

**11.S940 - Development, Planning, and Implementation: The Dialectic of
Theory and Practice**

Syllabus for the Fall 2016

Wednesdays (4:00 - 6:00 PM) - Room 10-401

Lead instructor:

Bish Sanyal – Office Hours: by appointment - Email: sanyal@mit.edu

Co-instructor:

Cauam Ferreira Cardoso – Office Hours: by appointment - Email: cauam@mit.edu

1. Course Description:

This is an advanced seminar that will analyze the effectiveness of development and planning theories from the perspective of practitioners who implement projects and policies based on such theories. The course will be organized around twelve implementation puzzles, which should be considered for re-theorizing both developmental and planning processes. The course will begin with a review of conventional theories of Development, Planning, and Implementation to set the stage for critical reviews of how such theories actually unfolded in practice. Then, drawing on the implementation experiences of projects and policies, the conventional theories will be revised particularly to fit organizational constraints which influence implementation outcomes. The ultimate goal is to create new planning sensibilities, which theorize from practice, not the other way around. Students will be required to focus on any one of the implementation puzzles discussed in the class and write a paper on the multiple facets of any such puzzle. This kind of an understanding can lead to re-conceptualization of the developmental process, as nations develop, cities grow, and planning is practiced by professionals who do not conceptualize the process as either "top-down" or "bottom-up", but seek an understanding of the connection between the two

levels. Since the central purpose of the course is to cultivate a conversation between theory and practice, this class will be open to both graduate students and SPURS-Humphrey Fellows.

2. Learning Objectives:

The choice of a dialectic approach to study the relationship between development, planning, and implementation is intended to foster critical thinking. Specifically, we expect students attending 11.S940 to develop two critical skills, which are the *ability to understand conventional development and planning theories*, then question the conventional understanding by looking at actual outcomes, and finally revise theory building in a way that is useful for practitioners. Even if this process sounds very clear-cut, the process is likely to be dialogic, and will rely on students reflecting on their own professional experience.

The main goal is not to replace conventional theories with non-conventional ones, but identify under what conditions any set of theoretical propositions hold. Hence, identifying conditions which determine development and planning outcomes is crucial.

One assumption that underlies this pedagogical approach is that it encourages unconventional thinking, and reflection in action – and not planning prescriptions based on pre-conceived ideas.

3. Course Format & Structure

The classes will start with lecture on each of the debates, followed by a seminar style discussion, in which students are expected to participate actively. The students will need to read the assigned material in advance as a way to prepare for an extensive in-class discussion. The weekly meetings will be organized around the implementation-related debates, with the co-instructors taking the lead.

We will also use online resources for information sharing, and to promote discussions on the challenges of implementation development policies and projects. These include the usual Stellar website and group emails.

4. Calendar Summary:

Date	Week #	Topic
Sep 7	1	<i>Introduction – The rationale for the course: why is it important to understand the difference between conventional theories and actual outcomes.</i>
Sep 14	2	<i>Overview of conventional theories of development, planning, and implementation</i>
Sep 21	3	<i>One Modernity or Multiple Modernities?</i>
Sep 28	4	<i>Assessment of development and planning efforts: what has worked and what has not?</i>
Oct 5	5	<i>Bottom-up versus Top-down development</i>
Oct 12	6	<i>Comprehensive versus incremental planning</i>
Oct 19	7	<i>Under what conditions do public sector institutions perform well?</i>
Oct 26	8	<i>Is politics a hindrance to, or essential for planning?</i>
Nov 2	9	<i>How do development professionals define what is ethical practice?</i>
Nov 9	10	<i>Rigidity versus flexibility</i>
Nov 16	11	<i>Modes of evaluation: what is useful knowledge for practitioners?</i>
Nov 23	12	<i>The Social construction of learning institutions.</i>
Nov 30	13	<i>Surety of purpose or humility of not knowing the answer?</i>
Dec 7	14	<i>Students Final Paper Presentations (1)</i>
Dec 14	15	<i>Students Final Paper Presentations (2)</i>

5. Assignments:

- **Analysis of an “Implementation Surprise”:** Two-page paper sharing a surprising outcome of an effort to implement either a development project or policy that the student is personally familiar with. At this stage, students will be asked to identify one or more of the proposed

implementation puzzles that come closer to their experience, and will be asked to make a short presentation (10 minutes) sharing the puzzle with their classmates.

- **Mid-term:** Students will complete an extended outline (5-pages), drawing on the implementation surprise selected in the first class. This outline will expand the description of the surprise and should include three plausible alternative explanations on why this might have happened. This assignment should be an intermediary step towards the formulating a full-fledged paper by the end of the semester.
- **Final Paper:** Individual 15-20-pages paper due at the last week of the semester. The paper should be built on the mid-term paper, and focus on one of the three potential explanations given earlier. In writing their final paper, students will be expected to draw from the required and some of the optional readings; or even better introduce new readings that could make the class better in the future.

6. Grading Framework:

Assignments	Due Date	Percentage of the Final Grade
Implementation Puzzle	09/21	10%
Mid-term	10/19	25%
Final Paper	12/07	40%
Class Participation	-	25%
Final Grade	--	100%

7. Grades Levels:

A=93-100%; A- = 90-92%; B+ = 87-89%; B = 83-86%; B- = 80-82%; C+ = 77-79%; C = 73-76%; C- = 70-72%; D+ = 67-69%; D = 63-66%; D- = 60-62%; F = <60

8. Additional Requirements:

Attendance: Attendance is required. More than two unexcused absences will result in a full letter grade reduction. Three “late” will result in one absence.

Statement on Class Conduct: I expect students to behave respectfully in class, which includes politeness towards the classmates and the instructor (e.g. giving others the chance to speak), as well as full engagement with the classroom activities (no browsing on the internet and social media allowed during class).

Plagiarism will not be tolerated! Please consult Institute guidelines:

<http://humanistic.mit.edu/wcc/avoidingplagiarism>

10. Classes and Reading Assignments^{*, **, ***}:

**Some of the reading assignments may change in the course of the semester to incorporate student feedback.*

*** Students must complete these readings prior coming to class.*

**** A list of Optional Readings is provided for each class. These readings are not required. Students may access these resources for further study, according to their own time availability and interests.*

Sep 7	<i>Introduction – The rationale for the course: why is it important to understand the difference between conventional theories and actual outcomes.</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hack, G. (2015). Designing Cities and the Academy. Journal of the American Planning Association, (ahead-of-print), 1-9.• Friedmann, J. (2002). A life in Planning. In Friedmann (2002) The prospect of cities. U of Minnesota Press. – Ch 7.
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Hirschman, A. O. (1995). A propensity to self-subversion. Harvard university press. –Ch 5

Sep 14	<i>Overview of conventional theories of development, planning, and implementation</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rostow, W. W. (1959). The stages of economic growth. The Economic History Review, 12(1), 1• Lewis, A. (1951). <i>Measures for the economic development of under-developed</i>

countries. United Nations, New York

- Optional Readings**
- Meier, G. (1984) Introduction. In Meier, G. M., & Seers, D. (Eds.). (1984). *Pioneers in development* (Vol. 375). New York: Oxford University Press.
 - Rosenstein-Rodan, P. N. (1943). Problems of industrialisation of eastern and south-eastern Europe. *The economic journal*, 202-211.
 - Weintraub, D. (1948). International approaches to economic development of undeveloped areas. *The Milbank Memorial Fund Quarterly*, 260-268.
 - Sutcliffe, R. B. (1964). Balanced and unbalanced growth. *The quarterly journal of economics*, 621-640.

Sep 21 *One Modernity or Multiple Modernities?*

- Required Readings**
- Mazlish, B. (1963). The Idea of Progress. *Daedalus*, 447-461.
 - Scott, J. C. (1998). Authoritarian high modernism. *Seeing Like a State. How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*, 87-102.

- Optional Readings**
- Ferguson, J. (2005). Decomposing modernity: history and hierarchy after development. *Postcolonial studies and beyond*, 166-181.
 - Eisenstadt, S. N. (2000). Multiple Modernities. *Daedalus*, 129, 1
 - Geertz, C. (1996). Modernities. In Geertz, C. (1996). *After the fact*. Harvard University Press.
 - Inkeles, A., & Smith, D. H. (1974). *Becoming modern: Individual change in six developing countries*. Harvard University Press – Ch. 2

Sep 28 *Assessment of development and planning efforts: what has worked and what has not?*

- Required Readings**
- Hirschman, A. O. (1986). In defense of possibilism. *Rival Views of Market Society and Recent Essays*.
 - Tendler, J. (1997). *Good government in the Tropics*. Johns Hopkins University Press. - Introduction

- Optional Readings**
- Hall, P., & Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2010). Planning, Planners, and Plans. In Hall, P., & Tewdwr-Jones, M. (2010). *Urban and regional planning*. Routledge.
 - Sen, A. (2001). Market, State, and Social Opportunity in Development. In Sen, A. (2001). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Oct 5	<i>Bottom-up versus Top-down development?</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tandler, J. (1989). What ever happened to poverty alleviation?. World development, 17(7), 1033-1044. • Evans, P. B., Rueschemeyer, D., & Skocpol, T. (1985). Bringing the state back in. Cambridge University Press. – Ch 2
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robertson, A. F. (1984). People and the state: An anthropology of planned development. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. – Ch 2. • Peattie, L. (1990). Planning: Rethinking Ciudad Guayana. In Planning: rethinking Ciudad Guayana. Ann Arbor.

Oct 12	<i>Comprehensive versus incremental planning</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2013). Escaping capability traps through problem driven iterative adaptation (PDIA). World Development, 51, 234-244. • Altshuler, A. (1965). The goals of comprehensive planning. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 31(3), 186-195.
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Medina, E. (2011). <i>Cybernetic revolutionaries: technology and politics in Allende's Chile</i>. MIT Press. Intro + Ch 7 • Lindblom, C. E. (1959). The science of" muddling through". Public administration review, 79-88.

Oct 19	<i>Under what conditions do public sector institutions perform well?</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grindle, M. S., & Hilderbrand, M. E. (1995). Building sustainable capacity in the public sector: what can be done?. Public Administration & Development (1986-1998), 15(5), 441. • Roll, M. (Ed.). (2014). The politics of public sector performance: pockets of effectiveness in developing countries. Routledge.
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pires, R. R. C. (2011). Beyond the fear of discretion: Flexibility, performance, and accountability in the management of regulatory bureaucracies. Regulation & Governance. Volume 5, Issue 1, pages 43–69, March 2011 • Evans, P. (1997). Development Strategies across the Public Private Divide. In Evans, P. (1997). State-society synergy: government and social capital in

development. Research Series.

Oct 26 *Is politics a hindrance to, or essential for planning?*

Required Readings

- Hoch, C. (1994). What planners do: Power, politics, and persuasion. American Planning Association.
- Krumholz, N. (2011). Making equity planning work: Leadership in the public sector. Temple University Press. – Ch 14

Optional Readings

- Natsios, A. (2011). The Clash of the Counter-bureaucracy and Development. Center for Global Development.
- Brooks, M. P. (2002). The Political Savvy Planner. In Brooks, M. P. (2002). Planning theory for practitioners. Amer Planning Assn.
- Sanyal, B. (2005). Planning as anticipation of resistance. Planning Theory, 4(3), 225-245.
- Grindle, M. S., & Thomas, J. W. (1991). Finding room for maneuver. In Grindle, M. S., & Thomas, J. W. (1991). Public choices and policy change: the political economy of reform in developing countries. JHU Press. P. 182 – 194.

Nov 2 *How do development professionals define what is ethical practice?*

Required Readings

- Sanyal, B. (2002). Globalization, ethical compromise and planning theory. Planning Theory-London-, 1(2), 116-123.
- Bazerman, M. H., & Tenbrunsel, A. E. (2011). Blind spots: Why we fail to do what's right and what to do about it. Princeton University Press. – Ch 2

Optional Readings

- Giri, A. K., & van Ufford, P. Q. (Eds.). (2003). A moral critique of development: in search of global responsibilities. Routledge. – Ch 9
- Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. (2010). Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing. Penguin. – Ch. 3
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. F. (2014). The spirit of compromise: Why governing demands it and campaigning undermines it. Princeton University Press.

Nov 9 *Rigidity versus flexibility*

Required Readings

- Jain, P. S. (1996). Managing credit for the rural poor: lessons from the Grameen Bank. World development, 24(1), 79-89.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tandler, J. (1997). Good government in the Tropics. Johns Hopkins University Press. Ch. 6 “
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jain, P. S. (1994). Managing for success: Lessons from Asian development programs. World Development, 22(9), 1363-1377. • Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Ingle, M. D. (1989). Integrating blueprint and process: A structured flexibility approach to development management. Public Administration and Development, 9(5), 487-503 • Graziano da Silva, J. F., Del Grossi, M. E., & de França, C. G. (2013). Fome Zero (Zero Hunger) Program. Ministry of Agrarian Development. • Levy, S. (2007). Progress against poverty: sustaining Mexico's Progresa-Oportunidades program. Brookings Institution Press.

Nov 16	<i>Modes of evaluation: what is useful knowledge for practitioners?</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sabel, C. (1993). Learning by Monitoring: The Institutions of Economic Development. In Handbook of Economic Sociology, Edited by Neil Smelser and Richard Swedberg. Princeton: Princeton University Press. • Hirschman, A. O. (2011). Development projects observed. Brookings Institution Press. – Ch. 5
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. (2010). Practical wisdom: The right way to do the right thing. Penguin. – Ch. 6 • Polanyi, M. (1967). The tacit dimension. • Hoffman, L. M. (1989). The politics of knowledge: Activist movements in medicine and planning. SUNY Press. – 191 – 204 (the problem of professional knowledge) • Friedmann, J. (1987). Planning in the public domain: From knowledge to action. Princeton University Press. – appendix A

Nov 23	<i>The Social construction of learning institutions.</i>
Required Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sanyal, B., Vale, L. J., & Rosan, C. (2012). Planning ideas that matter: Livability, territoriality, governance, and reflective practice. MIT Press. – Ch. 12 • Argyris, C. (2004). Reasons and Rationalizations: The Limits to Organizational Knowledge: The Limits to Organizational Knowledge. OUP Oxford. – Ch. 7
Optional Readings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Healey, P. (1997). Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies. UBC Press. – Ch. 9 • Stiglitz, J. E., & Greenwald, B. C. (2014). Creating a learning society: a new

approach to growth, development, and social progress. Columbia University Press.
– Ch. 16

Dec 30 *Surety of purpose or humility of not knowing the answer?*

Required Readings

- Gardner, H. (2006). Changing minds: The art and science of changing our own and other people's minds. Harvard Business Review Press. – Ch. 9
- Lear, J. (1998). *Open minded: Working out the logic of the soul*. Harvard University Press. – Ch 3

Optional Readings

- Schon, D. (1983). The reflexive practitioner. Arena, Ashgate publishing limited, GB. 4. Pg. 287 - 354
- Forester, J. (2006). Policy analysis as critical listening. The Oxford handbook of public policy, 6, 124.

Dec 7 *Student Presentations of Final Papers (1)*

Required Readings

- No required Readings

Dec 14 *Student Presentations of Final Papers (2)*

Required Readings

- No required Readings