

Measurement in Developmental Practice

From the mundane to the transformational



James Taylor and Sue Soal
of the Community Development Resource Association
March 2003

This paper was inspired by a three-day exploration into measurement and its impact on development practice. Fourteen development practitioners from different parts of the world, fulfilling different functions in the development sector, participated in the process. What brought us together is a commitment to building a development practice that has the best chance of countering the societal forces that exclude, marginalise, and undermine people's ability to develop to their fullest potential.

This is not in any way an attempt to capture the collective conclusions of the group process. Through this paper we share only what lives in, and between, the two of us after engaging with the others. As with all interactive learning processes it is impossible to claim exclusive ownership of the ideas, or to impose responsibility for them on others.

We have been dilettantes and amateurs
With some of our greatest notions
For human betterment.
We have been like spoilt children:
We have been like tyrannical children;
Demanding proof when listening is required

Ben Okri
(From: Mental Fight)

The tension between product and process is at the very core of the development industry. It is a defining characteristic of the sector that shapes the practices within it.

The products of development are many and varied, but the delivery of these is not the purpose of development. The purpose of development is to apply the resources (the product) through processes that transform relationships in society. The ultimate purpose of developmental interventions is always to ensure that the excluded, those at the margins, gain greater access to and control over the decisions and resources that directly affect their lives.

The tension in development, then, is between delivery of "product" to the needy, and the facilitation of process that shifts power relations in favour of the less powerful. Through the lens of this tension, this paper explores measurement as an essential and inescapable element of development practice. It shares some of the impact measurement practices have had on this tension, as experienced by practitioners. It then proposes some essential characteristics and practices required for the type of

measurement that appreciates and supports the ultimate purpose of developmental interventions.

The aim of this paper is to contribute towards building a body of developmental practice that is effective. To be effective our combined efforts have to be transformational - those relationships and structures in society that restrict human potential have to be transformed. In the process of promoting good practice we join with all those who are starting to reject measurement practices that are counter-developmental.

Measurement and its impact on development practice.

Increasingly measurement is being promoted as a critical tool for improving the outputs, effect and impact of physical and human resources. It is encountered at all levels of individual and organisational activity. Our individual contributions are measured in performance appraisals, the time and resources we use to do things are measured, our implementation is measured against our plans through the promotion of results based management systems, our individual and organisational impact is assessed, our organisations are evaluated and measured against their stated objectives in order to be held accountable and to access resources to sustain ourselves. As development practitioners we are not alone in this. We are but a small part of a world that is dominated by a deep-seated belief in what is essentially a scientific and instrumentalist way of relating in and on the world.

As development practitioners we are bound to shape the use of measurement towards meeting the needs of our purpose. We cannot allow the process of measurement to undermine it. The simple logic of measurement can best serve the interests of development practice by gauging the extent to which ‘what’ we bring and ‘how’ we bring it contributes towards our achievement of our developmental purpose. Because of the immense difficulty and complexity of what we are attempting to achieve, measurement itself must be measured in its ability to contribute towards our learning. Our purpose is too urgent and important to waste time on activities that are subversive of that.

The experience of many who have been measuring, and have been measured, gives us some idea of the extent to which measurement is achieving its developmental objective. Below are some of the conclusions reached by practitioners from all levels of the “aid chain”:

Measurement is an inherent ability that we all use.

We can and do all measure. Measurement is not first and foremost a sophisticated technical skill, it is an intuitive ability. Single cell organisms can detect and measure subtle changes in their environment. Black eagles can measure when the communities of rock-rabbits they prey on are being over exploited and are in danger of becoming unsustainable. Human beings from a very early age have an incredibly sophisticated ability to measure. Without even being conscious of doing it they can measure the amount of oxygen in their blood and innumerable other body functions. They can assess the mood of their parent and their ability to undertake a range of risky

activities. Human beings can plan activities ranging from children's games, to large and complex village celebrations, to intricate manufacturing processes. Those who plan and implement activities always have the ability to measure the extent to which they have succeeded in achieving their own objectives.

People do not have to be taught to measure. Measurement is central to how they have learned. They need to be reassured that they can measure and helped to adapt and apply their ability to new situations. All individuals and organisations are in some way, planning and measuring and learning.

Measurement facilitates accountability.

Measurement has played a significant role establishing a more planned and organised approach to development practice. It is an integral part of planning, monitoring and evaluation. Through measurement the focus shifts from what we are doing to what we have achieved through our actions. Development agencies have had to become increasingly "business-like". Funds can no longer be raised without clear and logical strategic plans with clear objectives and indicators for success. Accounting for the use of funds is no longer simply a bookkeeping exercise. Life without performance appraisals and impact evaluations is unimaginable.

Learning to plan and measure our activities has improved our ability to account for ourselves. It has contributed much to improving our efficiency as delivery systems. In many instances it has made us more competitive, to the point where we win tenders from government to implement large and complex projects.

However we are nervous that these gains in our ability to measure the delivery of product can undermine our ability to focus our efforts on our ultimate purpose.

Measurement tends always towards the mundane.

Within the dominant scientific paradigm, measurement reduces and standardises. In order to make sense of complex systems and processes, measurement first uses models and frameworks to reduce them to manageable segments. In the process the models and frameworks standardise what is measured. The models and frameworks are usually drawn from the reality of the measurer and not the measured.

As a result measurement is most effective and easily applied to the more material and mundane. Those things that are not easily counted are simplified and superficialised. To the developmental practitioner measurement does not convey what is most important. It is not that effective in capturing value. It focuses on 'what' you deliver and not on 'how' you deliver it - on the product and not the process - on the material not the relational - on the things not on the relationships that define them - on the outer and not the inner.

Measurement is really efficient and effective in conveying that which is easy to count. It is the best way for holding ourselves accountable for what we have done against what we planned to do. But despite all the attempts it remains inherently unsuitable as a means of appreciating what is of greatest value to us. It is not capable of capturing impact. We end up feeding each other with information that is only indirectly related

to what we consider to be really important in our work. At times it is so distantly related to anything connected to our work that it borders on deceit.

Excessive measurement is a symptom of a particular phase of development.

It is clear that some people have more of a need to measure than others. To those interested in observing and learning about development processes it is clear that measurement becomes more important at a certain phase of development. In the jargon of organisation development the phase is called the 'scientific' or 'differentiated' phase. During this phase the differentiation of activities needs high levels of management, coordination and control. These highly measured and regulated systems have the ability to manipulate their environment and be enormously productive. But this power eventually tends to start turning inwards on itself. As measurement becomes an end in itself, it starts to stifle creativity and the ability to adapt.

In pioneer phase organisations intuition, flexibility and response-ability are essential to success. Excessive measurement to a pioneer organisation is as dangerous as no measurement is to a scientific phase organisation. Excessive measurement is increasingly being recognised as becoming a threat to productivity, creativity and even to trust, in those parts of the world where it is rampant. This fundamental principle of development does not only apply to organisations, but to individuals and even to societies in different phases of development. The use of measurement is but one of many things that changes in different phases of development.

One of the complicating factors in development is that Northern and Southern organisations are often at very different phases of development. They also operate out of vastly differing societal contexts and cultures.

Measurement is used as a means of centralising control.

Measurement is a very important part of our ability to adjust our behaviour in order to achieve desired results. We measure those things we want to control. Those who are being measured by others feel this very strongly. There is a major difference being measured by someone who has power over you, and measuring yourself. In the development sector there is much evidence that measurement is used to effect control. This is commonly experienced through processes such as evaluation and performance appraisal. Control is exercised simply by setting standards and benchmarks and making the judgements required for measurement. This ability to influence is further expanded through making recommendations, and actively supporting some activities and discouraging others.

Another very common experience in the sector is that those more powerful than you (those closer to the resources) pass their problems on to you down the line. If your donor is being challenged by their back-donor to account differently for their impact, you can be sure you are going to have to start doing things very differently in the near future.

This phenomenon is particularly rife in situations of so-called partnership. Many international agencies have stopped implementing in other countries and now support

the activities of “partner”¹ organisations. It is clear that many international agencies still have the need to extend their sphere of control beyond their relationship with their “partner” to the relationship with the ultimate recipient of the service. For this reason the donor is not that interested in measuring its own success and ability in building the capacity of its partner, but is more interested in the success of its partner in delivering their services to the end user.

Measurement can dominate and devastate relationships.

In many so-called partnerships measurement is experienced by the “lesser” partner as dominating the quality and quantity of communication between the two parties. It is generally accepted that those providing the resources need to be reassured of the value of the work being done. But measurement is but a small part of fully appreciating the value of developmental work. Much of the more nuanced value achieved cannot be appreciated thorough short-term long distance measurement processes. More time needs to be spent in the kind of quality communication and relationship that facilitates “really getting to know each other”.

The other simple fact that cannot be escaped is that all too often evaluations are experienced as traumatic, threatening processes that leave those evaluated feeling deeply frustrated, powerless and insecure. It is very common for evaluation to be experienced as a continuation of past oppressive relationships. All too often the evaluator is experienced as slipping into the role of coloniser as the evaluated slips into the role of the colonised. In Central Asia evaluations are nothing new. Organisations prepare themselves much as they did when they were a part of the centrally controlled Soviet Union. The process of one person evaluating another only contributes to improved relations between the two when immense skill, sensitivity and trust prevails.

In a business where positive shifts in the “nature, quality and power in relationships over time” are central to its purpose, measurement needs to be used with great care. Anything that leaves “partners” feeling less powerful is counter-productive, anti-developmental.

Measurement can undermine learning and trust.

When we have a picture in our mind of what we hope to achieve before we act there is a strong chance that the outcomes of our actions will not “measure up” exactly to our original picture. It is out of the tension created by this discrepancy that learning occurs. It is this tension that leads us to asking the learning questions. “Why did my efforts not turn out as I had intended?” Ideally this process of questioning and learning leads to improved future practice.

All too often however this simple logical process simply does not take place. Because of the threatening nature of the process and consequences of measuring it is difficult even to admit that things have not turned out as planned. When it is impossible to avoid, the discrepancy is rationalised and justified in ways that do not involve the

¹ We use the word partner in inverted commas because we feel it is used inaccurately to describe all forms of relationship we have with each other – many of which do not in any way resemble partnerships. If interested read “The Poverty of Partnership” on www.cdra.org.za

painful process of introspection. In relationships where there is insufficient trust it is simply not safe to look for and reveal one's inner weaknesses. If one does not look inside for the reasons why you are not able to achieve what is expected you will not be able to change and improve. If it is not safe to look inside there is much that encourages the externalisation of problems. It is often easier to blame something external to yourself – a person, a system, an event - but the developmental cost is heavy. By turning yourself into the victim you fall prey to the most counter-developmental of all forces.

All too often the learning that flows from measurement and evaluation stays at the level of information and does not impact on changed behaviour. At worst it actually adds to disempowerment.

Measurement ignores developmental timeframes.

When development is understood as an inherent natural process it is accepted that each system has built into it its own development clock. It develops at its own pace. Similar types of systems have similar development time frames, but each individual progresses differently through it. Through our interventions into developing systems we can at best contribute towards unblocking stuckness – we can never speed up development beyond its natural pace without doing damage.

When measurement takes place outside of the implementation project cycle it frustrates itself by becoming unrealistic. It is good at keeping track of inputs and outputs but at the levels of effect and impact it is often too impatient to be helpful to developmental practitioners.

Measurement is becoming an imposed, standardised, specialist activity.

Measurement is at its most powerful when we use it as an integral part of our ongoing cycles of purposeful action. However we constantly experience measurement as something imposed by others and carried out by specialists. Those doing the measurement tend to use a very limited array of standardised models and methods. For the moment the 'logical framework' with a few lesser "SMARTs" and "SWOTS" dominate the development landscape. The problem lies not in the quality of these little models, but in their slavish application in all situations. This undifferentiated use of tools and techniques is non-developmental.

Our own measurement in our own way never suffices. We are all forced to report endlessly but it is never enough. Enormous amounts of money are being spent on specialist evaluations that are occasionally good enough to state what we already knew.

If measurement is to become a part of our own learning we must own and control the process.

Towards developmental measurement.

The way measurement is being applied at present is succeeding most in enabling organisations and individuals hold others accountable. While it is experienced as a powerful and formative force in relationships, its impact is not shifting power relations in favour of the less powerful. In this section we start exploring what developmental measurement might look and feel like. First we look at what developmental measurement must achieve. We suggest a few criteria for developmental measurement that could be used for measuring measurement itself. Criteria that will help us assess whether measurement is serving our developmental purpose.

And finally we share some characteristic elements of developmental measurement practice. Here we look more how it should be done. Not the detail, not standardised tools and techniques as there are more of these available than practitioners have the skill to use appropriately. We will look more at some basic principles of practice that should guide the practitioner in building their practice and their “toolbox”.

Basic requirements

Measurement must first do what it is good at, quickly and simply.

Measurement is best at the more mundane material level. It is best at measuring inputs and outputs. On occasion it is also helpful at the level of effect or outcomes. These basic levels are absolutely vital for development practice, and form its foundation. After all, development does occur through the delivery of products and services and development organisations must be able to deliver their services properly, and account for the fact that they have. If they cannot do this they should not get the resources to continue functioning. If they cannot master this basic activity there is little chance that will become effective in the more complex developmental aspect of their practice.

Equally if those providing the resources cannot articulate clearly and simply what the basic minimum “non-negotiable” accountability requirements are they are not fit to be stewards of development resources. The more technical “accounting” type measurement at this level should simply be done – and done as simply as possible. Appropriate methods should be sought to ensure that it is not difficult to do. All too often it is made difficult by over complicated standardised and bureaucratic systems and procedures.

Planning, monitoring and evaluation at this level has made a very important contribution to the sector, but it is only the beginning. Those making resources available to anyone at any level in the chain must make this a condition. The developmental aspect of this part of measurement is to help “partners” understand how easy it is by assisting them to find ways that are appropriate to them. What often confuses and confounds is the more common practice of imposing systems that are more suited to the provider of the resources.

Developmental measurement is transformational.

Developmental practitioners that are committed to going beyond the delivery of product must find ways of using measurement to inform and build their practice. After the relatively simple measurement of product it must focus on purpose and process. Its focus must always be on the higher purpose of development, and avoid being drawn always into the easier to measure countable levels. It must face the challenge of ensuring that good practice is being informed by keeping the ultimate objective (of really challenging and changing the world) in mind.

The “counting” type of measurement really struggles at this level. There are many efforts to combine the “quantitative” with the “qualitative”. The problem when we move into the realm of measuring relationships is that attribution becomes virtually impossible. One simply cannot attribute impact to input because of the complexity resulting from the inter-connectedness of all things. Measuring changes in relationships has as much to do with emotion as it does with rationality. It is more about ideas and actions than information and data.

The concept and convention of measuring is getting in the way rather than helping us appreciate the impact of our efforts at the more complex levels of social and relational impact. There have been many creative efforts to quantify quality, but they remain locked into focusing on the objects rather than what happens between them. Perhaps we need to let go of the word “measurement” when attempting to capture shifts and movements between social entities. We should consider the word “capture” rather than measure or “appreciate” (as in appreciative enquiry). We need to find a word that supports creative process rather than counting.

Developmental measurement must contain within it the ability to apprehend and describe changes in the nature and quality of relationships over time. But in addition to this it must succeed in rising above the mundane in order to contribute towards transforming relationships. Successful developmental measurement focuses intentions in ways that spark creativity. It does not reduce the complexity of life in order to capture it in small boxes. It faces the challenge of working holistically.

Measurement must improve the efficacy of practice.

Measurement starts with practice, and should end in improved practice. It must always begin with clarifying and understanding plans and intentions, it then looks at what was done and achieved, and compares it to what was intended. The circle must then be completed. The learning that is the product of measurement must result in improved future practice.

Despite all the rhetoric claiming that the purpose of measurement is learning (as well as accountability) it is difficult to detect its impact. The gap between knowledge about development practice and the actual quality of what is done in the name of development is unacceptable. A cost-benefit analysis of evaluations in the sector and their impact on improved practice would make us reconsider the resources invested in this activity. We know that a lot of measurement activity produces information that we simply do not have the capacity or time to process and use meaningfully.

Developmental measurement must improve the quality of practice of those being measured.

Measurement must contribute towards shifting relationships through learning.

The tendency of measurement to centralise control is directly contrary to the developmental purpose. Developmental measurement must promote consciousness, openness, honesty and depth – particularly in ones relationship to self. It must be experienced first as contributing to ongoing learning, and secondly as a means of holding oneself accountable. If it experienced as being first for someone else, the potential to learn from the process will be minimised.

Measurement must build confidence through facing failure, celebrating success and learning from both. It must contribute towards relationships that empower, always from dependency through independence towards inter-dependence. Above all it must always leave the measured party more in control, rather than less.

Developmental measurement must constantly create the tension that prompts learning that results in change that impacts positively on relationships. What makes transformational learning different, and much more challenging, is the fact that in order to take on new forms you first have to let go of the old.

Principles for measurement in developmental practice.

Developmental measurement is always “from the inside out”.

Measuring someone else with the expectation that they will draw learning from the experience is in its essence instrumentalist, controlling and counter-developmental. Developmental measurement is measurement undertaken by yourself on the understanding that you are going to be the primary beneficiary of the learning.

The power in relationships starts shifting when individual parties become more conscious of, and connected to, the power that they have. It is not a “top down” or “bottom up” process. Power is not given through empowerment from the top or taken from the bottom without first finding a source of power from within. The power that transforms starts as an “inside out” process. When power is wrested from the top to the bottom it tends simply to re-form rather than transform the relationships.

When evaluating and measuring yourself you start with your relationship with yourself. You have to accept full responsibility for your successes and failures, and the ability to change and improve. You always start with questions about your own purpose and practice. But to make sense of your impact on the world you need to explore and assess your relationships with others.

Developmental measurement is very different from the “top-down” measurement of the recipient of by the provider – it is circular, not linear. The principle of “inside-out” suggests that after starting within, you proceed to review your relationships with others in all directions. Both vertical and horizontal relationships need to be included.

In shifting power all relationships are important; those who have power over you; those over whom you have power; and those who share your position and interests.

At times, particularly with periodic evaluations, there might be value in engaging an outsider in order to bring a different perspective, specialist skills or facilitation skills. When this is done it is vital that the organisation being evaluated own and control the process. They must decide what the questions are that need to be asked, what the learning needs and accountability needs are. If outsiders are engaged to do some of the work they must be hired, instructed, managed, monitored and paid (or not paid) by the organisation being evaluated. This arrangement increases the chance of the external service provider taking seriously the needs of the organisation being evaluated.

The information and conclusions gained through this process are then used to account for your self (becoming account-able!), rather than being held accountable by others. This fulfils the basic requirement of shifting power to “the measured”. The organisation providing resources already has power over the recipient. If there is any doubt about the honesty or “objectivity” of the report they have every right to audit the organisation. But this approach is being promoted from experience of “partnerships” where the quality of relationships is such that there is enough knowledge of each other that this “policing” is not necessary. By spending time, energy and resources building relationship with, rather than evaluating, your partner you will know whether to trust them or not. Encouraging “partners” to evaluate themselves contributes enormously to building relationship and trust.

What is being suggested is not that you don’t involve others in your evaluations but that when you are involved in commissioning an evaluation it is understood that you are the primary learner expected to benefit from the process. The less powerful “partner” is usually more than willing to be the subject of the evaluation if they know that your success and practice is being measured and judged and not theirs. What is then being measured is the more powerful “partner’s” impact on those they serve – on the quality of their services.

If organisations supporting others are concerned about their “partners” ability to measure and evaluate themselves they must not under any circumstances take over the task. Their developmental responsibility is to convince the organisation that they have the ability to do it themselves. They must facilitate processes that connect their “partners” to their own innate knowledge of measurement. This must then be built upon until they can design a process that is appropriate to their own skills, phase of development, and needs.

If we all evaluate ourselves honestly and share our findings with each other we will be contributing to building a development sector that is worthy of its name, and a real chance of achieving its purpose. We must have the courage to challenge those who are not honest and hold them accountable for their dishonesty when it is a threat to our purpose.

Developmental measurement is not an event but an orientation.

If developmental measurement is from the inside out then it is not something that is occasionally forced on you by those who have influence over you. Measurement is but one part of a self-consciousness orientation. It is a part of an orientation based on a belief that by acting with intent and a commitment to ongoing learning you can shape your world, and not be a victim. It stems from taking pride in what you do and responsibility for the effect it has on others. It is based on a self-critical questioning approach to life.

Measurement should be built into all formal aspects of your work including planning, monitoring and evaluation. But also in the less formal pondering, wondering, and questioning that turns a job into a challenging life task.

Developmental measurement builds from the parts to the whole.

Scientific measurement reduces things to the point where they can be counted. The value of its contribution stems from the fact that it is reductionist. It simplifies and standardises. The logical framework approach to planning and measurement is a good example of this. It is designed to reduce the enormously complex social process to the point where they can fit into a series of boxes, and measured using “SMART” objectives and “OVI’s” (objectively verifiable indicators). The point has already been made that these tools are effective at the level of input/output but decreasingly so towards impact.

To really “appreciate” or “capture” the changes that are of most importance to developmental practitioners we cannot reduce things of quality to quantities and little boxes. We cannot end up considering only that part of what is important to us that is easily measured – we need to be working with the whole. This is a very practical dilemma that faces all those responsible for reporting on their progress and achievements. Those closest to the actual “coalface” of development practice are overwhelmed by the quantity of qualitative information they have. It is impossible for them to convey it to others without reducing its volume. They don’t have the time to collate it all, and even if they did, it would be useless to those who need it.

But to the developmental practitioner the issue of quantity is secondary. The real concern is with quality. The potential learning for improved practice that can be drawn from the charts, graphs and tables of reduced information is very limited. Our challenge is to appreciate the whole – and this requires a completely different orientation and approach to that of the reductionist, rational and scientific. Developmental practice needs to draw as much from the creative arts as it does from science, it needs to draw on the “right side of the brain”, the intuitive as much as the rational.

When working with highly complex social systems it is not possible to engage with and make sense of the whole. In order to start gathering information on which to base some understanding you have to use models that give you a “way in” to the system. These models assist in gathering, capturing and interrogating information that is meaningful. It helps us take the system apart, and understand the parts, their function,

and even something about how they relate to each other. But it is limited in its ability to help us understand the real meaning of the whole.

Taking one human individual as an example of a social system we can clarify the point. There are many models that help us make sense of the human being. Medical models help us understand the organs, their functions and relationships to each other. There are psychological models that help us gain insight into the workings of the mind. There are models that further differentiate between the body, mind spirit, and soul. There are methods to assist us in looking at how people have been shaped through their social interactions and relationships. Even if we were to apply all of these, we would not yet have a means of conveying the essence of the person. This is the challenge of holism – to capture the essence of the whole. The underlying principle is that the whole is always more than the sum of its parts.

The ability to capture and communicate the essence, or essential character, of complex systems and the relationships between them must be a core competence of the truly developmental practitioner. This is a skill that can, and must, be learned and developed. The ability to characterise is central to all art forms and developmental practice is as much an art as it is a science. There are practitioners already using this skill to great effect. It is providing people and organisations with insights into themselves that have more depth and meaning than other forms of measurement are capable of. There are simple and practical ways of doing it involving creative activities like storytelling, drawing and painting, characterisation exercises, role-plays, and the use of metaphors.

Again it takes courage to start implementing these approaches in a world dominated by scientific cynicism. There is however much proof that there is a side of all people that is more moved by a good story than a graph. There is no doubt that a story or a picture can capture more of the nuance and complexity of the human condition and potential than a graph ever will. Equally numbers have the enormous power of the finite. To meet the challenges we face in development we need to bring together capability of numbers to ground and bring down to earth, and the creative ability we have to capture the meaning of the stars.

Measurement is but a part of developmental practice.

However vital measurement might be it is but a small part of development practice. Measurement is becoming a major focus in the development sector but its contribution must be kept in perspective. Ongoing measurement can play a significant role in informing and improving practice that has the best chance of contributing to developmental change. But in and of itself it has as much chance of undermining what we are trying to achieve as contributing towards it. The difficult part is achieving the shifts in relationships, not measuring them. When they happen they are all too easy to observe and appreciate.

At best measurement is but one aspect the reflective learning part of developmental practice. It focuses attention on practice in order to improve it. Measurement will come into its own in development practice when it addresses the dilemmas and challenges that are most central to our task. When we develop the skills to engage in measurement in ways that bring complex systems to life rather than reduce them in

order to control them. In seeking to understand our impact more deeply through measurement we must generate better questions rather than superficial answers. We must measure our practice in ways that inspire, challenge and make us more conscious. Always building on the mundane towards transformation.

Measurement must be undertaken with courage in search of truth.

In practice, measurement is too often undertaken with expediency and efficiency foremost in mind. Developmental measurement must not fall into the trap of supporting the pretence that development is easy and that we have the answers and ability to achieve what we are attempting. We don't! If our relationships are based on this premise we start off with a lie, and all our communications thereafter have to perpetuate it. The most critical relationship of all is with ourselves. We have to have the courage to ask ourselves the difficult questions, to challenge ourselves, to live with the reality of how long it really takes for developmental transformations to come about. Then we have to have the courage to share this with others - particularly those who have power over us. We have to call the big development bluff.

“A quantum universe is enacted only in an environment rich in relationships. Nothing happens in the quantum world without something countering something else. Nothing is independent of the relationships that occur. I am constantly creating the world – evoking it, not discovering it – as I participate in all its many interactions. This is a world of process, not a world of things.”

*Margaret J. Wheatley
(Leadership and the New Science.)*