (who), and necessary organization for project implementation (how). The simple statement regarding five Ws and one H on a proposed project would be basic criteria for fundamental management principles as they were experienced in any action involved in military operations. Such an implicit rule of management applied at the village-level practice in project planning tends to be the unique virtues of management technique for Saemaul projects in Korean rural villages.

B. Management Techniques for Coordination at the Village Level

The concept of coordination consists not only of vertical coordination but also of horizontal coordination. Vertical coordination means internal consistencies between goals and instruments of projects or between planning and implementation. Horizontal coordination means the solution of conflicts, elimination of unnecessary overlaps or narrowing of gaps between/among projects (Whang 1974, p. 987). In the case of Saemaul projects, which are mostly small-scale activities at the village level, vertical coordination is the major concern for the eradication of conflicts over resources and the elimination of unnecessary overlaps.

The problem of coordination for Saemaul projects would be relatively complex in its nature because IRD projects would involve various types of action agents, different interests and a variety of resources. The successful implementation of Saemaul project requires effective coordination between village leaders and government officials with respect to the delivery of administrative support and government assistance. One of the important variables which determine the effectiveness of coordination is communication between the parties. In the case of Saemaul projects in Korea, a technical device for easy communication between village leaders and local government officials is simple management practice, including military briefings, planning with the use of Gantt charts, simple layouts of activities to be performed, sequential arrangement of supportive services and assistances, etc. The explicit and also simple statement about what to be done has been a mandate of techniques for better coordination between government officials and village leaders. Actions involved in the village-level coordination for people's participation and mobilization of idle manpower may be rather a matter of village leadership, because there are no serious conflicts over goals or objectives among vill-

age members once Saemaul projects are decided by the village members.

C. Management Techniques for Monitoring and Evaluation of IRD Projects

Monitoring of project performance is defined as an action process which produces information regarding whether or not the results of project performance are likely to be as they were planned at the beginning. It also involves the facilitation and reinforcement of project performance and corrective action through proper feedback. Such data are related to resources mobilized for project implementation, time allocation and sequential arrangement, and progress of work performance.

Both monitoring and evaluation of project performance are necessary as an integral part of effective implementation of projects. Although both are concerned with corrective action and problem-solving for the successful implementation of IRD projects, there are several aspects for which monitoring and evaluation work differently. Monitoring is concerned with the performance of specific activities or jobs comprised in a project, while evaluation is concerned with completion of the project as a whole. Therefore, indicators for monitoring project performance and their measurement are related to inputs and immediate outputs, while those for evaluation are related to performance and impacts. In temporal terms, monitoring is exercised mid-stream in the on-going of project, while evaluation is at the final termination of the project cycle. In other words, monitoring is required for immediate feedback for corrective action in the mid-stream of project implementation by reviewing the mobilization of required inputs and delivery of desirable outputs. Evaluation is introduced for improvement in project planning and implementation in the next cycle of project management by reviewing the performance brought about through the accumulation of outputs and by further analyzing the impact of project performance upon the environment.

What are the monitoring techniques specifically applied to Saemaul projects in Korea? The monitoring techniques at the village level would be different from those at the national level because of different monitoring purposes and different levels of available skills.

The major indicators for monitoring purpose have been derived from input, process and output targets set for particular Saemaul projects. (Onate 1977). They are, for examples, some indicators related to time constraints, some to key materials, manpower, etc. Theoretically, concepts such as PERT-time, PERT-cost, or PERT-manpower, which concern critical resources, would be useful.[2] However, most Saemaul projects att he village level tend to be monitored by village leaders in order to ensure the performance of certain activities which will eventually lead to

[2] For monitoring implications of PERT techniques, see Federal Electric Corporation (1963).

completion of the project. Therefore, they are rather used to utilize Gantt Chart operation by activity over a certain period of time. That is, the set of procedures starting from objective identification → activity analysis → performance measurement → analysis of gaps → attention → recommendation of corrective actions, etc.

However, monitoring at the intermediate governmental level, such as county or provincial governments, tends to be exercised by a variety of techniques and methods including Gantt Chart, simple PERT technique, case study, evaluative research, field visits, or people's assessment (observatory evaluation), etc. It goes without saying that whatever techniques may be used, management techniques utilized at this level were chosen to promote people's participation in the decision-making process, as well as for efficient delivery of government support. The choice of techniques would also depend on the capabilities of officials.

Chart I. Monitoring System of Saemaul Projects by Level

	Level of Adeministration		
	Village	Township & County	Province & Central
1. Why monitoring? (Purpose)	-Facilitation -Supplementary & corrective measures -Self-Reinforcement	-Facilitation of delivery of material assistance -Provision of timely & proper guidance, education -Supervision of proper use of government-donated resources -Supplementary measures -Additional assistance/ support	-Management support -Policy readjustment -Readaptation of overall management system -Overall on-going evaluation
2. What to be monitored? (Indicators)	-Input -Output	-Input -Organization -Output -Progress	-Output -Performance -Impact/influence
3. Who collect information?	-Saemaul Leaders -Village Chief	-Township Chief Deputy County Chief County Chief with Assistance Officials	-Deputy Governor -Governor -Minister of Home Affairs with Assistance of Bureau of Saemaul Undong
4. How to collect and analyze informations? (Techniques)	-Built in the village-level management of project	-Application of Gantt Chart to planning & monitoring -Field visits & daily report -PERT techniques -Daily	-Application of Gantt Chart to planning & monitoring -Field visits -ad hoc case analysis & follow-up -Evaluative research
5. To whom and how often report? (Communication)	-For village leadership themselves -Daily & weekly	-To County Chief -To Governor -Daily/weekly -Bi-weekly/monthly -ad hoc	-To Minister of Home Affairs & President -Monthly, quarterly, annually -ad hoc

The frequency of monitoring also depends on the purpose of monitoring. The monitoring by village leaders is constantly exercised and built-in over the process of project implementation. However, monitoring at the county office is exercised by field visits, monthly reports, or quarterly reports.

For the benefit of efficient comprehension of the monitoring system for Saemaul projects, a simple chart is drawn as Chart I.

IV. Conclusions

There is no doubt that leadership and organization are critical factors of rural development in the Asian context. Appropriate management techniques could be a precondition to the proper exercise of rural leadership as well as conducive to organizational efficiency. Management techniques for IRD projects are not to be different from the techniques involved in the process of a project management at the government level, as IRD projects are to be managed on the basis of the principles of efficiency and effectiveness. Management of IRD projects requires the extensive involvement and participation of rural people and efficient coordination of multi-disciplinary factors, various kinds of resources and action instruments. It also requires use of rural folk culture and traditional values.

Therefore, the appropriateness of management techniques for IRD projects should be different from those for industrial development projects handled by government. The appropriateness should be decided in terms of major resources to be mobilized for IRD projects, objectives and goals of rural development projects, organizational structure in terms of pattern of interactions among people involved in the process of IRD projects, and the socio-cultural context of rural communities in which IRD projects are to be undertaken. It has been stated that management techniques for IRD projects should be simple and explicit so as to easily tell all the partners or parties about how things are being organized, implemented, and evaluated, by which all the rural people can easily participate in the process of IRD project management. Communication with all the people is the key for management efficiency in IRD projects.

The Korean experience in Saemaul projects demonstrate that the communication skill trained in the military and simple but complete techniques for planning, coordination and monitoring of Saemaul projects are key factors which eventually promote the efficiency of rural leadership and organizational performance. Simple PERT notions adapted to the rural context serve as an instrument for better coordination between local administrators in providing their respective services for IRD projects at the village level. Planning and implementation of component activities for an IRD project by utilizing Gantt Chart provide the minimum information to indicate critical activities to be planned and performed, issues of coordination, desirable means and directions,

and also who are counterparts to work with.

It goes without saying, nevertheless, that the most appropriate management techniques for the success of Saemaul projects must be those which are conducive to the exercise of rural leadership and to the motivation as well as participation of the people to the maximum extent.

REFERENCES

Baum, W. C., 1978, "The World Bank Project Cycle," *Finance and Development* 15 (Dec.): 10–17.

FAO, 1977, *Inter-Regional Symposium on Integrated Rural Development,* Berlin, 19–23 Sept.

Federal Electric Corporation, 1963, *A Programmed Introduction to PERT,* New York, John Wiley.

Haque, W., et al., 1975, *Toward A Theory of Rural Development,* Bangkok, UN/ADPI, Mimeo.

IBRD, 1974, *Rural Development and Bank Policies: A Progress Report,* Washington.

Litchfield, 1956 "Notes on a General Theory of Administration," *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 1956 No. 1, pp. 1–29.

Onate, B. T., 1977 "Indicators for Monitoring Rural Area Development Projects," A Paper presented at the Symposium on Programs for Rural Development, University of Philippines at Los Baños, 23–24 June.

Perrow, C., 1967 "A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Organization," *American Sociological Review* 32:194–208.

————, 1970 *Organizational Analysis,* London: Tavistock,

Rondinelli, D. A., 1975, "Preparing and Analysing Case Studies in Development Project Management," Honolulu: East-West TDI Working Paper.

Skinner, W. G., 1958, *Leadership and Power in the Chinese Community of Thailand,* New York: Cornell University Press.

Thompson, J. and A. Tuden, 1959, "Strategies, Structures, and Process of Organizational Decisions," in *Comparative Studies in Administration,* edited by Thompson, James et. al., Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 195–216.

UNAPDI, UNCRD, UNICEF, 1978, *Monitoring and Evaluation of Social Development Programmes, Summary Report of A Consultative Meeting,* Manila, 15–23 February.

Whang, In-Joung, 1978 *Administrative Feasibility Analysis for Development Projects: Concept and Approach,* Kuala Lumpur: UN/APDSC, 1978.

————, 1977, "Introduction: Concepts of Intergrated Rural Development," in *Training Strategies for Integrated Rural Development,* Kuala Lumpur, UN/APDAC, pp. 1–15.

————, 1974, "Integration and Coordination of Population Policies in South Korea," *Asian Survey* 19 (Nov.) pp. 985–999.

————, 1978, "Training Strategies for Integrated Rural Development," *Journal of Rural Development* 1 (Nov.): pp. 111–131.

————, 1980, *Hankuk ui Jonghap Nongchon Kaebal (Integrated Rural Development in Korea):* Seoul: KREI.

Wildavsky, A. and J. Pressman, 1973, *Implementation,* Berkley:Univ. of California Press.